

Ohio

The Truth about Bob's Lanes

Sean Swain



2021

Contents

PART I: Indian Territory	6
<i>The Problem with Telling the Truth</i>	6
<i>The Facts, Like Them or Not</i>	7
A Lie For Everything	12
It All Goes Together...	13
What <i>Real</i> Humans Do	13
The Imperative to Consult Unreality	14
Two Realities	15
Everybody Knew	15
Truth, Re-Packaged	17
A Tool for Everything	18
Crime Pays	18
Good Fences (Sometimes) Make Good Neighbors	19
Reality on the Ground	19
Tools	20
It's About "The State Of Ohio"	20
Tools... Again	21
A Puppy Killer	21
Indian Territory	22
What This Means, Part II	22
Power	23
"The State Of Ohio," Role Model	24
Behind Bars	24
Authority	25
Peace and Dignity	25
My Case	25
Indian Territory, Part II	26
Tecumseh	26
What is a Law?	27
Two Things	27
The Taino	27
Reputable	27
Changing History	28
Really Low-Down Atrocities	28
Real	29
Strong vs. The United States	29
Authority, Part II	30
You Can't Do That	31

Real, Part II	32
The Milgram Experiments	32
The Point?	33
Justice	33
PART II: The Contract	34
Origins	34
The Charter	35
Contracts, Part I	35
Contracts, Part II	36
Democracy, Part I	36
Democracy, Part II	37
Contracts, Part III	37
Democracy, Part III	38
Democracy, Part IV	38
Contracts, Part IV	38
Democracy, Part V	39
Contracts, Part V	39
Without Consent, Part II	39
Implied Consent, Part I	40
Democracy, Part VI	40
Contracts, Part VI	40
Democracy, Part VII	41
Democracy, Part VIII	41
Implied Consent, Part II	42
Rights, Part I	43
Democracy, Part IX	44
Contracts, Part VIII	44
Implied Consent, Part III	44
Rights, Part II	45
Rights, Part III	46
Democracy, Part X	46
Rights, Part IV	46
Implied Consent, Part IV	47
Rights, Part V	47
Implied Consent, Part V	48
The No-Fly List Threshold	49
You Can't Protect Yourself from a Liar, Part I	50
Rights, Part VI	50
You Can't Protect Yourself from a Liar, Part II	50
Personhood	51
The Right to Create a God	51
Subjects and Slaves	51
Rights, Part VII	52
Contracts, Part IX	53

Rights, Part VIII	53
Contracts, Part X	53
God	53
No-Fly List Revisited	54
All of Us	54
Intelligent Life	54
Government-less	54
Part III: The Myth	56
Magical Beans, Part I	56
Flat Earth, Part I	56
Magical Beans, Part II	57
Flat Earth, Part II	57
An Observation about Myths	58
Respecting the Laws, Part I	58
What is a Law? Part II	59
The Right to Rule, Part I	59
Milgram Again	60
Respecting the Laws, Part II	60
Submission	61
Truth from the Future	61
The Right to Rule, Part II	62
The Idiot Factory	73
PART IV: Tipping Things Over	79
A Brief Recapitulation	79
Taking Down <i>What???</i>	80
No Other Option	81
The Audacity of Total Abolition	81
<i>premise:</i> I'm not alone.	82
<i>premise:</i> Enough is enough.	83
<i>premise:</i> If you build it, they will come.	83
To Abolish Anything, Start Anywhere	83
Why Ohio, Part I	84
No Other Option, Part II	85
Why Ohio, Part II	86
No Other Option, Part III	87
Why Ohio, Part III	87
The Audacity of Total Abolition, Part II	88
Political Violence, Part I	89
Why Ohio, Part IV	90
Political Violence, Part II	90
Why Ohio, Part V	91
Convergences, Part V	92
Political Violence, Part III	93

Why Ohio, Part VI	94
Reality Doesn't Matter	94
Political Violence, Part IV	95
Shock-u-py and Awe-cu-py	96
Marching Orders and Invitations	96
Political Violence, Part V	96
The Army of the 12 Monkeys	97
The Barbarians	98
Political Violence, Part VI	98
What Stops Torture, Part I	99
Political Violence, Part VII	100
What Stops Torture, Part II	100
Guerrilla Warfare, Part I	102
Good Danes	103
Why Ohio, Part VII	104
An Analogy, Part I	105
Reality Doesn't Matter, Part II	105
Guerrilla Warfare, Part II	105
Guns and Bombs, Part I	107
An Approach to an Approach	108
Guns and Bombs, Part II	108
Potato Guns, Super-Soakers, and Bowling Balls	109
Lessons from the Viet Cong	109
From the Air	109
Unready	110
Block Everything	111
Molotovs	111
Veterans	111
Drones	112
Government and Control	112
Back to Greeneville	112
Decolonization	112
Tanks and Bombers and Nukes, Oh My	113
Twelve Rebels and a Yacht	114
An Analogy, Part II	114
No Other Option, Part IV	115
An Analogy, Part III	115
Too Dangerous for Ohio	115
Columbus Day	116

PART I: Indian Territory

There are whole disciplines, institutions, rubrics in our culture which serve as categories of denial.

—Susan Griffin,

A Chorus of Stones

If rape is violence, as feminists correctly insist, then so too is the interculture analogue of rape: colonial domination.

—Ward Churchill,

Acts of Rebellion

The Problem with Telling the Truth

I had this bright idea when I started formulating the writing of this project. I was going to tell you the whole truth about this thing we call “The State of Ohio.” I would present the historical facts, the whole context, and then I would present to you my brilliant and captivating arguments.

That seemed like a winning plan to me. But then I wrote up the next section, “The Facts,” complete with a lot of research conducted by smarter people than me, including Ward Churchill, Derrick Jensen, and John Zerzan, among others. And that’s when I realized I couldn’t just spring this on readers without preparing them for it first. I can’t just tell you the truth. The truth hurts. And it hurts because we’re not used to hearing it. We live in a culture where there’s a lie for *everything*.

Think about it. Where do babies come from? Storks. Who delivers Christmas presents? Santa Claus. Who hides Easter eggs? The Easter Bunny. Who exchanges standard currency for baby teeth left under pillows? The Tooth Faerie. These are just the small lies at the beginning that get us adapting to the larger, more important lies later. We accept the Tooth Faerie exchanging currency for teeth, then later the schools convince us to accept the value of the currency. We get molded and become something useful to the larger program. The important lies help with that.

So if I just go blurting out the objective, undeniable truth, it will probably be too many wats for your speakers. It will conflict with the really important lies you’ve already digested, the ones that keep you (not) thinking a certain way, the ones that keep you under control.

You might read the next section and be inclined to think I just made it up. Even with all those references you’ll think it can’t be true, the same way that many victims of the Holocaust marched into the gas chamber not believing that mass genocide was taking place, dying with denial on their lips.

Really terrible atrocities always require a certain level of denial. Really terrible atrocities continue only if those taking part can convince themselves that nothing is really happening. It’s a good thing for really terrible atrocities that we live in a world where there’s *a lie for everything*.

To stop the atrocities, we have to first de-construct the convenient lies.

We're all entitled to our own opinions. We're not entitled to our own facts. The facts are the facts. And these are the facts.

The Facts, Like Them or Not

During the Crusades, Pope Innocent IV drafted a series of Papal Bulls to clarify the Catholic Church's position on the relationship between Christian crusaders and Islamic defenders in the Holy Land.¹ These Bulls represent the first European recognition that non-Christians had rights, including the right to own property.² In terms of an international standard, these Bulls established a general rule that people universally possess rights.³ This remained internationally-accepted doctrine at the time that Columbus arrived in the New World.

In the first encounters between Europeans and Native Americans, the question arose in European thought as to whether or not New World people possessed souls, whether they were fully human and therefore had a claim to rights. In 1550, a debate involving Bartolome de las Casas led to papal recognition of Native Americans as human beings with souls, thereby entitling them to recognition of basic rights.^{3,4}

From 1550 onward, international law applied to New World inhabitants who were accorded property rights. They owned the land of the New World.

With regard to completely and absolutely unoccupied lands, legal theorist Franciscus de Vitoria established the foundational legal theory of *terra nullius*; by this theory, European Christian sovereigns obtained automatic title to completely and absolutely unoccupied lands discovered by their subjects. This theory was quickly applied but almost immediately rendered moot because virtually none of the lands encountered by Europeans were completely uninhabited.⁵

This Vitorian logic was the basis for what became the Doctrine of Discovery," according to which New World inhabitants possessed aboriginal title to their lands. The native residents owned the land, but European discoverers, by virtue of first discovery, obtained exclusive rights to purchase discovered property from its owners if the owners ever chose to relinquish the land of their own free will. In this way, the Doctrine of Discovery served as a gentlemen's agreement of sorts between European powers as to who had first choice to purchase land that might come up for sale by native owners. The Doctrine of Discovery did *not* in any way stand for the proposition that Europeans could simply invade and take lands from native residents, contrary to revisionist myth. Well-settled and universally-accepted even among the founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson recognized that no "white nation" had any right to make "an invasion," as simple discovery bestowed "no right of soil against the native possessors."⁶

¹ Robert A. Williams, Jr., *The American Indian in Western Thought: The Discourses of Conquest*, pp. 43-49, 59-60, 64-72.

² However, the Christians could still dispossess others of their land holdings. See, Robert A. Williams, Jr., "the Medieval and Renaissance Origins of the Status of the American Indians in Western Legal Thought," *Southern California Law Review*, Vol. 57, No. 1, 1983.

³ Lewis Hawke, *Aristotle and the American Indian: A Study of Race Prejudice in the Modern World*.

⁴ To my knowledge, Native Americans never held a debate to determine whether or not Europeans possess souls and are fully human. The jury, it seems, is still out on that question.

⁵ Antonio Truyol y Serra, "The Discovery of the New World and International Law," *University of Toledo Law Review*, No. 43, 1971.

⁶ Andrew A. Liscomb and Albert Ellery Burgh (eds.), *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 20 vols.

So legally, the area now known as Ohio was the undisputed property of the native tribes who lived there, and it would remain their property until they chose to sell it or relinquish it of their own free will. This was a universally-recognized historical and legal fact, from 1550 through the settlement of the thirteen colonies.

For purchase of land, European states engaged in treaties with native people, fashioning legal instruments that mutually recognized each party's sovereignty and legal standing, just as with treaties between two European states. The "Indians were treated as sovereigns possessing full ownership of the lands of America..."⁷ Thomas Jefferson asserted that the Indians had "full, undivided, and independent sovereignty as long as they choose to keep it..."⁸ In 1750, England dispatched no less than an ambassador to negotiate relations with the Iroquois Six Nation Confederacy,⁹ demonstrating the general recognition of Native American sovereignty and land rights.

In 1763, King George III, the ruler of the American colonies, issued a proclamation¹⁰ that prohibited English settlement west of the Allegheny Mountains. This 1763 proclamation established a dividing line between the territory that England actually owned (the thirteen colonies) and the territory that remained in possession of the native peoples, including the area now known as Ohio. This proclamation is significant because it demonstrates that England, in ownership of the thirteen colonies, recognized a distinction between the territory it actually owned and the territory for which England reserved the right to purchase under the Doctrine of Discovery if native owners chose to sell—including Ohio.

On September 3, 1783, England signed the Treaty of Paris, recognizing the United States as an independent and sovereign nation. By virtue of this treaty, the US inherited the original thirteen colonies. Contrary to any revisionist myth, this inheritance did not—and could not—include lands beyond the Alleghenies: lands west of the 1763 demarcation line. Because England did not own those lands, England could have no legal authority to transfer title for those lands to the United States.¹¹ What England did transfer to the US was England's right to first purchase of lands beyond the Alleghenies, under the Doctrine of Discovery.¹² This was the interpretation accepted by both England and the United States, as recorded by Thomas Jefferson who was present at the signing of the Treaty of Paris.¹³ So, as late as 1783, it was unanimously recognized by England, the US, and the native tribes that the area now known as Ohio was the exclusive property of the native people who lived there.

In 1787, the congress authored the Northwest Territory Ordinance, which set forth, in part: *The utmost good faith shall always be observed toward the Indian; their land shall never be taken from them without consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty, they shall never be invaded or*

⁷ Renard Strickland and Charles F. Wilkinson (eds.), *Felix Cohen's Handbook on Federal Indian Law*.

⁸ Quoted in Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Trade and Intercourse Acts, 1790-1834*.

⁹ James Thomas Flexner, *Lord of the Mohawks: A Biography of Sir William Johnson*.

¹⁰ RSC 1970, App. II, No. 1, @ 127.

¹¹ England could no more transfer title to land beyond the Allegheny Mountains than I could sell the Brooklyn Bridge.

¹² "The Treaty of Paris", in Hunter Miller (ed.), *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America*; also in Ruhl J. Bartlett (ed.), *The Record of American Diplomacy: Documents and Readings in the History of US Foreign Relations*.

¹³ Merrill D. Peterson, *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation*; and Gordon Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787*.

*disturbed—but laws shall from time to time be made, for wrongs done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them.*¹⁴

Yet, while the US government made such promises, a deliberate and purposeful enterprise for stealing land from native peoples was already well under way. In 1763, Sir Jeffrey Amherst wrote to his subordinate that he was sending smallpox- infected blankets among the native tribes and Amherst's subordinate, in turn, replied that he too would send infected blankets to the Indians, noting cryptically in his journal that he hoped "it will have the desired effect." As a result, smallpox spread among the Ohio River Valley tribes including the Shawnee, Delaware, and Mingo, taking the lives of as many as a hundred thousand innocent victims through the first documented use of deliberate biological warfare in human history.¹⁵

In 1783, General Philip Schuyler wrote to the same congress that pledged the "utmost good faith" toward the Indian: As our settlements approach their country, they must, from the scarcity of game, which that approach will induce, retire farther back, and dispose of their lands, unless they dwindle to nothing as all savages have done... when compelled to live in the vicinity of civilized people, and thus leave us the country without expense of purchase.¹⁶

George Washington summed up this encroachment strategy quite succinctly: "The gradual extension of our Settlements will certainly cause the Savage as the Wolf to retire."¹⁷ A British observer in 1784 noted that the policy toward native inhabitants was one of "extirpating them totally from the face of the earth, men, women, and children,"¹⁸ Encroachment was a deliberate strategy to push native landowners off of their land, a process that the American Indian Movement's Russell Means and others have aptly equated with genocide.¹⁹

By the time of the authoring of the Northwest Territory Ordinance, promising the "utmost good faith" toward native people and guaranteeing that their "land shall never be taken from them without their consent," a full-scale and deliberate genocide was being committed in the area now known as Ohio. While the Northwest Territory Ordinance recognized native rights to land in conformity with the Doctrine of Discovery and the international law standards of the time, it also contained a plan for carving states out of that same territory. By that plan, territory owned by the native people would be divided into states that would "forever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States of America."²⁰ It would seem, then, that this ordinance presented

¹⁴ Northwest Territory Ordinance, 1 Stat. 50 (1787).

¹⁵ All of these details are affirmed in E. Wagner Stern and Allen E. Stern, *The Effects of Smallpox on the Destiny of the Amerindian*.

¹⁶ from *Papers of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*.

¹⁷ letter from Washington to James Duane, September 7, 1783, quoted in John C. Fitzgerald (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington from Original Manuscript Sources, 1745-1799*.

¹⁸ John F.D. Smyth, *A Tour of the United States of America*.

¹⁹ According to Raphael Lamkin in *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, p. 79: Generally speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of nation, except when accomplished by mass killing of all the members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aimed at the destruction of the essential foundations of life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the group themselves. The objective of such a plan would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feeling, religion, liberty, health, dignity, and the lives of individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is the destruction of the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity but as members of the national group. Genocide, according to the United Nations Secretariat, is defined twofold as "destruction of a group" and also as "preventing its preservation and development," United Nations Document A/36, 1948. For further interpretation, see U.N. Doc. E/A.C. 25/S.R. 1-28.

²⁰ Northwest Territory Ordinance, Article IV.

two contradictory and irreconcilable ideas—first that native people would never have their land taken; second that the land would be carved into states whether any natives wanted it or not.

Colonizers streamed into Indian territory at a rate of ten thousand per year, stealing native lands; they were soon followed by General Josiah Harmer with more than fifteen hundred troops, not to protect the native possessors of the land but to protect the invading colonizers who were stealing it. When native peoples defended their land rights recognized by the Northwest Territory Ordinance and the Treaty of Paris, the US sent General “Mad Anthony” Wayne who orchestrated a systematic, military extermination of the tribal people (who, remember, “shall never be invaded or disturbed...,” and whose lands “shall never be taken away without their consent”).²¹

Once the native populations were effectively decimated, Mad Anthony Wayne negotiated a treaty on behalf of the United States. Signed August 3, 1795, it was entitled “The Treaty of Greenville,”²² and declared an end to the fighting, restored prisoners to both sides, and set a boundary line for territories that the tribes were relinquishing and were retaining.²³ By this boundary, the vast majority of territory now known as Ohio was set aside as Indian Territory. Native peoples could remain within this territory “so long as they please, without any molestation from the United States,” and “the United States will protect all the said Indian tribes... against all citizens of the United States, and against all other white persons who intrude upon the same.”²⁴ It then went on:

If any citizen of the United States, or any other white person or persons, shall presume to settle upon the lands now relinquished by the United States, such citizen or other person shall be out of the protection of the United States; and the Indian tribe, on whose land the settlement shall be made, may drive off the settler, or punish him in such manner as they think fit...²⁵

In 1795, the Treaty of Greenville became the “supreme law of the land,” as this status is confirmed by the US Constitution, which sets forth: *The Constitution and Laws of the United States which Shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the Land and the Judges in*

²¹ Richard Bettin, “‘Mad Anthony’ Wayne at Fallen Timbers: General Wayne’s Decisive Victory in the Northeast Territory Ends the Young Nation’s Crisis of Authority,” Ft. Wayne, News Sentinel, 1996, *The Early American Review*, Fall, 1996.

²² The Treaty of Greenville, subtitled, “Treaty of Peace Between the United States of America and the Tribes of Indians Called the Wyandots, Delawares, Shawanoes, Ottawas, Chipewas, Putawatimes, Miamis, Eel-River, Weas, Kickapoos, Piankashaws, and Kaskaskias.”

²³ According to Article III: *The general boundary line between the lands of the United States and the lands of said Indian tribes, shall begin at the mouth of the Cuyahoga River, and run thence up the same to the portage, between that and the Tuscarawas branch of the Muskingum, thence down that branch to the crossing place above Fort Lawrence, thus westerly to a fork of that branch of the Great Miami River, running into the Ohio, at or near which fork stood Laramie’s store, and where commences the portage between the Miami of the Ohio, and St. Mary’s River, which is a branch of the Miami which runs into Lake Erie; thence a westerly course to Fort Recovery, which stands on a branch of Wabash; thence southwesterly in a direct line to the Ohio, so as to intersect that river opposite the mouth of the Kentucke of Cuttawa River...*

²⁴ In Article IV, the treaty set forth, “[T]he United States relinquish their claims to all other Indian land northward of the river Ohio, eastward of the Mississippi, and westward and southward of the Great Lakes and the waters, uniting them, according to the boundary line agreed on by the United States and the King of Britain, in the treaty of peace made between them in the year 1783...”

²⁵ Treaty of Greenville, Article V.

*every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.*²⁶

In November 1802, seven years after the signing of the Treaty of Greeneville became the supreme law of the land and set aside most of Ohio as unceded Indian Territory, thirty-five white men gathered together and drafted the Ohio Constitution. They did not consult the legal owners of the vast Indian Territory that the so-called State of Ohio would occupy. By the Ohio Constitution, voting in the state would be limited only to white men, thereby disenfranchising the entire population of people who owned the land according to US treaty. Thomas Worthington took the Ohio Constitution to Washington, D.C., and presented it to congress on December 22, 1802. On February 19, 1803, the US Congress declared Ohio a state of the United States.

What This Means...

“Do you know what this *means*?”

That’s the question I get from a lot of people who read the preceding. The other popular response is, “So what?” Both responses are questions. Both address the value of the information presented. The first response (“Do you know what this *means*?”) indicates that the reader sees a great many important implications, while the second (“So what?”) indicates the reader sees no value at all. I’ll try to answer both questions.

There are more than eleven million people who currently reside within the territorial boundaries of this thing we call the *State of Ohio*. I’m one of them. I write this from an Ohio prison, having been delivered here by order of an Ohio court, found guilty of violating an Ohio law. Ohio laws were passed by Ohio’s legislature, called the Ohio Assembly. The courts, the legislature, and the governor all claim to derive their powers from the Ohio Constitution.

The Ohio Constitution serves as something of a charter for this incorporated *State of Ohio*. So Ohio’s courts and legislature and governor only exercise legal authority if the Ohio Constitution is a legal document. If the Ohio Constitution is *not* a legal document, but is only a bogus instrument drawn up by thirty-five trespassers who violated federal law to rob people of their land and get themselves rich, then Ohio courts and legislators and governor have no legal authority and they never did.

This isn’t a question of whether or not the government of this *State of Ohio* is a good government. It isn’t a question of whether or not the Ohio Constitution is a good document or not. It’s not even a question of whether or not incorporating the *State of Ohio* was a good idea.

What I’m saying is, this *State of Ohio* doesn’t legally exist. I’m saying this thing calling itself the *State of Ohio* doesn’t have any real legal authority and that it never did.

Thirty-five men including Thomas Worthington (if that *was* his real name) violated the terms of a US treaty, broke federal law, trespassed onto unceded Indian Territory and wrote up a purported legal instrument that completely abrogated “the supreme law of the land.”

Worthington and his friends had no legal standing to draft the Ohio Constitution. They could no more include unceded Indian Territory into their *State of Ohio* than you or I could go down to the local bowling alley, write up our own founding documents, and declare Bob’s Lanes part of our new state.

Go ahead. Give it a shot. Take thirty-four of your closest friends to the bowling alley, draft up a constitution, and plant your flag right next to the ball return. Let the manager know his

²⁶ Treaty of Greeneville, Article VI.

bowling alley is now under your legal jurisdiction. When the cops arrive, show them your new constitution and explain your newly-derived legal authority as President of the Republic of Bob's Lanes. See where that gets you. Drop me a line and let me know what the court sets your bond at.

If it's a crime to take over a lousy bowling alley, then what do you call it when a small group of thugs in 1802 took over thousands of square miles of real estate without consulting the land's rightful owners? They had no more right to establish *the State of Ohio* than we have the right to establish the Republic of Bob's Lanes.

If that all proves true, then the Ohio Constitution and any subsequent constitutions aren't worth the paper they're printed on. The courts, legislature, and governor have never exercised any legitimate authority. This *State of Ohio* as a government entity is as real as faerie dust and magical moon-beams. It's as valid as our Republic of Bob's Lanes.

That is what this means.

A Lie For Everything

There are lessons to be learned from truth that hurts. In 1550, Bartolome de las Casas won a debate. He argued that New World inhabitants were fully human and possessed souls, that they were entitled to basic rights. Because he won the debate, we might be inclined to conclude that our juridical method, however imperfect, leads us to the truth. Some might see the results of that debate as a vindication of our culture's methods for resolving questions.

Perhaps it is. But perhaps not. I see it like this: While Bartolome de las Casas was arguing that Native Americans were fully human and possessed souls, *somebody* was arguing against him. I don't know who that person was, but it doesn't really matter. Whoever he was, he had met New World people, had been the beneficiary of their hospitality. He had looked into their eyes. He had seen their smiles. He had heard their language even if he didn't understand it; he knew it was language, the same way he would have heard Portuguese or Italian or French and understood it as language even if he couldn't understand what was being said. He had probably eaten their food. He might have lusted after their women. He had seen them playing with their children. And he was arguing that they weren't fully human. He was arguing they didn't have souls.

He was making an argument that he knew, if successful, could lead to the complete extermination of those people. It could lead to them being pushed off the land without purchase, slaughtered wholesale. He knew that in making such an argument, he was doing holy work for the Church. He was conducting himself in obedience to God.

Even back in 1550, we had a lie for *everything*.

Bartolome de las Casas' debate opponent was so steeped in his culture's lies that he could ignore all of his direct experience with peaceful human beings, ignore all of the evidence right in front of his nose, and calmly argue a position that, if accepted, would logically and inevitably lead to innocent people being obliterated. He could do that to people after he sat down at a fire and ate with them.

Sure, de las Casas won the debate. But my point is, there was a *debate*. Nobody could trust themselves to recognize the obvious truth, but instead had to ask the Pope, "Can we kill these people and take their land without purchase, or do we have a moral duty to treat them like

humans?” The very fact that the question was ever posed is troubling. It says something about us, going all the way back to 1550.

Imagine if de las Casas hadn't won the debate. Today, your cosmetics would be tested first on chimpanzees, then on Indians. If de las Casas had lost the debate, European colonizers would have invaded the Americas and slaughtered the Indians wholesale without purchase of the land.

Oh, wait. They did that anyway.

It All Goes Together...

So, this is what I'm doing...

You might be wondering why, if this is about Ohio, my facts go back to papal bulls and then some debate in 1550. You might think that all of that has nothing to do with Ohio.

The thing is, the colonization of Ohio didn't happen in a vacuum. We have to see everything in its context. I'm trying to connect some dots and show you a pattern I see, and that pattern extends back before Ohio, and it extends forward from Ohio's colonization to the present, which is why I use some of my own experiences to prove my points. That's what I'm doing.

Also, we seem to have this idea in our culture that this process of taking over the Americas was an inevitability, just progress, and even though it was messy, you have to crack some eggs to make an omelet, right? The conception is that the people doing the colonizing were like folks on the 1960s television show, *Daniel Boone*: well-intentioned people who just accidentally stumbled into a genocide.

But there was already a universally-acknowledged framework of international law in place. Nobody was making things up, or flying by the seat of their pants. There was a clear and settled understanding regarding property rights. You can't look at the Treaty of Greeneville without seeing the entire context. If you do that, you won't see it for what it really was. It all goes together.

The truth hurts.

What *Real* Humans Do

The arrogance.

Imagine you and I met for the first time. We exchange pleasantries. Then, before I engage you in discussion, I call in a team of theologians and experts who subject you to an inquisition in order to come to some official determination as to whether or not you are fully human and possess a soul. If they say you do, I engage you. If not, all bets are off. How would you feel about that?

The fucking *arrogance*. To do something like that, I'd have to really think of myself as all-that-and-a-bag-of-chips, wouldn't I? I would have to be convinced that my experts with big, big brains have special dispensation from the gods so they can tell humans from non-humans, those with souls from those without, the soulful from the soulless. I would have to think that my pronouncements about you somehow outweighed your own pronouncements about yourself.

If I say it, then it is so. By saying it, I make it so. Until I say it, it is not so. I said so.

The fucking arrogance.

But Native Americans didn't gather their own Bartolome de las Casas and their theologians to hold a debate as to

whether newly-arrived Europeans from across the water were fully human, whether they possessed souls. When these gaunt, sickly, pasty specimens stepped off their boat, stinking and covered in lice, desperately in need of food, the natives they encountered generously handed them something to eat. But imagine if, instead, the natives had called a council to determine whether or not Europeans were human.

Through an interpreter, the Native Americans' top theologian may have addressed the Europeans: *See, you seem human to us. You look human, except for all that unsightly hair on your faces. You dress human. Sort of. And you have language, even though it sounds like gibberish to our cultured ears. But see, the thing is, we can't trust our experiences. Just because I look into your eyes and shake your hand and eat food with you, I can't trust my own judgment. Instead, in our culture, we ignore what we see and hear and feel, and we employ a juridical process that allows a learned few to decide for all of us. We defer to that process. See, there are two realities: what we experience and can't trust, and what our juridical process determines from consulting principles and ideas completely divorced from anything experienced in the real world. So, we're going to hold a debate that appeals to those ideas and principles and in the end, we'll either feed you or we'll decide you're not human and we'll exterminate you, take your supplies, and burn your boats into the sea. Please stand by.*

Wouldn't that be disturbing? Just a little bit. All those lives in the balance, awaiting a kind of academic coin-flip? Lucky for the Europeans, the Native Americans didn't act like... well... Europeans. Fortunately for Columbus and everyone who came after, Native Americans weren't so arrogant. Instead of holding a debate, they handed food to hungry people. They handed blankets to the cold and shivering. That's what *real* humans do.

The Imperative to Consult Unreality

In Vietnam, the troops who did the fighting and dying often complained that the generals and politicians making the decisions didn't understand "the reality on the ground." In many analyses after the war, this inability to perceive the "reality on the ground" is cited as a principle cause for the US defeat. Not trying to sound funny here, but what other reality is there? Does some other reality exist besides the one on the ground? How many realities are there?

Apparently, there's something else. To generals and politicians, there was something other than the reality on the ground. In their reality—divorced from the reality on the ground, so a false reality, they formulated successful strategies that would win the war and return the troops to tickertape parades and faithful girlfriends at the maltshop. Their false reality was no reality at all. The generals and bureaucrats couldn't just take a chopper into the thick of things and observe the war. They couldn't talk to soldiers. They couldn't go on patrol with a squad to see what the troops were up against, to see firsthand the level of support or opposition shown by the population. That lack meant they were not informed.

Apparently the best way to get informed about the war in Vietnam was to never go there, to sit in an air-conditioned office thousands of miles away, consult data printouts and statistics, read theories produced by others who had never been to Vietnam, call others in other air-conditioned offices, who had also never been to Vietnam, and solicit their best thinking. *That* is how you get informed about Vietnam.

We're all Vietnam generals in this sense. We're trained from birth, in every instance of our lives, to ignore the reality on the ground because that reality is not as real, not as important,

as the unreality that flows from the pronouncements of authorities who are complete strangers to us. Their unreality informs our every move, influences how we see the world. We can't trust our own eyes and ears and hearts and minds. Our immediate experiences are wholly unreliable. Instead, we must consult the juridical and theological and academic unrealities, the theories and dogmas and legal codes, in order to properly interpret the world. All of that is more real to us than the reality on the ground.

In Vietnam, generals and politicians couldn't see reality. Their minds were captive to an unreality to which they had to defer. In the New World, colonizers couldn't see the reality on the ground either. They couldn't see that the Native Americans were humans with souls. They needed a decree, a piece of paper to which they could defer.

It seems that none of us can ever accept reality on the ground. We consult the unreality constructed by strangers to inform and influence our decisions and actions. We can't do anything until we first defer to the lies we have for *everything*.

Two Realities

Two realities, completely unrelated.

You've got the reality on the ground, which is the real reality, and then you've got the other reality, an unreality, a false reality, a construct. That other reality flows from impersonal authorities, dead and living, whose decrees and pronouncements emanate from court rooms and offices and classrooms and pulpits to influence and control our perceptions of the world and our experience, our direct understanding of the reality on the ground.

Ignore what you experience. Defer to some external authority, far removed from your experience. Your direct experience is invalid. It is unreliable. You must always defer to an outside authority.

Think about this: Is it really any wonder that drivers will sometimes ignore what they see with their own eyes and defer instead to the computer voice coming out of the dashboard that is instructing them to drive directly into a lake? Always defer to an external authority.

...Calculating route...

There's a lie for *everything*.

Everybody Knew

The truth hurts.

That's why we make a lot of excuses for the conduct of early settlers. We say they didn't know any better. We say the world was different then. It was a violent world... lawless... cruel... People had to do what they had to do. And so on. But none of that is true. Not really. We're making excuses. We're engaging in denial.

The colonizers knew better. They knew that people were people. They knew Native Americans were human beings with babies and children and hopes and dreams. They knew. Thomas Jefferson knew. He said no "white nation" had any right to make "an invasion." He wasn't alone. The British government recognized the land rights of Native Americans and negotiated land acquisition through an ambassador. Congress knew Native Americans were humans with land

rights and said so when it passed the Northwest Territory Ordinance promising “utmost good faith” toward the Indian, and that “land shall never be taken from them without their consent.”

The legal principles were very clear to everybody right from the start.

The legal principles were also completely irrelevant. Settlers wanted free land. They cared more about land than they did the people who lived on it. They knew, as General Philip Schuyler described it, that they could destroy Native Americans’ way of life by encroaching upon them and causing a “scarcity of game,” as Schuyler euphemistically put it in his letter to Congress. “Scarcity of game” is another way of saying, “extermination of their food source,” which is another way of saying, “making their children go hungry.”

We knew that if enough of their children starved to death, they would leave and we would get their land for free. To employ a similar strategy against sedentary agriculturalists, you would burn their crops. Creating a “scarcity of game” for semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers is the same as torching the crops of farmers. Colonizers knew that tribes would move due to “scarcity of game,” just like burned-out farmers would reasonably migrate to lands they could harvest. Starving children equals free land.

When you look across the geography of Ohio, there are miles and miles of “free land” gained without purchase. There is an inevitable calculus that we never think about, a ratio of dead children for every mile of free real estate. Schuyler knew when he spoke of “scarcity of game” what the encroachment strategy would produce. He knew he was ultimately creating a math problem, a ratio of dead children per mile of free real estate. He knew. Everybody knew.

Settlers streamed into Ohio at a rate of ten thousand per year, knowing they were breaking the law. They knew they were stealing. They knew they were disrupting the Indian way of life. They knew Indian children would die. The government knew what was happening. It made no real effort to stop the flood of colonizers. The government had no more respect for the law than the people did.

George Washington knew what was happening. He invested in a company that sought settlement in Ohio and he became this country’s first lobbyist, first insider-trader. Funny we learn in school how he was too honest to lie about chopping down a cherry tree, but learn nothing about his profiteering when he chopped down the Indians’ way of life. He saw human beings as nothing more than “wolves” to be driven off the land and exterminated.

George Washington knew. Everybody knew.

When Captain Amherst and his subordinate sent smallpox-infected blankets to Native Americans, they knew what they were doing. They knew they were committing purposeful mass murder. They knew they were killing human beings. And they weren’t the only ones: recall, more than a hundred thousand natives died. That didn’t happen from just two blankets and a handkerchief.

Lots of people were handing infected blankets to Indians. Lots of people were willingly participating in mass murder. They were murdering children. Everybody knew.

The truth hurts. It hurts because we’re so unaccustomed to hearing it.

When ten thousand settlers streamed into Ohio each year, making the invasion that the US promised it would never make, everybody knew what was happening. Everybody knew it was theft and murder. Everybody knew what the steady invasion of Ohio would inevitably provoke.

When General Josiah Harmar and fifteen hundred troops were sent into Ohio to make the invasion that the Northwest Territory Ordinance forbid, everybody knew what was coming. Tribes with starving children would defend their land and their right to exist, and that would give the

US the excuse it needed. So when General “Mad Anthony” Wayne was sent to Ohio, everybody knew what he was sent to do. “Mad Anthony” wasn’t sent to negotiate. “Mad Anthony” wasn’t sent to talk. When you want peace, you don’t send people nicknamed “Mad Anthony” to handle the business.

So everybody knew whose blood would be used to sign the Treaty of Greenville once the smoke cleared.

General Josiah Harmar and General “Mad Anthony” Wayne were mass murderers who exterminated innocent human beings for defending their own land rights. Harmar and Wayne thereby clearing the way for thieves and robbers to get free land fertilized by the blood of children. Fort Wayne, Indiana, is named for a maniac in the same category as Adolf Hitler, Josef Stalin, and General George Armstrong Custer.

When you cross the state line into Ohio, there’s a sign along the interstate that says, “Welcome to Ohio! The Heart of It All!”

No shit.

Truth, Re-Packaged

We make excuses for the colonizers who invaded Ohio. We talk about the territory they “discovered,” as if people weren’t already living here; we talk about “settlement” as if it wasn’t an invasion. We use different words so those words those words will evoke a different idea, and we can then create for ourselves a false sense of history and reality. Our words shape our denial. We think of the trajectory of our history as some unfortunate inevitability, something destined to have happened, unpreventable.

A lie for *everything*.

Ward Churchill, a scholar and activist, wrote:...[T]erms like “discovery” and “settlement” do not reflect the actualities of invasion and conquest they are used to disguise; colonialism is not a matter of “trust,” it is colonialism, a crime under international law; genocide isn’t an “inadvertent” outcome of “progress,” it is genocide, an always avoidable crime against humanity; ecocide is not “development,” it is ecocide, the most blatant and irremediable form of environmental destruction; mere possession constitutes “nine tenths of the law” only among thugs devoted to enjoying the fruits of an organized system of theft.²⁷

Elsewhere, he wrote, ...[A] vast amount of intellectual energy has been expended by Euroamerican legal theorists over the years in an unending effort to make the armed expropriation of native land on a continental scale seem not only “natural” and therefore “inevitable,” but “right and just,” which is to say, “lawful.”²⁸

So here is the reality on the ground, the reality that now confronts us: Ohio is a graveyard, a site of invasion and conquest by lawless sociopaths who committed unforgiveable genocide against innocent landowners. But, as quickly as you blink, that reality is re-packaged and sold to you as discovery and settlement and progress, an inevitable transition to modernization, from savage to civilized.

Welcome to Ohio! The Heart of It All!

²⁷ Ward Churchill, “A Breach of Trust,” *Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader*, pp. 139-40.

²⁸ Ward Churchill, “The Earth is Our Mother,” *Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader*, p. 65.

A Tool for Everything

Lies are tools. Just like a screwdriver or a hammer is a tool, so is a lie. You use screwdrivers to loosen or tighten screws. You use a hammer to pound in nails. You use lies to get the outcome you want when telling the truth won't get it for you. If you tell people you want to invade a nation of generally peace-loving people and cause a lot of needless bloodshed and death just so some rich corporations run by wealthy oligarch friends can control more oil, you won't have a lot of volunteers. But if you waggle your finger and proclaim that a tyrant promoted terrorism and subjected his people to a humiliating dictatorship, and that those people look to us to liberate them so they can be free like us, and if we don't invade there will be more terrorist attacks like September 11, you get volunteers by the droves.

A lie is a tool you use to get the outcome you want when telling the truth won't get it for you.

If you want people to work and shop and go along with the program and think well of the authorities, you probably don't want to tell them that people like themselves have gotten tricked for centuries into committing crimes against humanity for the benefit of the wealthy and powerful. Instead, you have them learn from history books in public schools, describing how George Washington chopped down a cherry tree and other such ridiculous shit. A lie is a tool. We have a tool for *everything*.

Crime Pays

You can't accidentally steal an area the size of Ohio. It can't be done. How would that even happen?

Okay, you're in Pennsylvania, right? You're right on the border between your state and Indian Territory. You're minding your own business, playing with your dog, and you accidentally throw the ball over the fence. Somehow, the dog gets through the fence and chases it and you have to retrieve your dog. You suddenly realize you're in Indian Territory. Then, whoops! you accidentally build a McDonalds' and an interstate and you mistakenly put up a road-sign that says, "Welcome to Ohio! The Heart of It All!"

You see what I mean? How do you accidentally steal thousands of square miles of real estate?

Also, consider the pattern here. Long before the Treaty of Greenville, the US recognized the dividing line between Indian Territory and the thirteen colonies. The US drafted the Northwest Territory Ordinance. US citizens had been jumping the fence by the thousands, and the US had done nothing to stop them. Remember, ten thousand a year entered Indian Territory, followed by General Josiah Harmar, followed by skirmishing, followed by General "Mad Anthony" Wayne, followed by genocide, followed by the signing of the Treaty of Greenville.

So, in 1795 at the signing of the Treaty of Greenville, we all know what happens when you have an area set aside as Indian Territory and you let US citizens jump the fence and run around willy-nilly in the Indians' yard. We've already been through that. We've already learned that lesson. That's why in Article V of the Treaty of Greenville the US promised to "protect all said Indian tribes... against all citizens of the United States, and against all other white persons who intrude upon the same..." This is saying, We're going to keep our people out of your yard. It's saying, We're not going to jump the fence and steal this area called Ohio. That was 1795.

In 1802, just seven years later, a guy named Thomas Worthington and thirty-four other white guys were smackdab in the middle of this Indian Territory, acting like they owned it, drafting the Ohio Constitution. And what happened when Worthington, if that is his real name, headed to Washington with evidence that he and his friends violated US treaty, that they committed a criminal act, that they jumped the fence after the US promised they wouldn't, that they committed conduct that might actually be treasonous? Congress validated their crimes.

Imagine this. We take over the local bowling alley and draft our constitution. The owner of the bowling alley contacts the authorities—or, better yet, we march to the city council with our flag and constitution and make a show of presenting it. What do you think the authorities will do? Recognize our Republic of Bob's Lanes? Probably not. Charter our misadventures? Not likely. Best bet is, they'll lock our dumb asses in jail and run a psychological battery on us.

If you can't take over a bowling alley by drafting a constitution, then how can you take over thousands of square miles protected by US treaty just by drafting a constitution?

The US government ignored its own laws, its own constitution, its own treaty, and abolished the very legal principle of land rights and private property that it claimed to hold sacrosanct. It rewarded criminal misconduct, validated a vast theft, and turned a blind eye to the genocide that would result, or should I say continue.

I bet that night in Washington, Thomas Worthington and his gang drank champagne. I bet they smoked cigars. I bet they got together with powerful Washington insiders, senators, and representatives, and in a seedy hotel, they fucked each others' dogs and kicked each other's wives right up until the crack of dawn. You can't tell me crime doesn't pay. It certainly enriched the Worthington Gang.

Good Fences (Sometimes) Make Good Neighbors

Imagine you and I are neighbors. We have a fence between our properties. My kids keep jumping the fence and playing in your yard. I do nothing about it. You complain. Still, I do nothing. Finally, you take drastic action to evict my kids and it results in a tussle, so I get involved in defense of my kids and I kill a few members of your family. At the end of it, I approach you with an agreement to move the fence over further into your yard so the area where my kids play will now be on my side of the fence.

When we move the fence and the next day you find my kids rooting through your refrigerator and I refuse to do anything about it, do you think this is just an accidental event, an unavoidable inevitability of history?

It's no accident. I'm a liar. I'm a ruthless bastard pushing you out of existence. I'm engaging in denial. And when you're dead and gone and everyone you love is wiped out, I'll write the history books and tell the story any way I want, and there will be no one there to call me a liar.

Welcome to Ohio! The Heart of It All!

Reality on the Ground

The fact that the Indians possessed it didn't make it Indian Territory. Their existence there for thousands of years didn't make it Indian Territory. The remains of their ancestors buried there since time began didn't make it Indian Territory. The fact that their lives and their perspectives

and everything that made them who they were had been shaped by the land to which they all shared a sacred relationship didn't make it Indian Territory.

Thomas Worthington had a piece of paper. Thomas Worthington's piece of paper negated the "reality on the ground."

...Calculating route...

Tools

What the fuck is a law? I'm not trying to be funny. I really don't know what a law is. I know what people in authority *say* a law is, but nothing really seems to add up. Maybe I'm too stupid to follow the math.

Wasn't the Northwest Territory Ordinance a law? Wasn't the Treaty of Greeneville the "supreme law of the land"? Aren't property rights written into the law? Either law is law or law ain't law. Right? And laws, individual laws, all comprise this larger thing called 'the law,' or, more appropriately for emphasis, "THE LAW."

I don't know. Maybe it's me. Maybe I'm an idiot. But by my thinking, if the law is the law, then you can't pick and choose. You can't enforce the statute against spitting on the sidewalk but let someone else burn down an orphanage when the children are sleeping.

I'm thinking THE LAW isn't what we've been taught to worship. If the people who wrote them have no respect for them, and if states are created by the violation of them, and if states then attempt to enforce the very laws that states don't follow, what does all this mean?

I'm reminded of a quote from a decision rendered by, of all entities, the alleged "Ohio Supreme Court": *It would, indeed, be a great absurdity, that the government... should aid in the subversion of its own policy; assault those principles of virtue and morality it is created to uphold; or itself overthrow the law which it compels others to observe, and which it was made to enforce.*²⁹

A "great absurdity." Governments pass laws for our protection and to keep society in good order. By "governments," I mean "rich people who stole land and power (and now assume the right to rule)," and by "pass laws," I mean "make shit up as they go along," and by "for our protection" I mean, "in order to swindle us and make a profit off of our hard work as we struggle along under their tyranny," and by "to keep society in good order" I mean, "and do it in a way so we won't do anything about it."

Rich people who stole land and power (and now assume the right to rule) make shit up as they go along in order to swindle us and make a profit off of our hard work as we struggle along under their tyranny, and do it in a way so we won't do anything about it.

Has there ever been a "law" passed by a government that the government didn't enforce upon the people, while the government itself broke it?

The law is a tool.

We have a tool for *everything*.

It's About "The State Of Ohio"

I know some of you reading this are thinking I need to stop crying about the Indians. The Indians are old news. We've got real problems in the modern world.

²⁹ *State v. Buttles*, 3 O.S. 309 (1854).

I get that. And I'm not crying about the Indians. I'm really not. This isn't about the Indians, and if I haven't made this clear yet, this is about the State of Ohio. This is about this incorporated entity that calls itself a government, says it's legitimately exercising power over more than eleven million people. It's about the character of *this* thing.

It was born in blood. From its very inception, lives and property rights didn't count. It had no regard for law or order or rights. This "State of Ohio" could chew up anybody that got in the way, including the Indians.

What it did to them, it now has the power to do to us.

Tools... Again

Lies are tools we use to get the outcome we want when telling the truth won't get it for us.

Laws are tools we use to force others to go along with our program when they cannot be persuaded to go along of their own free will.

Lies and laws are both tools. Lies and laws are a lot alike.

We often defer to both.

...Calculating route...

A Puppy Killer

Imagine a little girl whose parents bring home a new puppy. She plays with it all day and she's tired at night. She takes the puppy to bed. The next morning, she finds that she rolled over on the puppy in the night and accidentally killed it. She's devastated, crying day and night.

Her parents bury the puppy and don't know what to do to make her feel better. So, they buy her another puppy. They make a rule, though, that the new puppy must sleep in its own room. The little girl plays with the puppy all day and puts the puppy in its room before bed, but at night she hears the puppy whimpering and she feels bad, so she goes and gets him and puts him in the bed with her.

Next morning, dead puppy.

Now, the first one might have been a complete accident. The second one, the little girl shouldn't have gotten the puppy out of the room. But my question is, how many puppies does it take, if you're a parent, before you stop bringing home new puppies? Two? Three? Four? Ten? How many dead puppies does it take before you have to wonder why the little girl has no more regard for the lives of puppies than that, before you start wondering why she keeps making the same choices that lead to the predictable deaths of puppies? Three? Five? Ten? How long before you suspect the little girl is a sociopath? I mean, a full-blown sociopath?

Okay. Now, instead of puppies, let's make it people. And instead of a little girl, let's make it a colonizing population. How many times do they have to "accidentally" commit genocide before you suspect you're dealing with a sociopath? How many deaths does it take? A hundred thousand just from smallpox alone? Or tens of thousands more killed by muskets and cannons? Or tens of thousands more killed through starvation?

Indian Territory

After the Worthington Gang stole Indian Territory and called it “The State of Ohio,” the United States Supreme Court addressed an identical situation. The case before them was *Samuel A. Worcester, Plaintiff in Error vs. The State of Georgia* (1832), 31 US 515, 6 Pet. 515, 8 L.Ed 483. Some background: Samuel Worcester was a white man living in Cherokee Territory. The Cherokee Territory was established through US treaty. But along came men from the State of Georgia who decided their state wasn’t big enough, and thought it would be great to expand their state boundary into Cherokee Territory.

The State of Georgia incorporated the Cherokee Territory into their state and thereafter they arrested Samuel Worcester for something. They put him on trial under Georgia law. They convicted him and sentenced him to a Georgia prison.

Worcester argued that he was not in the jurisdiction of the State of Georgia, that Georgia had no authority over him or over the Indian Territory in which he had resided. He fought his case to the highest court in the land.

US Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall wrote the court’s opinion. The nation’s highest court concluded that no state had the authority to abrogate a US treaty. Since Indian Territory was established by US treaty, no state could incorporate Indian Territory into their own state boundaries. The Supreme Court said that the State of Georgia’s claim of jurisdiction over Indian Territory was “void,” that Worcester was “apprehended, tried, and condemned, under colour of law which has been shown to be repugnant to the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States.”

So, whenever a state incorporates Indian Territory into its borders and thereby violates US treaty, the state’s actions are “repugnant to the constitution, laws, and treaties of the US.”

Welcome to Indian Territory! The Heart of It All!

No. Really. No shit.

What This Means, Part II

“Do you know what this *means*?” I think I do.

This means Ohio has never been a state. It means the Ohio Constitution is a void document with no incorporating power under law at all. It means the Ohio governor, the legislature, and the courts hold no legitimate, legal power. It means Ohio’s laws are not laws at all. No one in Ohio ever had the authority to pass laws. It means every action by every single court in Ohio has been an exercise in make-believe.

I mean, if you think that governments are valid, and if you believe that laws are laws, and if you accept the legitimacy of the “rule of law,” then this alleged “State of Ohio” doesn’t legally exist yet.

Now, don’t get confused. I want to be clear. All I’m saying is that Ohio is not a state. I’m saying officials who claim to act on behalf of this rogue-state are not officials at all, any more than I can claim to be the King of Denmark. That’s what I’m saying. I haven’t yet advocated what has to be done about this. That’s a whole other ball of wax. And I think I have to mention this because, when I’ve explained to others how Ohio is not a state, they immediately begin shaking their heads. They reject, it seems, the sound and irrefutable case I present because they

are already thinking ahead to all of the implications. They say things like, “But they won’t let all the prisoners go just because you say Ohio isn’t a state,” or they say, “The governor isn’t going to resign just because you say Ohio isn’t a state,” or they say, “School teachers are still going to show up for work and get paid, even if you say Ohio isn’t a state.”

But I’m not talking about any of that. I haven’t yet mentioned the liberation of prisoners or the resignation of government officials or the laying off of teachers. I’ve only said that Ohio isn’t a state. What we *do* about it is a separate question. I guess what we *do* depends on whether or not we live in a nation of laws or whether we live in a nation where so-called governments impose themselves and do whatever they want.

From my own experience, I know what this means. From my experience, I was living in Indian Territory, minding my own business, just like Samuel A. Worcester was. Andrew Crouch broke into my second story apartment while I was home alone. He had been drinking and was volatile. He threatened to kill me and I panicked, stabbing him several times. I called for an ambulance.

Men with guns showed up. They claimed to have authority vested in them by an entity as real as Santa Claus, as valid as the Republic of Bob’s Lanes. No offense, Bob.

Those men with guns kidnapped me and took me to a kangaroo court established under a government as real as the Easter Bunny. Someone claiming to be a judge, who may just as well have declared herself the Queen of Denmark, sentenced me to prison. Armed thugs then delivered me to a concentration camp set up illegally right in the midst of Indian Territory, and I have been held hostage by these terrorists for more than twenty-five years.

That’s my experience. That’s the reality of my situation. And there are eleven million others who have their own experiences as subjects to a lawless and invalid rogue-state calling itself “The State of Ohio.”

That’s what this means.

Power

So, let’s talk about power for a minute. I say “power” because “power” and “authority” are two different things. By our culture’s thinking, authority is derived from some kind of legal instrument. When someone is exercising authority, he or she is conducting business according to some sort of lawful dispensation.

When we talk about “power,” though, we’re really talking about brute force. When someone exercises power, he or she is not appealing to legality, but just doing what he or she can get away with doing.

When Arnold Schwarzenegger was the Terminator, he had the *power* to kill you. When he became Governor of the State of California and signed death warrants, he ostensibly had the *authority* to kill you.

This so-called “State of Ohio” exercises no legitimate authority. No law justifies its claimed existence. In fact, the US Constitution, the Northwest Territory Ordinance, the Treaty of Greenville, and US Supreme Court precedents like *Worcester vs. Georgia* all unanimously and unambiguously militate *against* the legitimacy of Ohio’s claim to statehood. That means Ohio is a rogue-state exercising power and not authority. It only continues to impose itself because it has attack helicopters and troops and tear gas and police.

Ask the students at Kent State University who were gunned down by the Ohio National Guard while peacefully protesting an illegal war.

Fuck, ask the Indians.

“The State Of Ohio,” Role Model

Okay. I have to admit, not *everybody* says *The State of Ohio* is illegitimate. It’s not as unanimous as I painted it. In fact, *The State of Ohio* can brag that it inspired a pretty powerful world figure. He ran his own country as head of state. He came up with a policy called “breathing room” (“lebensraum”) toward his neighbors based theoretically and practically upon the Ohio model for expanding into the territory of Native Americans.¹ His program for dealing with “racial inferiors” was inspired by the historical example of the colonization of Ohio. He said so in his book. You may have heard of this guy. His name was Adolf Hitler.

When the US engaged in war-crimes prosecutions against the Nazis, the accused “initially professed a certain bewilderment, their first line of defense being that they’d done nothing the United States itself hadn’t done to American Indians.”² So, you see, while I’m bashing The State of Ohio, it has been both an inspiration and a role model for pretty momentous historical figures. In light of this, I felt, in full disclosure, that I should admit that there is, in fact, another side to the story.

Welcome to Ohio! The Heart of It All! Seig Heil!

Behind Bars

More than a hundred thousand murdered through biological warfare. Thousands more exterminated during unlawful military invasion. Still thousands more killed through starvation and deprivation as they fled the killing fields. This is the birth of this *State of Ohio*.

Can the *State of Ohio*, born in the blood of thousands, really outlaw murder? Being a murderer itself, a mass-murderer, an irremediable mass-murderer on a historical scale, can the *State of Ohio* really judge anyone? Can the *State of Ohio* really impose some kind of moral standard? That seems a tad bit hypocritical. A little bit insincere.

The irony of my experience is that I am held captive by a lawless rogue state that was founded upon crimes against humanity, and I am held for a murder I didn’t commit. While my kidnapper is not innocent, I am.

The further irony is, this rogue state with its long history of ignoring all laws had to break its own laws in order to convict me of a crime I didn’t commit. So, my experience, as insignificant as it is, being just the experience of one person, shows that this *State of Ohio* has never really changed its stripes.

This *State of Ohio* judges me to be a danger to public order? This *State of Ohio* with no regard for life or law or human rights? Are you fucking serious?

If anyone should be behind bars for the protection of the public, it’s this *State of Ohio*. This motherfucker is a maniac.

Authority

When you take away authority, you're left with naked, brute force. Power. Without authority, the "State of Ohio" and the schoolyard bully and the serial rapist are all on the same level. They all do what they do because they can. They have the *power* to impose themselves, whether that power is expressed by fists or a penis or attack helicopters.

The difference between the bully and rapist on one hand, and the "State of Ohio" on the other, is that victims of the bully and rapist know they are victims. They know the bully and the rapist have no right to impose upon them. But with this "State of Ohio," you've got eleven million people who don't realize that the predator imposing on them has no authority at all. The victims of this "State of Ohio" have deferred to the lies we have for *everything*. They can't see the reality on the ground.

Peace and Dignity

My indictment reads, *The State of Ohio vs. Sean Swain*. I killed Andrew Crouch, so you would think my indictment would read, *Andrew Crouch vs. Sean Swain*, or *The Survivors of Andrew Crouch vs. Sean Swain*. I mean, if I was in the wrong, then Crouch was the victim, and the matter was between Crouch and myself... not this "State of Ohio," whoever he is.

This "State of Ohio" wasn't in my apartment when Crouch kicked in the door. I never saw this "State of Ohio" character. Can't pick him out of a police line-up. And still, the indictment reads, *The State of Ohio vs. Sean Swain*. It alleges that, by killing Crouch, I violated the "peace and dignity" of the "State of Ohio."

First, the event for which I'm currently held captive occurred in unceded Indian Territory. Second, my conduct— whatever it was, whatever it was alleged to be—could never disturb the "peace" and "dignity" of an entity that doesn't really exist. And third, if the "State of Ohio" was real, I think the question would have to be addressed as to whether or not the "State of Ohio" possesses "peace" or "dignity," and whether or not this "State of Ohio" is entitled to "peace" or "dignity." That the "State of Ohio" would demand "peace" or "dignity" from anyone demonstrates that this sociopath has an infantile sense of entitlement. It says, "I'll kill, rape, steal, destroy, and lie with reckless abandon, but I want my victims to be nice to me at all times." Really?

My Case

I'm not the center of the universe. I'm not special. And this isn't about me. It's not. But, to use my own experience as an example, I have to give you some context here. I killed Andrew Crouch in self-defense in my own home. He had been drinking and kicked in my door and threatened my life. I panicked. I stabbed him several times. I didn't want him to die; I wanted to survive, plain and simple. I passed a polygraph. I was released on a bond payment of \$2,000 and I didn't run. I was the first "murder suspect" in Ohio released on \$2,000 since 1929. I didn't run because I wasn't guilty. I had acted in self defense.

Police withheld photographs of break-in damage and then claimed there was no break-in. The prosecutor kept my expert witnesses from testifying because my attorney made a mistake.

The jury wasn't allowed to know that I passed a polygraph. A manager for the company I was working to unionize was the jury foreman.

Did I mention that Andrew Crouch, the guy I killed, was the nephew of the Clerk of Courts?

I was found guilty of a crime I didn't commit. I appealed. I won. My conviction was reversed and I returned to the same trial court that had falsely convicted me. But, instead of following the mandate from the higher court, the trial court decided to conduct the trial its own way. It did what it was instructed not to do. There is no law. There are no rules. There's only a predetermined outcome.

So, here I am. I've been held for more than twenty-five years. I'm still waiting for the fair trial that my trial court was ordered to give me.

In the "State of Ohio," justice is swift... and injustice lasts forever. Just ask the Indians.

Indian Territory, Part II

The US bristled at Nazi claims that the genocide committed by the German government was nothing that the US hadn't committed against the Indians. The US wasn't so much offended by an inaccurate comparison as it was shocked that anyone had noticed. So, the US set up the Indian Claims Commission. They figured they could hand out a few bucks and then put the history of conquest and invasion behind them. Smooth things over. Create a good public image.

As claims poured in, the US Attorney General, armed with a veritable army of archivists and historians, combed over every single document in the history of American land acquisition. US Attorney General Francis Biddle had to admit in a report before the US Senate that he could not find a single shred of evidence to justify the US seizure of more than one third of the continental United States, including this area called Ohio. In essence, he admitted that more than one third of the continental United States is still, legally speaking, Indian Territory.³⁰

Do you know what this *means*?

Tecumseh

Tecumseh was a Shawnee and lived at least part of his life in this area called Ohio. He saw the true threat that the colonizer represented to his way of life and he devoted himself to unifying the various tribes against their common enemy. Tecumseh was respected even by his enemies. He was the rare personality who could really unite people.

Betrayed by the British who had promised support, and devastated by the tragic loss of his brother at the Battle of Tippecanoe, the federation that Tecumseh brought together slowly unraveled. Fighting to the end, Tecumseh died at the Battle of Ontario in 1813.

I wonder what Tecumseh thought about the "legitimacy" of "The State of Ohio." I wonder if Thomas Worthington ever consulted Tecumseh when drafting the Ohio Constitution? I bet he didn't.

³⁰ See, US Senate, *Terminating the Existence of the Indian Claims Commission* (Washington, DC: 84th Congress, 2d Session, Report 1727, April 11, 1956)

What is a Law?

Isn't it a law that police have to turn over all the evidence? Isn't it a law that courts have to allow you to present a defense? Isn't it a law that lower courts must follow the orders given by higher courts?

If this "state of Ohio" reserves the right to do this to me, then it can do it to anyone. Nobody is safe. Going back to the analogy of the little girl who kept killing puppies, we're like puppies in the bed of a giant sociopath, and we're just hoping against hope that the sociopath doesn't happen to roll over and crush *us*. Oh, please, please, please, let it be *somebody else*... If this "State of Ohio" can ignore its own laws but enforce its laws upon us, we're in constant danger.

And I'm back to the same question: What the fuck is a law?

Two Things

There are two things that set apart this "State of Ohio" as a law-breaker from all of the mere human law-breakers it attempts to punish. First, the scale. No single human could destroy and devastate and exterminate on the scale that this "State of Ohio" has. Second, when mere humans break laws, they break the laws imposed upon them by someone else; whereas, when this "State of Ohio" breaks laws, it breaks laws that it has written for itself. That makes the "State of Ohio" far more lawless and hypocritical than any mere human.

The Taino

If you've never heard of the Taino people, there's a good reason. When Columbus first landed, the people he encountered were the Taino. There were eight million of them on the island that is now Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Just five years later, only three million were left. By 1514, there were just twenty-two thousand. A hundred years after Columbus landed, a population of eight million Taino had been reduced to just two hundred. At some point shortly thereafter, the last living Taino took one final breath and an entire people went extinct.

Columbus' men hanged the Taino *en masse*, roasted them on spits, burned them at the stake, and hacked their children to death to use them as dogfood. They would make bets as to who could cut a Taino in half or cut off her head with a single swing of a sword. Taino babies were torn from their mothers' breasts and their heads were dashed upon the rocks.³¹

The capitol of Ohio is "Columbus." The courthouse where I was denied justice is located on Columbus Avenue in Sandusky. In Ohio, Columbus is everywhere.

But there are no Taino.

Reputable

When I appeared before the Ohio Adult Parole Authority in September 2011, board member Jose Torres asked me if any "reputable" organizations recognized me as a political prisoner. In

³¹ For comprehensive research on the genocide of the Taino people, read, "Confronting Columbus Day," *Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader*, Ward Churchill.

response, I wanted to ask him if any “reputable” organization had recognized him as a parole board member. Implication: the “State of Ohio” is not reputable.

But, I didn’t say that. Instead, I tried to make as good of an impression as I could. By my thinking, I was demonstrably innocent of a crime; I was unlawfully confined; I was possibly the most well-behaved prisoner in Ohio penal history; I had already served twenty years. I believed that if I bit my tongue and said nothing to offend them, maybe the parole board would give me a parole. Like I already noted, concentration camp victims often marched to their doom with denial on their lips. So did I.

If I had things to do over, I’d let Torres know he could shove his snotty, condescending attitude straight up his fascist, state-worshipping ass.

Changing History

Prison is a place filled with regret. A common prison game is to contemplate what you would do if you could go back in time and change just one thing. Sometimes in this game, you can go back in time and take something with you into the past. Sometimes you can’t.

I’ve heard guys say they would go back in time to just before the commission of their crimes and take one less drink, or flush a baggy down the toilet, or disable a pistol. Some would take advantage of future knowledge and bet on sports events and get rich.

I once contemplated going back in time to wait along a snowy road for the right wagon to come along, and when the time was right, I’d leap out of the underbrush and yank Thomas Worthington off his horse and kill him before he ever got to Washington, DC. But I know if I succeeded, the Worthington Gang would just send another guy with a copy of the Ohio Constitution, and another, and another.

So, I came up with something else. I would go back in time and live among th Taino. I would learn their language and culture, become one of them. And when the time came, I would explain to them what was going to happen, that men would come who would look like me, with hair on their faces, and that the Taino should welcome them and be generous, feed them and give them wine. Offer them warm, comfortable quarters. And kill them in their sleep. Every last one of them. Do not let even one of them live.

I would say, “Use this,” and hand them an AK-47 rifle with five hundred rounds of ammunition.

I would say, “Burn their boats into the sea and then warn your children: there will be more.”

Christopher Columbus would never appear in history books. There would be no European discovery of the New World. There would be no capitol of Ohio named after a genocidal maniac, no avenue in Sandusky where a courthouse dispenses deliberate injustice.

When a fellow prisoner pointed out that, by killing Columbus, I would alter the future in such a way that my European ancestry would never arrive here, I realized that if I armed the Taino to kill Columbus and his men in the past, then I would never be born.

I’d still do it. I swear to you that I would.

Really Low-Down Atrocities

I bet Tecumseh wasn’t real to Thomas Worthington, and neither were the Shawnee people. I bet the Native Americans exterminated by small-pox weren’t real to Captain Amherst and the

troops who dropped off blankets and handkerchiefs. They were objects. Obstacles to be removed from the way of progress. The babies that the soldiers heard crying weren't like *real* babies, not like the babies they themselves had waiting for them at home. Those sailors who landed with Columbus, I bet the Taino weren't *real* to them. Not real like their own mothers and fathers were real.

There's a necessary ingredient for those carrying out really low-down atrocities. They have to be able to divorce themselves from the reality of their victims. They have to be disconnected from the "reality on the ground." It makes the screams more tolerable, the stench of burning flesh and the cries of suffering more endurable.

It takes a lot of preparation and de-sensitization to successfully carry out really low-down atrocities. It takes a lot of well-rehearsed lies, repeated again and again through the minds of the people who will carry out those atrocities. Fortunately for really low-down atrocities, we've been conditioned since birth.

We have a lie for *everything*. Even for killing children by the thousands, whether it's in Ohio or Vietnam or Afghanistan or Iraq. We're really good at this shit.

Real

I wonder if I was real to the police who withheld the photographs of the break-in damage. Could they have set me up to go to prison for life for something they knew I didn't do if they knew me? If they knew my family? If they knew me as that awkward kid with the stutter? I wonder if I was real to the prosecutor who presented known liars as witnesses and prosecuted me even though I passed a polygraph. I wonder if I was real to the judge who sentenced me for a crime I didn't commit and then, when my conviction was overturned, violated the law and the higher court's mandate and sent me off to prison for the rest of my life. I wonder if I was real to the judge who replaced her, who simply refused to rule on motions before him because, if he did, he would have to allow me to have a new trial. I wonder if I was real to Jose Torres and other members of the Ohio Adult Parole Authority who held a secret full-board hearing without allowing my counsel to attend and then gave me five more years based on reasons that are patently and provably not true.

I think of the police, the prosecutor, the judges. I think of the parole board members. I can easily picture them hacking a Taino baby in half with a sword or handing out small-pox infected blankets to the Shawnee.

Welcome to Ohio! The Heart of It All!

Strong vs. The United States

In 1975, the federal courts finally resolved the case of *Strong vs. the United States* (1975), 207 Ct.Cl. 254, 518 F.2d 556. This was the federal case brought by the tribes who were party to the Treaty of Greeneville. They sought monetary reparations for the land taken from them.

This case came relatively late in the Indian Claims continuum. There was already a long, long history of US courts continually shifting the legal standards for both law and fact, reinterpreting history again and again to justify decisions against Native Americans. The history of jurisprudence regarding Indian land rights is an absolute train wreck. So, at the time that *Strong* came

logic says Ohio belongs to the Indians. You've got the US Attorney General, the highest law enforcement officer in the country, saying to the US Senate that Ohio belongs to the Indians. That's pretty unanimous. Pretty conclusive. Pretty persuasive, I should think. You've got a whole population of eleven million people pretending to reside in a state. You've got a group of people pretending to pass real laws like a real legislature, a guy pretending to be a real governor, and people with law degrees who really ought to know better pretending to be a state supreme court. It's all as real as magical beans and faerie dust, but there's no outrage, no bewilderment. There's not even an acknowledgment or a discussion. "In Habeas Corpus. On petition for writ of habeas corpus of Sean Swain. *Sua sponte*, cause dismissed."

That's all they say when you de-construct the lies they have for *everything*.

You Can't Do That

"You can't do that."

I've said those words a lot. When I was wrongly convicted of a crime I didn't commit, I said those words like a mantra, "You can't do that you can't do that you can't do that..." shocked and dazed and traumatized. When I returned for re-trial to witness the judge refuse to follow the law and higher courts, I numbly mouthed those words again. When former Toledo Warden Khelleh Konteh sent guards to assault me while I was cuffed and prone, grinding my face into the concrete floor because I reported his abuses to his boss, and when they shipped me off to the prison's nuthouse to hide me away until my face healed, I remember those words in my head, over and over, "You can't do that you can't do that you can't do that..."

Every time an official or administrator for this alleged State of Ohio falsifies facts or ignores evidence of misconduct and human rights abuses, those same words run through my head, "You can't do that you can't do that you can't do that." I maybe even say them out loud.

But when I say, "You can't do that," it only seems to add more fuel to the fire, as if I don't know my place and they intend to prove it to me. They stick out their chests and say, "Oh, YEAH?," and then they go on to prove that not only can they do "that," but they can do even more. So, take that... and that too... and some of that...

I think there's a misunderstanding between myself and this State of Ohio. I think we're talking past each other. I think they misinterpret what I mean when I say, "You can't do that."

I don't mean that the forces of the universe will somehow prevent them from performing some really bewildering injustice, or from feeling a real joy, a deep sense of accomplishment, for proving they not only can commit a bewildering injustice, but even add a little bonus pain on top of it.

What I mean when I say, "You can't do that," is, "You can't do that and still claim you're operating on behalf of the common good, because you're not." What I mean is, "You can't do that and still claim to be a decent human being with a conscience." What I mean is, "You can't do that and still say you have respect for law and order and rights and justice." What I mean is, "You can't do that without becoming the very kind of criminal you say you hate and desire to punish, without becoming a hypocrite undeserving of anyone's respect, without being the proverbial Good German, the most cowardly and revolting abomination that a free-thinking human being can become." That's what I mean.

You can't do that without demonstrating through your actions that all of your words are a Goddamn lie.

I think they usually miss the point. They're usually too busy trying to make me bleed.

Real, Part II

I wonder if I was real to Lieutenant Sean Bowerman and the guards at Toledo Correctional who opened a steel door with my head and then left me unconscious in a puddle of my own urine for three days until a nurse saw me having a seizure and I ended up in the hospital, dehydrated. I wonder if I was real to Officers Burnett and Nissan and Lieutenant Brown when they ground my face into the floor. I wonder if I was real to the administrators who subjected me to sleep deprivation and conditions that the US government, in its internal documents, refers to as "the simple torture situation." I think of all those prison employees. I think of the federal judge, Jack Zouhary, who dismissed my claims as frivolous. I can easily picture them yanking a Taino baby from its mother's breast and dashing its brains on the rocks.

Perhaps they know exactly what I mean when I say, "You can't do that." Perhaps they just don't give a fuck.

The Milgram Experiments

I previously wrote an article entitled, "No Such Thing as a Healthy Respect for Authority," about the Stanley Milgram experiments. I think Milgram's findings bear repeating here. At the end of World War II when Nazi atrocities came to public attention, psychologist Stanley Milgram devised an experiment designed to prove that non-Germans would not simply "follow orders," that it is not universal human nature to become accomplices in crimes against humanity. Milgram intended to vindicate us as humans.

Here's how the experiment went: A doctor in a lab coat and a stethoscope and a clipboard represented authority. The doctor had a test subject sit at a control panel and ask questions to another person in another room. The subject falsely believed the experiment was about learning. The subject falsely believed that when the other person gave a wrong answer, the subject was giving the person an electric shock. Nobody was really getting shocked, but the subject pressing the button didn't know that. The real point of the experiment was to see how long the subject would keep pressing the button and shocking the other person in the other room. By Milgram's thinking, most subjects would refuse to follow the orders of the doctor, the orders of authority. He thought most subjects would refuse to deliver electric shocks to other human beings. Milgram was very, very wrong.

The vast majority of subjects delivered what they believed to be potentially-deadly jolts of electricity. Some subjects kept shocking the person after the recipient complained of heart problems and then stopped answering questions at all. Zap... zap... zap... Most people kept on hitting the button, right up to the triple-X voltage. Most subjects did what they were told, just like the Germans working in the concentration camps.

It turns out, we Americans would make *excellent* Nazis.

Milgram found through his experiments that there were three necessary ingredients for getting a subject to participate in crimes against humanity. First, you convince the subject that his

or her victims have it coming—they volunteered, or they committed a crime, or they deserved it for what they did, or whatever. Second, convince the subject he or she isn't responsible—the authorities gave the orders and are responsible for the outcome, whatever it is, so the subject is *absolved*. And third, you convince the subject he or she has a duty to follow orders—he or she volunteered, it's his or her job, and so on.

That's your recipe for really low-down atrocities, the ingredients for turning average people into war criminals. Notice that those ingredients fit in quite nicely with the lies we have for *everything*.

You should always do what you're told. You should always follow orders. You should always defer to authorities. The cop/priest/teacher/government is your friend.

...Calculating route...

The Point?

Okay, okay. They chopped up children to make dog food. They bashed babies' brains out on the rocks. They named the capitol of Ohio after their leader. They gave small-pox- infected blankets to innocent people and wiped them all out. They inspired the Nazi Holocaust. Now millions of people live in denial and continue going along with the program, following orders, perpetuating a centuries-long atrocity, completely oblivious, not even blinking an eye. So what's your point?

Justice

This isn't about me, but I'm thinking that my experience reveals something of the true character of this thing calling itself The State of Ohio. I'm still waiting for it to respect its own laws, to force my trial court to abide by the higher court's decision and give me the fair trial as their laws demand. I'm still here without a valid conviction or sentence for a crime I can objectively prove I didn't commit. I'm still waiting for the Ohio Adult Parole Authority to hold its full board hearing according to their own rules and to allow my counsel to present witnesses and argue my case. I'm still waiting for this State of Ohio to recognize that subjecting human beings to conditions that the US government calls "the simple torture situation" is a violation of basic human rights.

I'm waiting for this State of Ohio to respect its own laws and live up to them. But so is Tecumseh. So are the Wyandots, Delawares, Shawanoes, Ottawas, Chipewas, Putawamies, Miamis, Eel-River, Waas, Kickapoos, Piankashaws, and Kaskaskias. In this State of Ohio, justice is swift... and injustice lasts forever...

PART II: The Contract

I am ashamed to think how easily we capitulate to badges and names, to large societies and dead institutions.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson

The State is force.

—Mikhail Alexandrovitch Bakunin

The government of man by man is slavery.

—Pierre-Joseph Proudhon

Origins

Where does this “State of Ohio” come from?

I don’t mean the area we call Ohio. That’s land. It’s been here. I know generally how it got here. And I don’t mean the people who inhabit the area we call Ohio. I know how they got here. They got here the same that I did—an incredible amount of genital friction. I’m talking about “The State of Ohio.” How did it get here? It wasn’t born and it didn’t hatch, but somehow it came into existence in 1803. Poof. So, where did it come from? And what is it?

According to the legal paradigm, the “State of Ohio” exists as a “creature of law,” an “artificial being, invisible, intangible.”¹ It doesn’t have a body the way that you and I do. It is, in some ways, made up of the law-makers and judges and clerks and secretaries and prison guards that all maintain it, an “association of persons,” who are “acting as a single person, and by their corporate name.”² This corporation, the “State of Ohio,” as an artificial being, a creature of law, is known “by the powers and faculties bestowed upon it, expressly or impliedly, by the charter.”^[36] This corporate entity “possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it.”³

The charter for this “State of Ohio” is the Ohio Constitution, originally drafted by the Worthington Gang in 1802. They created this corporation called “The State of Ohio,” writing up its charter, describing its powers and properties.

That all seems legal enough, doesn’t it?

[36] *Andrew Brothers Co. vs. Youngstown Coke Co.* (Sixth Circuit, 1898), 86 F. 585, 587.

¹ *Trustees of Dartmouth College vs. Woodward* (1819), 17 US 518, 636, 4 Wheat. 518.

² *US vs. Trinidad Coal and Coking Co.* (1890), 137 US 160, 169, 11 S.Ct. 37.

³ *Trustees of Dartmouth College*, Id.

The Charter

Because this “State of Ohio” is not a human being running around like you and me, and it only exists in a *legal* sense, it is a corporation. It’s an incorporated entity. It only exists on paper. You can’t walk up to an office and say, “I would like to speak with the State of Ohio,” as if the State of Ohio is like the Wizard of Oz, some strangely-dressed guy who grants wishes.

Corporations are legal entities created by a charter. A document. A piece of paper that says what this corporation will do and how it will operate. So, charters make corporations come into existence and, without a charter, there’s no corporation. Since the State of Ohio is a corporation, it must have a charter to exist. The charter for the State of Ohio, the piece of paper describing what it will do and how it will operate is the Ohio Constitution. Without the Ohio Constitution, the State of Ohio would not exist.

Contracts, Part I

All law is contract law. A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal. If I agree to fix your roof, and you agree to pay me \$500,

we have a deal. We have a contract. I can’t just take your money and run; I have a legal obligation to fix your roof. And you can’t just take my services and tell me I won’t get paid; you have a legal obligation to pay me. A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal.

All law is a framework for arbitrating contracts, for regulating the fulfillment of obligations that one party owes to another. Even so-called *criminal law* is really contract law, describing the duties that parties owe to one another and the penalties for not fulfilling those duties.

All law is contract law.

A contract is really nothing more than making a record of a relationship. In the case of our contract described previously, the relationship is one where I provide a service, fixing your roof, and you provide me remuneration for my services. Our contract, then, is a written record of the terms for how we are to relate to each other.

In 1802, when the Worthington Gang drew up the Ohio Constitution as the charter for this State of Ohio, that charter qualified as a contract. It was designed to record a relationship between this State of Ohio, the corporation that the Worthington Gang intended to create, and the people of Ohio who would be the subjects of this corporate entity, The State of Ohio. All charters are contracts, recording relationships. A contract is a contract.

This specific contract, The Ohio Constitution, described what powers and duties this State of Ohio would exercise in relation to its subjects, and it described the rights and duties that its subjects would have secured and recognized by this State of Ohio. This contract recorded a relationship, just like our contract recorded a relationship where I would fix your roof and you would give me \$500.

That’s what contracts do. A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal.

Contracts, Part II

I can sign a contract saying I'll fix your roof for \$500. I have the authority to do that. But, I cannot sign a contract saying Joe Snowbucket will fix your roof if you give me \$500. I don't have the authority to do that. Joe Snowbucket might not appreciate me sticking him with obligations he never agreed to fulfill.

Likewise, I cannot write up a contract to sell Joe Snowbucket's house to you. If Joe comes home to find you in his living room, eating his pizza, he's going to call the police and have you escorted out of his home. It makes no difference if you show him the bill of sale I signed for a house I don't own. The point is, legally, I cannot make promises that someone else has to keep.

So, I've got a question for you. When the Worthington Gang drew up the Ohio Constitution as the charter for this State of Ohio, when they created a contract between this State of Ohio and its subjects, describing the powers and duties of each, recording a relationship between the parties, did *you* sign it?

Neither did I.

Democracy, Part I

We equate democracy with freedom. The idea is, in democracy, we all have a say. We each have a vote. We then have equal power over what happens. That's what makes us free, unlike people who have no say, no vote, no power over what happens.

I know I want to be free. I want a voice. I want power over what happens to me, and I suspect that most people want power over what happens to themselves too. So, this desire for freedom is pretty universal, I think.

But the sad fact is that we don't really live in a democracy. In a democracy, everybody votes on every decision. Funding for a road halfway across the country? Vote on it. Every single one of us. Building a new aircraft carrier? Vote on it. Every single one of us. What color curtains are going to go on the windows of public buildings? Vote. All of us. In a real democracy, millions of us would sit around all day and do nothing except vote. There are millions of decisions at many different levels of government made every single day in a country as big as the US, and we would have to vote on all of them. Nobody would ever get any work done. We'd be too busy voting.

So, we don't live in a democracy. We live in what is more accurately described as a representative republic. We vote to elect a few people who will hold institutional authority to make all of those millions of decisions on our behalf so the

rest of us can get back to work. The idea underlying this thing called a representative republic is that the ones we elect will act on our behalf. Like our proxies. Our agents. Our representatives. On our behalf.

They rarely do that.

Once they get elected, the few who make millions of decisions for us usually exercise the power we give them to the benefit of themselves and their golf partners. They use the power we give them to get wealthy. They use the power we give them to make other wealthy people happy, who then fund the representatives' re-election. If you play golf with the ones who make all the decisions, then this system is probably great for you and you see this as freedom, which, for you, it is. But if you don't play golf with the right people, this really sucks.

If you think you're free when you're really not, it's probably because those with power over you said you were.

Without Consent

A quick summary here, just so we're clear: In 1803 the Worthington Gang created a corporation called The State of Ohio. They drafted a contract, The Ohio Constitution, that described the duties and powers of this State of Ohio they were creating, and the people who would be its subjects.

They didn't consult you. They didn't ask your permission. You weren't even born yet.

So, more than a century before you were born, the Worthington Gang effectively made you a party to a contract you did not sign, relinquishing your freedom to their creation, making it a ruler over you. They did this in 1803. They did this by writing up a contract that you never signed.

I think I'm going to draw up a contract that says you will pay for my pizza. I like pizza. As I see it, if you'll let Thomas Worthington and his gang enslave you to a corporation without your consent, you're probably the kind of sucker who will pay for my pizza. No offense.

Democracy, Part II

The majority rules. That's the idea behind democracy. By this way of thinking, if the majority wants it, we all get it. So, if the majority wants to have this corporation called The State of Ohio as their government, then that's just how it is. Right? If the majority wants it, we all get it. Nothing we can do.

My question is, how do we know the majority wants this State of Ohio? In order to know that, wouldn't we have to have a vote? We'd have to make sure everybody understood what they were voting on, what it means to be a subject to this State of Ohio, and exactly how this thing really operates. Then, once everybody voted as to whether they want this State of Ohio to rule them, we'd have to count the votes, all of them, no matter the outcome.

If the majority wanted this State of Ohio as their government, conducting itself as it does, then that's how it goes. If the majority wants it, we all get it.

Fair is fair. Majority rules. Right?

Contracts, Part III

When the Worthington Gang drafted their charter, their contract, for incorporating this "State of Ohio," they didn't try to impose it on people in Pennsylvania. People in Pennsylvania had their own government. And they didn't try to impose it on people in Indiana. Everybody knows you can't do that. People in other states have the right to form their own governments—or no governments at all. That's up to them. You cannot impose your state's government on the people of some other state, no more than you can make Joe Snowbucket fix somebody's roof. It's a legal principle.

But, I have a question. If the Worthington Gang couldn't impose their corporation, their government, on people in Pennsylvania who didn't want it, why could they impose their corporation on other people in Ohio who didn't want it? Shouldn't people in Ohio have the same right to reject this "State of Ohio" as people in Pennsylvania or Indiana? You can't tell me that every

single Ohioan in 1803 voted for the “State of Ohio.” You can’t tell me that not even one Ohioan objected. So, how could Thomas Worthington and his gang force that one Ohioan to relinquish his or her freedom?

And how is it that the Worthington Gang couldn’t impose their corporation on people in Pennsylvania or Indiana in 1803, but they can impose their corporation on people in Ohio who wouldn’t even be born for another century?

People like us who were born in the future, after 1803, are stuck in subservience to a corporation that could not be imposed upon people in Pennsylvania or Indiana in 1803... even though we weren’t any more consulted than people in Pennsylvania or Indiana in 1803. Does that sound right?

Consider: I can draw up a corporation on paper right now and make it so your great grandchildren who aren’t born yet must obey my corporation, whether they consent to it or not. Does that sound right?

Democracy, Part III

The majority rules.

That’s the idea behind democracy. If the majority wants it, we all get it. There’s nothing you can do.

So, if the majority wants the systematic elimination of Jews and political undesirables, we all get it. There’s nothing we can do. Fair is fair. Majority rules. Right?

Democracy, Part IV

The majority rules. So, what if most people are kind of... stupid?
Oh. Shit.

Contracts, Part IV

When we draw up a charter for a corporation, we give it powers and properties. If you and I and thirty-three of our closest friends want to incorporate, we can describe this corporation as having all of the powers that each of us can give it. A corporation is, after all, just an “association of persons.”

You can, for instance, give the corporation power to use your personal bank accounts. One of our friends can give the corporation the power to use his computer. But, we cannot give our corporation the power to use Bob’s Lanes. We don’t have the authority to do that because neither of us nor our friends own Bob’s Lanes. We cannot give our corporation any powers that we ourselves do not possess. To permit our corporation to use Bob’s Lanes, we would need to bring Bob into our corporation and get his consent.

So, where do thirty-five white guys in 1803 get the powers to create a corporation and give it authority to boss around millions of people for centuries—millions of people who never so much as voted on this thing? Those thirty-five white guys didn’t have the powers to boss around millions of people in the first place, no more than you or I have power over Bob’s Lanes, so how can this Worthington Gang give powers to their corporation that they themselves did not have?

Somehow Worthington got the crazy notion that he could convey to his corporation the power to rule millions, even though he didn't rule millions himself. He could no more create a corporation with those powers than he could create a unicorn.

Faerie dust. Magical beans. Fantastical thinking. By the way, thanks for the pizza.

Democracy, Part V

Worthington's "contract," the Ohio Constitution, limited voting rights only to white men of twenty-one years of age who paid taxes and helped maintain roads. No women, no one under twenty-one, no blacks, no Native Americans—even though, really, they were the owners of this thing called Ohio—and no poor whites who couldn't afford taxes or assistance with the roads.

Majority rules. Fair is fair.

So, let's work through an exercise here. Start off with 100% of the Ohio population in 1803. When we exclude women, we're down to just about 49% of the population. Then, we narrow it down by ethnicity. Only whites have the vote and we know they streamed into Ohio, invading as early as 1763 when King George ordered them to stop. But, Ohio was also a "free" state so that means freed blacks would also flock there, and we have to assume there was still a sizeable Native American population, sizeable enough to exclude them from voting. So, let's guess that when we exclude blacks and Native Americans that we go from 49% of the population to 40%.

Okay. Of this 40%, how many are voting age? Usually, at least half of any given population is under eighteen years of age. So, that would take us from 40% of the population down to 20% of the Ohio population voting in 1803.

But, we're not done. Of the white men twenty-one years of age or more, how many could not afford to pay taxes or could not help with the roads, or simply could not prove they paid their taxes or prove they helped on the roads? Recall, much of Ohio in 1803 was still a vast wilderness. Would even one third of the white adult male population of 1803 in Ohio be able to demonstrate they paid their taxes and assisted on the roads... and be able to take a day off of work to vote... and have a voting booth available to them? That takes us down to just 7% of the population actually voting. Rich white men over twenty- one. And, if the vote was nearly evenly split, that means you have roughly 3.5% of the 1803 population of Ohio making the decisions for everyone, whether they like it or not.

Democracy? Majority rules? Fair is fair?

Contracts, Part V

All law is contract law. In every case before every court, the issue is whether one party owed a duty to another party, and whether that duty had been performed. It doesn't matter if it's civil law or criminal law or domestic relations law.

Every legal scenario is based upon contracts. Everything else is window dressing.

Without Consent, Part II

This "State of Ohio" *assumes* it has a claim to our obedience, *assumes* our consent to be ruled by it, the same way I *assume* you want to pay for my pizza.

Why? Because thirty-five white guys in 1803 thought “The State of Ohio” was a fantastic idea. I could be wrong, but I think that’s *far* from conclusive.

Implied Consent, Part I

People sometimes make arguments based upon “implied consent” to say that we are subjects of this corporation that the Worthington Gang concocted. Implied consent is where I assume I have a right to keep ordering pizzas at your expense because I did it once and, for whatever reason, you didn’t catch me or make me stop, so that means you must like paying for my pizza.

By the theories of implied consent, if you do not actively oppose something, that means you are for it. The argument of implied consent says, *“By your actions, by your failure to actively oppose, you accept the authority of a corporation founded by thirty-five idiot trespassers in 1803, so this corporation maintains perpetual authority over you and your children and your grandchildren, to command to punish if you disobey, even though you technically never agreed to be a subject to this corporation in the first place.”*

I’m entitled to free pizza at your expense... forever.

Implied consent, sucker. Implied consent.

Democracy, Part VI

I don’t know the nuts and bolts of how the Ohio Constitution was ratified. It doesn’t really matter. It might be that only 7% of the population had the chance to vote on it in 1803, and if the vote was close, that means roughly 3.5% of the population from 1803 decided the fate of everybody, and decided the fate of countless future generations who didn’t get the chance to vote on the question at all. It might be that there wasn’t even a vote. It might be that Tommy Worthington and his pals got falling-down drunk and sacrificed a couple of chickens behind the Masonic Lodge and then ran around naked in the moonlight, performing some kind of official dog-fucking ritual that ratified the Ohio Constitution. Who knows?

However it happened, Worthington and his buddies signed up billions of strangers to be slaves to a powerful corporation without their consent. I’m ordering more pizza on your tab.

I know you won’t mind.

Contracts, Part VI

If we have a contract, you can take me to court when I refuse to fix your roof. When we get to court, you have to demonstrate that we had a contract. You have to show that we had a deal. Then, you have to demonstrate that you met your end of the deal, that you fulfilled your duty to me and that I breached my duty to you.

A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal.

In my own experience, this State of Ohio took me to court. It said I violated its “peace and dignity.” It said I disobeyed its laws. It implied by its claims that I breached a duty I owed to keep its “peace” and its “dignity.” It implied by its claims that I breached a duty to obey its laws.

If I ever entered into a contract promising to uphold the “peace” and “dignity” of this State of Ohio, and if I ever entered into a contract promising to accept the authority of this State of Ohio

as my government, accepting my role as its subject, then the State of Ohio might be able to argue a breach of my duty, a breach of contract.

All law is contract law.

So, when the State of Ohio accuses me of violating its “peace and dignity,” it must demonstrate that I accepted such a duty to uphold its “peace and dignity” the same way you must demonstrate that I accepted a duty to put a roof on your house. Without such a promise, there exists no duty to be performed, no breach of a promised duty. The problem is, apart from the question of whether or not I actually did anything to break a law, I never agreed to maintain the “peace” or “dignity” of this State of Ohio, in the first place. The State of Ohio, whatever that is, can no more take me to court for breaching a duty to maintain its “peace” and “dignity,” for failing to obey its laws, than we can take the patrons of Bob’s Lanes to court for refusing to obey the edicts issued by our Republic of Bob’s Lanes with its flag planted next to the ball return.

A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal. And the absence of a contract is the absence of a contract. The absence of a deal is the absence of a deal.

I signed no contract. I made no promise to uphold peace or dignity for any State of Ohio, whatever that is, and whatever peace and dignity it may allege to possess.

I made no agreement to abide by any laws. I have breached no contract because I entered into no contract. I have not failed to breach any duty because I never promised to fulfill any duty.

The State of Ohio can fuck off.

Democracy, Part VII

Imagine this: you’re locked in a cement and steel cage with ninety-nine other people. When the steel door opens, two hulking, slobbering sexual predators stalk into the room. A voice over the intercom calmly explains that one or the other of these sexual predators is going to butt-rape everyone in the room. There’s nothing you can do about it. But, the good news is that seven of you will have the opportunity to *vote* on which of the sexual predators will cram his package into everyone’s mailboxes.

You’re one of the lucky seven voters. One of the lucky few. You consult all of the ninety-three non-voters to get a sense of which sexual predator they would prefer to rape them. The overwhelming consensus is the skinnier predator with the small hands, in the hope that he’s not quite as well-hung as the other and the mass butt-rape will then not hurt quite as bad.

You vote for the skinnier of the two. Unfortunately, as it turns out, when the votes are tallied, four of the seven designated voters chose the stockier, sweatier, larger sexual predator with the oversized hands and the big hairy knuckles.

That’s democracy. Majority rules. If the majority wants it, we all get it. Nothing you can do.

Fair is fair. So, drop your pants.

Oh. Wait. You already did... In 1803.

Democracy, Part VIII

Notice, everyone runs to be elected leaders but nobody runs to be elected followers. Everyone runs to be elected to positions where they are in charge but nobody runs to be subjects.

Nobody is ever enthusiastic enough about getting bossed around and exploited to spend money and energy to get elected as subjects. That's because being subjects sucks.

Implied Consent, Part II

One of the arguments for "implied consent" is, "You pay taxes and therefore you have implied your consent to be ruled by this 'State of Ohio.'" By this argument, your actions of paying taxes say you approve of the ruler-subject relationship with this "State of Ohio." But I suggest that this is not true.

Back before the fascists dragged me away, when I worked at wage slavery, taxes were always taken out of my check before I ever got paid. I think the same goes for most people. I never willingly or voluntarily paid any taxes, or had the opportunity to do it willingly or voluntarily, or had the opportunity to withhold taxes. These days, you cannot pull what Henry David Thoreau pulled, refusing to pay taxes. The taxes are collected before you ever see the remainder of the money.

Paying taxes is no indication of consent for anything. In fact, the way the government collects taxes in advance and deprives all of us of the opportunity to withhold payment demonstrates that the government itself knows that if we were left to our own devices, we would probably opt not to give our money to the government. The government knows that it must take its money off the top or it will never see a dime from any of us. The government knows we wouldn't consent to give up our limited funds to maintain this system as it currently operates, doing so many things without our approval or consent.

And really, when you think about it, if you have a government taxing you in advance because it knows you disapprove of the way it uses your money, isn't that a better argument for overthrowing the government than it is for "implied consent" to be ruled?

Contracts, Part VII

A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal.

Contracts are supposed to be binding. If I breach our contract, you can take me to court. If you prove that I agreed to fix your roof, and if you prove you fulfilled your end of the contract by paying me \$500, and if you prove that I haven't fixed your roof, then you have made a case that I owe you a duty to be performed—namely, fixing your roof.

But in the case of The Ohio Constitution, none of us have signed it. I haven't. None of us have agreed to be the subjects of this "State of Ohio." We have no contractual relationship to this "State of Ohio," whatever it is. We have assumed no duty to be performed for this "State of Ohio," whatever it is.

But, to make matters worse, before this "State of Ohio," whatever it is, could enforce any alleged contract upon us, it would have to demonstrate first that it has made good on its end of the deal. Remember, before you could take action against me over the roof I failed to fix, you had to prove that you held up your end of the deal by paying me the \$500. You cannot seek enforcement of a contract that you yourself have breached. Right? So, the same holds true for this "State of Ohio." Before the "State of Ohio" could make any claim that any of us have breached a duty owed to the "State of Ohio" as its subjects, even though we never accepted any such duty, it would first have to prove that it fulfilled its duties to us. That is, the "State of Ohio" must prove first that it has held up its end of the deal.

That means the “State of Ohio” has to demonstrate that it has provided us all of the protections and services that are promised to us by the Ohio Constitution. And *that* means this “State of Ohio” has a lot to prove because the Ohio Constitution makes a *lot* of promises.

Here’s the first one: Article 1, Section 1. All men are, by nature, free and independent, and have certain inalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty; acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and seeking and obtaining happiness and safety.

If I am “free” and “independent,” and I have a right to enjoy my “liberty,” how can a corporation impose its authority upon me without consent and force me to be its unwilling subject? As to the promise that I can exercise the right of “defending” my “life,” in my own case, that was the very thing that I did that caused this State of Ohio, whatever it is, to take me to court and claim I breached some duty owed to it. Clearly, contrary to this promise contained in the Ohio Constitution, my own experience is anecdotal proof that we do not have a right to defend our lives protected by this State of Ohio, and that means this State of Ohio has breached its own contract.

That means this “State of Ohio” cannot seek enforcement of the contract that the “State of Ohio” itself has breached, even if we had signed it.

The “State of Ohio” is in breach of its own contract. This “State of Ohio” really is an unreasonable scoundrel.

Rights, Part I

Maybe I’m wrong. Go ahead and live as if you are free and independent. Set up your dwelling wherever you want. Maybe in a clearing in the woods, just like Henry David Thoreau did at Walden Pond. Go ahead. Try it.

Build a fire. As you are free and independent you need no permit. Eat some berries off the bushes and apples from the trees. Don’t seek permission. You’re free and independent. It’s in the contract. Go ahead. Try it. Kill a deer. Skin it and use the skins for your moccasins. Cook the meat for food. You don’t need permits. Dance naked around the fire, howling and screaming. You’re free and independent. It’s in the contract. Go ahead. Try it.

When the cops come to arrest you for trespassing, or for building a fire without a permit, or for hunting out of season and without a license, simply explain to them that you are free and independent and you do not want to put your pants on. Explain that you have the right to seek and obtain happiness and that dancing naked makes you happy. If the cops draw their weapons or attempt to physically restrain you, attempting to inhibit your liberty, tell them you have a right to “safety,” and a right to “defend” your “liberty” and that their guns waving in your face do not make you feel very “safe” or very “free.” I’m sure once you explain it, they will be perfectly reasonable.

Now, you might argue that what I’m presenting here is very entertaining but also very unfair. You might argue that there are reasonable limits to living free and independent and that the example I just provided is totally beyond those reasonable limits. I would politely disagree. If there are limits on your right to be free and independent, then you are not free and independent, you are limited in freedom and limited in independence. And, if you are limited, that means that there is something that reserves the right to set and define those limits, to decide what is reasonable freedom and independence.

But that's not what the contract says. It doesn't say that we are "free" and "independent" within "reasonable limits" as "defined and set by the government." That's not what it says. What it says is that you can dance naked around the fire with deer blood smeared on your face, howling at the moon, and you will not be interfered with. That's what it says. It says you have a right to be "free," not "free within reasonable limits set by the State of Ohio." It says you have a right to be "independent," not "independent within reasonable limits set by the State of Ohio." It says you have a right to "safety," not "safety within reasonable limits set by the State of Ohio." If all of those limitations are implied in this contract we did not sign, this contract the State of Ohio seeks to impose upon us without the State of Ohio fulfilling its end of the obligations, then we can only be "free" and "independent" and "safe" in the *absence* of this State of Ohio.

Democracy, Part IX

Majority rules. But, does 3.5% make up the majority?

What do you call a system where 3.5% make the decisions for the other 96.5% and impose their chosen system upon everyone, for centuries and centuries, generations and generations? I don't call that democracy.

I call it bullshit.

Contracts, Part VIII

Even if the contract were valid in 1803, even if everyone in the Territory of Ohio signed it and agreed to its terms and wanted this corporation called The State of Ohio to rule them, the contract would still have to be renewed for the next generation and the next. The people in 1803 perhaps agreed to the contractual relationship established by the Ohio Constitution, but the people born in 1804 were never consulted. So, if the 1803 generation died off without the contract being renewed, the corporation called the State of Ohio died with them.

The contract was seemingly renewed in 1853. Another generation re-crafted the Ohio Constitution and ratified it. But, even if we accept that everyone within the claimed territorial jurisdiction of the State of Ohio desired to be ruled by this corporation, and even if they all consented to the contract, they're all dead now.

Not one person from the 1853 generation is still alive. Their contract died with them. It has never again been renewed. None of us have signed it.

This State of Ohio, if it was ever legally incorporated in the first place, is dead. It is as dead as the generation from 1853. This dead corporation called The State of Ohio has no contractual relationship to us. What duty do we owe to a dead corporation that died long before we were born?

Implied Consent, Part III

Another argument based on "implied consent" is that we vote, and by voting we give consent to being ruled. This argument goes, "If we vote, we're showing by our actions that we have implied consent to be ruled by the State." By this argument, if you vote, your actions imply your approval for the ruler-subject relationship with this State of Ohio. I politely disagree.

Let's start with a question: What happens if we don't vote? If we don't vote, do we get an opt-out card, one we can present to police if they pull us over, showing them that their laws do not apply to us? Do we get this opt-out card so we can hand it to cashiers when we purchase goods at the store, so we won't ever have to pay sales tax? Exactly.

That means that if you vote or you don't vote, the State of Ohio will assume authority to rule you anyway. And that means this argument for implied consent is kind of nonsensical. Voting or not voting brings the same end result. But, further, the act of voting in no way implies acceptance of the authority claimed by this State of Ohio. In voting, you are not choosing whether to be under the control of the government or to be free of its control; you are only choosing between limited options about how the government will operate or the specific people who will run it.

To refer back to the analogy of the two rapists giving the choice of which one rapes everybody—those who vote are not provided the option of not getting raped. The rape is already a foregone conclusion; the choice is only between which of the two rapists will commit it. Choosing which rapist will perform a sexual assault is not consent. Rape is still rape.

So, until government offers the option, "None of the Above," until that choice is accompanied by opt-out cards, the act of voting implies consent for nothing.

Rights, Part II

Here's the second promise that this State of Ohio is obligated to fulfill in its contract that you never signed, the one it imposes on us without our consent, and without ever meeting its own end of the deal:

Article 1, Section 2. All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for their equal protection and benefit, and they have the right to alter, reform, or abolish the same, whenever they may deem it necessary; and no special privileges or immunities shall ever be granted, that may not be altered, revoked, or repealed by the General Assembly.

According to the contract with this State of Ohio, we have the right to abolish this State of Ohio. It's in the contract. If we decide we no longer want this State of Ohio, it will accept its own abolition. Yeah. Okay.

Mao Ze Dong said that all political power flows from the barrel of a gun. However you or I feel about that, and whether or not we agree, it would certainly appear that this State of Ohio agrees with Mao. It looks like this State of Ohio subscribes to the barrel-of-the-gun theory. Why else does the State of Ohio have the Ohio National Guard?

Think about it. The federal military exists to protect the US from invasion by Portugal or Italy. That military spends something like the equivalent to the next sixteen nations' military budgets. The US military is essentially prepared to fight a sixteen-front war. It would seem that we're pretty safe on the international front. So, the Ohio National Guard isn't there to protect Ohio from foreign invasion.

Also, ever since the Battle of Toledo in the 1800s, it would appear that Ohio and Michigan have buried the proverbial hatchet. It would seem that Ohio faces little hostile threat from neighboring states. There's been a long period of peace between Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and West Virginia. So, the National Guard isn't there to protect against invasion by other states.

Why does the Ohio National Guard even exist? News flash: the Ohio National Guard is there to protect the State of Ohio from *us*. The Ohio National Guard exists to prevent us from ever successfully exercising this right to abolish the government. While that right is promised to us in the contract, if we ever attempt to exercise it, we will end up deader than Elvis.

Consider the gravity of this. A dead corporation enforces a contract on us, one we never signed. It refuses to even consider meeting the terms of the contract but seeks to impose it on us. So, this dead corporation takes our money from us so it can build a military force it intends to use to protect itself from us, that it intends to neutralize us if we ever forget our places and realize our lives would be better without it.

We paid for the rifles. We paid for the bullets. We paid for the Apache attack helicopters.

While we are promised a right to abolish this State of Ohio, don't think that the Ohio Constitution will stop that hail of bullets coming at you. It didn't stop the bullets that killed those four students at Kent State and they weren't doing anything nearly as ambitious as trying to abolish the State of Ohio.

So much for the second promise the State of Ohio made in its contract.

Rights, Part III

A quick scenario. You have a hundred people on a tropical island. Five of them have automatic weapons with hundreds of rounds of ammunition. How many of those people have "rights"? Correct answer: Five.

Democracy, Part X

There are two methods for making up the majority. First, you can have more numbers than your opposition. That's kind of a no-brainer. Second, you can *disqualify* or otherwise discourage enough of your opposition's numbers that your numbers exceed the opposition members who are actually allowed to participate. The first method involves persuasion and a respect for everyone's supposed rights. The second method involves suppression and a respect for nothing but naked power and winning, winning, winning.

By the first method, at least 51% make the decisions for everyone. By the second method, as few as 3.5% make the decisions for everyone, and for millions and millions who are not yet born in centuries that follow.

Welcome to Ohio. The Heart of It All.

Rights, Part IV

Another quick scenario: You still have a hundred people on a tropical island. Almost all of them have semi-automatic weapons that are properly registered and they feel very safe in their rights. You've got one guy who has an Apache attack helicopter. How many of these people really have any *rights*?

Yup. You're catching on.

Implied Consent, Part IV

A third argument based on implied consent is that we avail ourselves of programs and benefits provided by the “State of Ohio,” and we therefore consent to be ruled by it. By accepting programs and benefits from the government, our actions say we approve of the ruler-subject relationship. I politely disagree.

Imagine I rob you and leave you broke and you cannot feed your family. With all the wealth I have, I donate bread to the destitute and the needy. The bread I donate ends up getting to you and you accept the bread for your starving family. Does that mean that when you accept, out of desperation, the bread I donated, you are also consenting to having been robbed? If your answer is no, then we have already disposed of this “implied consent” argument.

We certainly use state roads and state schools and a whole host of other state services. But we really have no choice. This “State of Ohio” has taken from us, collectively, enough of our resources to build and maintain those roads and schools—resources that you and I and others may have otherwise used collectively to build roads and schools to our liking and not to the government’s. In the absence of those resources, because the “State of Ohio” took them from us, we are now forced to use the state road and state school monopolies. The same is true for any service provided by this “State of Ohio.”

Right now, I am possibly availing myself of more services provided by the “State of Ohio” than just about anyone. Right now, at Warren Correctional, I wear state clothing. I sleep in a state dwelling with state bedding. I eat state food. I drink state water. I am provided state medical services. I would argue that my availing myself of these services does not in any way imply my consent to being ruled by this “State of Ohio.” I would prefer not to be a beneficiary of this state program, but I am not given a choice—there is a shotgun pointed at my head.

Availing ourselves of programs and benefits offered by the “State of Ohio”—when this “State of Ohio” forecloses upon all other practical options—doesn’t imply our consent to be ruled by this dead corporation.

Rights, Part V

What does “rights” mean? Again, I’m not being funny here. I really don’t know what they are. By the conception of famous dead guys who wrote stuff like the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, our rights are like possessions and they can never be taken from us, just like our *minds* or our *souls* or our *hearts*. By their idea, our rights don’t come from governments, but from the Creator. Our rights are ours by virtue of our being created, by virtue of our existence. If our rights come from some Creator, then our rights existed before government did. That means governments do not create rights but are simply institutions (corporations) that either recognize those rights or do not. Government recognition or no government recognition, our rights are what they are, we still have them, and no one can take them from us. They are ours.

Based on this idea, those famous dead guys wrote up the US Constitution, and that contract listed all of the rights that the corporation called the United States had a contractual duty to recognize. This corporation, the United States, is contractually obligated to recognize those rights.

Those famous dead guys wrote that contract to protect us and our rights from the corporation they were creating. That contract was designed to keep the government from ever violating our rights. It's in the contract.

A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal.

But who do we go to when we want to present a case that our rights have been violated by this government? Well, to the government.

So, look. We have these contracts with these corporations called "governments." These are contracts we never signed, with terms to which we never agreed. But these corporations, these "governments," enforce the contracts on us anyway. These contracts include descriptions of the rights that these corporations, these "governments," must recognize and protect. But who has the unilateral power to interpret the contract? Not us. The corporations, the "governments," have unilateral power to interpret the contracts they enforce upon us, contracts we never signed. The contracts mean what the "governments" say they mean, not what *we* say they mean.

So, imagine this. Imagine you have a bully taking others' lunch money. But you make a deal with this bully. You have it on paper. It says explicitly that the bully cannot take your lunch money.

A contract is a contract. A deal is a deal.

But you don't get to interpret what the contract means. The bully reserves the exclusive right to unilaterally interpret what the contract means. The contract means what the bully says it means. It doesn't mean what you say it means.

So, what good is this piece of paper? In the same way, what good are these contracts imposed upon us by dead corporations that assume unilateral powers to interpret what the contracts mean?

What are rights? Whatever this "State of Ohio" says they are. By the way, those famous dead guys with their lofty conception of *rights*—most of them owned slaves.

Implied Consent, Part V

The fourth argument for implied consent is the jurisdiction one. According to this argument, the "State of Ohio" has claimed jurisdictional authority over a geographical space and so, by entering that jurisdictional space, you have implied your consent to be ruled by this "State of Ohio." The argument is, if you set foot inside this "State of Ohio," then you recognize its authority. The argument is, if you are not prepared to recognize the authority of the "State of Ohio," you should not set foot within its territory. This is a kind of turf argument. If you enter the turf of the "State of Ohio," you must consent to its rule. I politely disagree.

Why is it that when I enter the area where the "State of Ohio" claims authority, we assume that the "State of Ohio" has authority over me rather than *me* having authority over *it*? What I mean is, if the State of Ohio can claim authority over a geographic area, can't I do it too? Perhaps I crossed the border from Michigan into this area called Ohio with the intent of recognizing the State of Ohio and obeying it. But perhaps I entered this area called Ohio as an invader, a conqueror, and when I crossed that border, I said, "This so-called State of Ohio is abolished and I am now King of Ohio." So, if this is the case, then we should assume that this State of Ohio, by existing in an area where I have claimed authority, has implied consent to be ruled by me rather than assuming that I have implied consent to be ruled by it.

I know, it sounds ridiculous that someone would declare himself a king, just as it would be ridiculous to establish the Republic of Bob's Lanes. But my point is still valid: why would we assume that people entering an area do so with the intent to be slaves to dead corporations rather than intending to be masters to those corporations?

For this argument of implied consent to work, we have to assume that the State of Ohio has some right to rule, a right to declare itself an authority over a jurisdictional space, a right that we mere humans do not possess. I don't know where such a right would originate. For this argument to work, we must also assume that our rights, which are our property and which preceded all governments, must yield to the claimed right to rule possessed by this dead corporation.

I would suggest that the State of Ohio has no legitimate authority that we have a duty to recognize. It has no right to impose itself upon anyone. My rights and your rights do not yield to it but, rather, it yields to us. This State of Ohio, as far as I can tell, has no right to exist.

The No-Fly List Threshold

Just a quick note. I want to be clear. You've reached the point in this work that I refer to as the "No-Fly List Threshold." Up to now, everything I wrote only annoyed the government and the poor, deluded hierarchs who run it. They didn't like being ridiculed and they grumbled and sneered like clowns in a dunk tank, tired of feeling wet and soggy. They thought that maybe if the opportunity might present itself at some point, it might be fun to rough me up a bit, give me the blues. But, nothing I said was really very alarming. Not even very original. They didn't consider what I was writing to be dangerous.

Not until that last sentence of the preceding segment.

With that last sentence, bells and whistles went off. Sirens flashed. For some monkey in a suit, that was the "Oh shit" moment where we reached the No-Fly List Threshold.

I said the State of Ohio has no right to exist. I led you to think about a world without the State of Ohio being better than a world with it. I implied that we have the right to make it not exist. I suggested that maybe we should make it not exist.

I know, I have the right to free speech. Sure. I have the right to abolish the government, for fuck's sake. I know. Reasonably, nobody could get bent out of shape because I said the "State of Ohio" has no right to exist.

But, that's kind of the point: we're not dealing with *reasonable* people. We're dealing with the "State of Ohio," and it never met a peace-loving, honest human being it didn't want to rob, rape, and kill.

Read Part One over again if you doubt me. Ask the Indians.

And as to my *right* to free speech, consider: In 2007, in an interview with Anthony Rayson, I tangentially mentioned that if Ohio prisoners laid on their bunks for thirty days and refused to work, the entire economy of the "State of Ohio" would collapse. I used that as an example to demonstrate my point about the power relationship between government and subject, to demonstrate that even in the most repressive setting, the ruled actually hold power over the ruler. At which point officials tried to send me to their super-duper-max. For seventy days, they subjected me to what the US government calls the "simple torture situation."

So much for the freedom of speech contractually promised in Article 1, Section 11 of the Ohio Constitution. So much for the protection from cruel and unusual punishment the “State of Ohio” contractually promised in Article 1, Section 9 of the Ohio Constitution. So much for *rights*.

In this absence of rights, what you have is a dead corporation armed with Apache attack helicopters. That means that, by the time you read this, there’s just no telling what they’ve done with me.

You Can’t Protect Yourself from a Liar, Part I

My grandmother always said, “You can protect yourself from a thief; you can’t protect yourself from a liar.” (In Ohio, you can’t protect yourself from either one or they’ll lock you away for decades and then torture you for having better ideas than they have, but that’s really beyond the point.) What my grandmother meant was, a thief sneaks into your home and steals mere possessions and you can generally stop a thief by locking your doors and windows. A liar, however, steals more than mere possessions. A liar sneaks into more than just your house.

It wouldn’t be so bad, I suppose, if liars had built-in warning buzzers that went off when they lied; then you could tell the truth from the lies. But they don’t have warning buzzers. And what makes good liars so successful, what makes them good liars, is the ability to tell lies that sound like the truth. Successful liars tell good lies. Really successful liars tell really good lies. People believe really good liars. This “State of Ohio” is a really good liar. It tells really good lies. Millions of people believe them. This dead corporation says it is still alive. It says it has legitimate authority over us even though we never signed the contract. It says we have rights and that we need the benefits and protections provided by this thing, and we would never get by without it.

You can’t protect yourself from a liar. Especially a liar with Apache attack helicopters.

Rights, Part VI

You have the right to oppose me and my Apache attack helicopter. You have the right to say what I want to hear. You have the right to hear me declare you guilty before I punish you. You have the right to appeal to me whenever I do something you don’t like. You have the right to be protected from me, by me. You have the right to be free from anything I deem to be cruel or unusual punishment, although we both know that nothing I would ever do to you would be cruel or unusual because I’m such a wonderful motherfucker. You have the right to be protected by laws I write until I suspend them or write new ones.

Do you understand your rights as I have dictated them to you, or do I need to get behind the controls of my Apache attack helicopter and read them to you again? I thought so.

Welcome to Ohio. The Heart of It All.

You Can’t Protect Yourself from a Liar, Part II

Let me tell you about Tracey. She started visiting me in 2007. She was smart, funny, and beautiful. She made a lot of promises.

Tracey worked at a law firm and promised to get an attorney to represent me. She promised to work as my agent and get some of my book-length fiction published, which would bring in

revenue I could use to get free. She promised to serve as the Executive Director of the Sean Swain Defense Committee, which would legitimize my struggle and would also benefit her when she got to law school, showing her activism and leadership qualities. She promised to have my name tattooed someplace very close to her genitalia. Tracey made a lot of promises. She made me feel very important to her. Tracey didn't keep her promises. She proved how unimportant I really was.

Tracey and the State of Ohio are a lot alike. Both of them hurt people. Both of them equate making promises with keeping promises. Both of them are very dangerous to anyone who has the misfortune to believe them.

Tracey promised to get legal help and to assist in getting books published and to get a tattoo next to her vagina, and her promises were empty words. The State of Ohio promised to respect our rights to defend our lives, and to respect our rights to free speech and protection from cruel and unusual punishment, but these promises are empty too. When Tracey and the State of Ohio lie, you just cannot tell. Really good liars tell really good lies. You can't protect yourself from a liar.

Personhood

In Ohio, blacks officially obtained "personhood" in the nineteenth century. Women officially obtained "personhood" in the twentieth century.

The "State of Ohio" obtained "personhood" before either of them. And it's not even a person.

The Right to Create a God

Just imagine being as powerful as Thomas Worthington and his pals. It might be hard to imagine because we're slaves to a dead corporation, but imagine having the ability to put words on paper and create an all-powerful god. Imagine having the magical powers to give this all-powerful god authority that you yourself do not possess.

Wouldn't it be great to have the powers of Thomas Worthington?

As a mere mortal, you would be powerless to give orders to eleven million people centuries in the future and threaten to drag them away if they refuse to obey you, or to take their property from them at will. As a mere mortal, you cannot extort eleven million people out of a percentage of their income.

But if you have Thomas Worthington powers, you can scribble a few words on paper and, poof!, like magic, you can create a god called the "State of Ohio," and this god will exist forever, immortal, ordering around millions for centuries and threatening to drag them away if they refuse to obey, extorting them out of a percentage of their hard-earned wages. If only you and I had those special, magical, super-human powers of Thomas Worthington...

We wouldn't be slaves.

Subjects and Slaves

What is the difference between subjects and slaves? In both cases, someone has power over you. In both cases, you are compelled to go along with a program that isn't yours. In both cases,

your rights are defined by someone else. When it all boils down, aren't a subject and a slave the same thing? Isn't a government a master by a different name?

Rights, Part VII

All men are created equal. Some men are created more equal than others.

You and I can't form the Republic of Bob's Lanes without getting arrested but Tommy Worthington can highjack an entire region belonging to someone else and enslave everyone who ever steps foot in it forever. That doesn't feel equal.

It feels like Tommy Worthington has some kind of special dispensation you and I do not have. It feels like he has been given special privileges and immunities that this "State of Ohio" has contractually promised never to dispense.

I know this much: if I had a choice between "Sean Swain rights" and "Thomas Worthington rights," I'd take the "Thomas Worthington rights," all day every day, and twice on Sunday.

All men are created equal. Some are created more equal than others.

The guy who broke into my home, Andrew Crouch, was the nephew of the Clerk of Courts. Being the nephew of the

Clerk of Courts, and being the beneficiary of her political clout and connections, Andrew Crouch had the right to rough up his girlfriend when he was drunk. Andrew Crouch had the right to beat her up when she was pregnant. Andrew Crouch had the right to kick her down the stairs. Andrew Crouch had the right to light her hair on fire. Andrew Crouch had the right to beat up the cops who responded until they stunned him several times with a stun gun. Andrew Crouch had the right to spend not one day in prison. Here at Warren Correctional, I have personally met a lot of prisoners who did far, far less than Andrew Crouch, but none of them are nephews of Clerks of Courts. All of them are serving time he never had to serve.

Even after death, Andrew Crouch had more rights than I have. Andrew Crouch had the right to have police conceal evidence of his criminal behavior. Andrew Crouch had the right to have witnesses lie to make him appear to have been something he was not. Andrew Crouch had the right to have a prosecutor expend the vast resources of the state to present an impossible scenario that would make me out to be something I was not, vindicating him as a victim in the eyes of twelve people too stupid to get out of jury duty. Andrew Crouch had the right to have my jury stacked with management from the predatory company I had attempted to unionize.

Me? I had the right to die or to go to prison. I had the right to wait for the rest of my life for the "fair trial" ordered by the court of appeals. I had the right to have my motions thrown away by the clerk rather than filed. I had the right to get tortured for having ideas better than my captors' ideas. If I had the choice between "Sean Swain rights" and "Andrew Crouch rights," I'd take the "Andrew Crouch rights" every day—and twice on Sunday.

All men are created equal. Some are more equal than others. Never kill anyone more equal than you are.

Contracts, Part IX

Tommy Worthington doesn't have the right to draft a contract that makes me obligated to put a roof on your house without my consent, but he can draft one that makes me a slave to a dead corporation for the rest of my life?

Rights, Part VIII

So, again, what the fuck are "rights"? What good is this contract that none of us have signed if the "State of Ohio" simply ignores everything in it that benefits us? What duty does anybody really owe to Tommy Worthington's dead corporation?

Contracts, Part X

If you accept the Euroamerican theory of law, then a contract is a contract, a deal is a deal. The Ohio Constitution is a contract that you and I never signed, one that cannot be enforced against us. Theories related to implied consent simply don't wash; paying taxes, voting, using state programs, or living in jurisdictional territory do not imply our consent to be enslaved by a corporation we never agreed to obey. So, by what authority can the State of Ohio claim to be our master and reduce us to slaves?

God. That's what one guy told me. He said God is the ultimate authority and in one of the books of Paul in the Bible, it says that no authority exists except by the will of God. Therefore, since God has put His stamp of approval on this State of Ohio, we must obey it. I don't know about that. I'm skeptical. I don't think an all-knowing, all-seeing, ever-present author of the ten commandments (you know, "thou shall not kill," and thou shall not steal," and so on) sided with murderers and thieves who took this area from its owners and slaughtered them. That's quite a disturbing proposition.

If the Creator of the universe is secretly in league with sociopaths, murderers, and rapists to reduce all of us to slavery for the benefit of the evil few, if that's truly God's agenda, then I don't know how I feel with Him in charge. This guy is a real asshole.

God

I doubt that if there is a Creator of the universe, he's really that callous. I doubt that he secretly supports all the bewildering nonsense that he says he opposes. I don't really think he's an asshole. I suspect he doesn't like this "State of Ohio" and its oppressions any better than I do.

If all reason tells us there's no valid argument to justify this

State of Ohio and its claims to authority, we cannot appeal to the imagined opinions of Santa Claus or the Easter Bunny or the Tooth Faerie or even God. We cannot resort to magical beans and faerie dust, to bunny rabbits and rainbows, when reason fails to give us the justification we seek.

Either this State of Ohio has valid authority according to law or it does not. Either this Ohio Constitution is a binding contract or it is not. I say it is not—the opinions of Kris Kringle, Buddha, and Jesus of Nazareth notwithstanding, thank you.

No-Fly List Revisited

We've already gone well beyond the no-fly list threshold, so let me ask you: What are we gonna DO about this?

All of Us

You probably already see what I'm doing. I suspect the cat is out of the bag. I might as well admit it, huh?

I made a contract argument about the State of Ohio, but my argument isn't really about the State of Ohio at all... because none of us signed the Declaration of Independence or the US Constitution or any other nations' constitutions.

None of us accepted the slavery status to these dead corporations called nation-states any more than we accepted slavery status to the State of Ohio. None of these governments are ours.

This applies to every government that we ourselves have not formed or fashioned or incorporated for ourselves. Every living being on the planet subjected to any supposed authority that has assumed the right to rule is enslaved by a tyrant, an usurper, an imposter, a false god, an illegitimate nonauthority. Ponder that for a moment.

So, imagine if we all got together to do something about this... All seven billion of us.

Intelligent Life

The Ohio Department of Retribution and Corruption sent me to their super-duper max because I wrote a book and mentioned the fact that Ohio prisoners laying on their bunks for thirty days would make Ohio's economy collapse. They sent me to the super-duper-max, admittedly, for my ideology, for having thoughts better than theirs.

But just now I admittedly proposed outright that we need to topple every single nation-state on the planet in the name of freedom. If a minor reference to prisoners disrupting Ohio's economy could potentially get me sent to the super- duper-max, and if my ideology could get me sent there, just imagine where they're going to send me now.

I might end up on the next rocket to be shot into space. I hope there's intelligent life out there.

Government-less

What would government-less life look like?

Whatever we made of it. Without someone else in charge, we would have to make our own decisions. I don't think we can do any worse than the clowns who are running everything now. No one knows our needs better than we do, so no one can do a better job meeting our needs than we can. Strangers who don't know us cannot possibly make us happier than we can make ourselves, especially if they're only concerned about the happiness of their golf partners.

So what would life be like if we got them out of our way and we could strive to meet our own needs and run our own lives? I'm confident that things would be very nice.

We're reasonable people, I think.

Of course, those in power who benefit from the current swindle will tell you the sky will fall if we get rid of them. They'll tell us we need them. They'll tell us that without them, there will be chaos and suffering.

As for the chaos and suffering, what the fuck do you call this? They will tell us the world will be lawless. But isn't it lawlessness when you ignore the law and act like it doesn't exist, and do whatever you want? Like if you ignore the Northwest Territory Ordinance and the Treaty of Greenville and property rights and Supreme Court decisions and sworn testimony of attorneys general and all of the foundational principles of your own legal system?

How much more lawless can you get?

Part III: The Myth

The belief in 'authority' which includes all belief in 'government,' is irrational and self-contradictory; it is contrary to civilization and morality, and constitutes the most dangerous, destructive superstition that has ever existed.

—Larken Rose

If the State is to exist, the dominated must obey the authority claimed by the powers that be.

—Max Weber

Magical Beans, Part I

Imagine this. Imagine that there has been a disaster on the international space station. NASA has to brainstorm for solutions and finds that no one can get a space craft up there for several days. Then, one of the technicians suggests, “Perhaps we could plant some magical beans and then climb the bean stalk into space, and rescue the space station.”

I suspect that no one would take that technician seriously. Everyone knows there are no such things as magical beans and that magical beans won't become real just because our need for them requires it. To believe that magical beans will become real in response to our need is fantastical thinking. There's no magical bean solution.

Flat Earth, Part I

If we went back in time, say, a thousand years, everyone we would encounter would believe the world is flat. The entire human population, everyone around us. They would have powerful institutions like The Church holding to theories about the centrality of man in creation, and the plan of God, all based on the false perception that the earth is flat and located in the center of the universe.

To challenge their misperception, to say the earth is round, is to challenge a great number of ideas that are central to their concept of the universe and the role of humanity and their own identities in relationship to those concepts. In fact, by simply saying, “You know the earth is round, right?” we would be calling into question the authority of The Church itself; we would be implying, intentionally or otherwise, that The Church, being capable of bungling something so simple as the location and shape of the planet, might also lack such a decent grasp on heavenly matters, and perhaps The Church doesn't have a monopoly on divinely-inspired truth after all.

Everyone around us, invested in these ideas of how the universe operates, would have an interest in silencing us. It wouldn't even be a matter of whether or not, individually, this person or this one believed or disbelieved our claim. Belief aside, our proposition that the world is round

would throw their lives into chaos. So, people would ridicule us. They would present arguments for the earth being flat, arguments we already know to be debunked. They would get angry, maybe burn us at the stake.

You can't go around challenging the false ideas that are at the very heart of people's belief systems. You can't go around challenging the lies we have for *everything*.

Magical Beans, Part II

What if people from the future came back to reveal to *us* the false myths that we hold onto tightly the same way that people a thousand years ago held onto the false myth that the earth is flat? Do you wonder what they would reveal to us as the big lie controlling how we fundamentally misperceive the world?

I know. The question seems absurd to you. You know that we are enlightened and modern people, no longer living in the dark ages. We have no myths to which we cling. The implication that we are still superstitiously misconceiving of the world we live in is somewhat... insulting. Right?

Still, I think I know what visitors from the future would say. They would say, "This thing you call 'government' doesn't really exist. It's a myth. Fundamentally, it's as real as magical beans."

Flat Earth, Part II

I don't think we would receive these visitors from the future with much enthusiasm. I don't think we would appreciate their news from the future that government isn't real. I suspect most of us know with great certitude that that's just plain crazy.

We look around and see the post office and the courthouse, we see cops on the streets, we see military jets flying in the sky. All of those things are components of government, so government must be real.

We all know that the very thing that separates us from the uncivilized is our respect for laws, and laws are enforced by government. We know this. We know that our obedience to government makes us moral, that obeying the rightful authorities is a duty.

We would tell those whack-a-doodles from the future that not only is government real, but we need it. It is *necessary*. We would say that with the same conviction and fervor as those flat-earthers who would insist the world is as flat as a pancake, who wouldn't just believe the world is flat, but would *need* the world to be flat, and we would go on believing that government is real. We would continue making decisions about our lives predicated on the belief that government is real. We would continue to raise our children to obey authorities and to respect government, to be good, obedient, moral, upstanding citizens who love their country and who defend government.

Lies are tools that are used when telling the truth doesn't work. Good liars tell good lies and great liars tell great lies. You can protect yourself from a thief, but you can't protect yourself from a liar.

We have a lie for *everything*.

The biggest lies are the hardest ones to shake.

An Observation about Myths

I might have lost you a couple of segments back when I used the word “myth.” It might have been too soon to hit you with the “m”-word.

See, it is easy to look back at the ancient Greeks and Romans and speak of myths. We learn that myths are the beliefs of unsophisticated thinkers. Everyone else has myths. But *we* don’t.

Thing is, early Greeks and Romans didn’t think of their myths as myths. To them, their myths were merely the story of the world that gave their lives meaning, the facts that informed their living from day to day. They would have been offended at the suggestion that they were duped by silly fables and that their beliefs were myths.

Everyone else’s beliefs are “myths.” Our own beliefs are the truth. A writer named Daniel Quinn has suggested that a culture’s mythology is nothing more than a “story to be in.” Taking that definition, I don’t think anyone would blanch at the suggestion that we have a “story to be in,” even if we cannot articulate its details, even if we haven’t given much thought to what that story is.

So, we do have a collective mythology, one that defines our world and our roles in that world and our relationships, including our relationships to this thing we call government.

Respecting the Laws, Part I

Respecting the laws of government makes us moral. That’s what we’d tell time travelers from the future who tell us that government is a myth.

But let’s consider whether or not our respect for laws really makes us moral. Recall that at one time in the US, slavery was legal. The laws of this country criminalized slaves escaping or anyone assisting slaves to escape. Helping a slave escape was equated with stealing someone’s property.

So, if respect for laws makes us moral, it was then moral to respect the slave master’s property rights. It was immoral to help a slave escape. In fact, it was a moral act to report escaped slaves so they could be apprehended and dragged back to their state of bondage and servitude.

But there came a time when slavery was abolished and the law demanded the emancipation of slaves. That means that what was moral the day before—reporting escaped slaves and dragging them back to their masters—became immoral the following day. On the day that the law demanding emancipation came into effect, it suddenly became moral to do what was immoral the day before... and it became immoral to do what was moral the day before.

If we accept that our respect for laws makes us moral, what’s moral one day is sometimes the exact opposite of what is moral the following day. And that means that morality isn’t really defined by a set system of fixed principles but is instead defined by the whims of those who pass laws.

We can also consider that lots of Germans respected the laws of the government under the Third Reich and they reported people and turned them in and had them sent to death camps, and some of them, those who respected the laws the most, worked at the death camps and dug the mass graves and herded children into gas chambers. A Nazi with great respect for the laws dropped canisters of Zyklon B into the gas chamber and participated in genocide.

I would suggest that perhaps respect for laws doesn't make us moral at all. Respecting immoral laws imposed by immoral governments cannot make us moral. So, when those whack-a-doodles from the future tell us government is a myth, perhaps we shouldn't tell them that respect for the laws of government makes us moral.

What is a Law? Part II

In part one, I asked this question: What is a law? And I think what I wrote for a definition of a law was this: *Laws are tools we use to force others to go along with our program when they cannot be persuaded to go along of their own free will.*

As a working definition, that served us. However, for our purposes here, I think we have to re-visit this definition, because if we are going to be specific and accurate, laws are not really tools that we use. Not if "we" means you and me. As we already established with the example of Bob's Lanes, you and I do not write decrees from on high, so we don't really pass laws at all.

More accurately, laws originate from government. That is, whatever it is that writes or formulates the law, it can only be passed and implemented by something recognized with the right to govern, and if it is governing, then it is, by virtue of its governing, a govern-MENT. Moses came down the mount with tablets and declared them to be the law. In that moment, Moses became the government. The Supreme Court issued a decision that the law demands us to do this or that; in that moment, the Supreme Court is acting as government.

So, for our purposes here, I propose that we modify the previous working definition of *laws* to recognize where it really originates—government. To put it simply, laws are demands made by governments. I think that works. Laws are tools used by government to make people do what the government wants them to do, whether people like it or not. If people comply with the demand, they do not get punished. If people don't comply with the demand, they get punished.

A law is a demand. That means that when we say, "Respect for the 'laws' makes us moral," what we are really saying is, "Complying with 'demands' makes us moral."

Isn't it more moral to think for yourself and do what you know to be right than to comply with demands out of fear of punishment? But what do I know.

The Right to Rule, Part I

Laws are demands made by government. But what is *government*?

Recall, in the last segment, I suggested that even Moses coming down from the mount with stone tablets was a government. That means we've got Moses and we've got kings and queens and dictators and presidents and prime ministers and courts and legislators and on and on. What do they all have in common?

I think for our purposes, discussing human social organization, government is an institution, first, that gives commands. It gives orders. It issues demands. Because government governs, it has to give orders. If you show me a government that doesn't issue orders, I'll show you a government that isn't a government.

But more than just giving orders or issuing demands, government must be seen as having the right to be obeyed. There are plenty of institutions that give orders. All kinds of bosses in work places give orders, but they are only bosses, not government. So, what distinguishes government

from every other institution that gives orders is that government is assumed to have the right to be obeyed.

I can give you orders, but that doesn't make me a government. You and I both know I have no authority, no claim to your obedience. But a government, in contrast, has recognition from those it commands. Those receiving the orders believe and act like that government, however it is composed and however it operates, has a right to rule. And this means that when the government is not obeyed, it has a right to punish.

So, when we confront those whack-a-doodles from the future who tell us government is a myth, and when we tell them that respecting the laws of government makes us moral, what we are really saying is, "Respecting the demands of those who assume the right to rule us makes us moral."

Does that *sound* right? Let's not say it.

Milgram Again

All this gets me to thinking about those experiments by Stanley Milgram again. Remember that guy? He's the guy who wore a lab coat and carried a clipboard and told average people off the street to administer what they believed to be electric shocks—electric shocks that were, they thought, hurting another human being. Out of respect for authority, most people complied. Most people were obedient to the commands of those who assumed a right to rule. Most subjects in the experiments kept administering what they thought were electric shocks to strangers, over and over, possibly causing serious harm or even death... or so they thought.

If respecting the demands of those who assume the right to rule us makes us moral, then isn't it the absolute height of morality to engage in bewildering human rights abuses, to perpetuate crimes against humanity, to participate in atrocities and genocide? Isn't it the most moral act to administer electric shocks to strangers, hitting that button again and again and again and again... possibly killing complete strangers on the orders of another complete stranger who gives orders? It's moral to commit mass murder for those who assume the right to rule, right?

Perhaps respecting the laws of government—that is, obeying the demands of those who assume the right to rule— only makes us as moral as the demands, only as moral as those who assume the right to issue those demands.

Respecting the Laws, Part II

Respecting the laws of government makes us civilized. That's what we would say to those whack-a-doodles from the future who tell us that government is a myth. And if we don't think about it, the argument makes sense to us. But does it make sense if we think about it?

Consider all of the worst atrocities in history. The really low-down ones. All of the world's worst atrocities are carried out by people who respected the laws of government, who obeyed the demands of those who assumed the right to rule.

Consider, the most *uncivilized* acts have been committed in the name of government.

Perhaps we could more readily argue that it is more civilized *not* to respect the laws of governments than it is to respect them. When we respect the laws of governments we encourage

those who assume the right to rule, encourage them to continue as they demand bigger and bigger atrocities from us. Aren't we at least partly to blame for letting them assume this right to rule in the first place?

So, whatever we tell those whack-a-doodles from the future who tell us government is a myth, we certainly shouldn't tell them that respecting the laws of governments makes us moral or civilized. Those arguments kinda suck.

Submission

From early childhood, we are taught to obey the demands of authority. We are graded and loved and rewarded according to how well we obey first our parents, and then teachers and maybe clergy, and then how well we obey bosses and the government. We all know that the good children are the children who do as they are told, and that later in life, the good people are the people who do as they are told, who work hard and pay their taxes and don't steal. The bad children are the ones who rebel against their parents, who rebel against all the other authorities. Good people recognize obedience as a virtue and they put it into practice. God expects it, parents expect it, teachers expect it, bosses expect it, and government expects it. We are taught to expect it from ourselves. We might stop at a stoplight in the middle of the night even though we see there is no traffic and there are no police and we might be tired and anxious to get home. But we stop. And we wait for the light to turn green. That's what good people do.

It is good and right to do as we are told, regardless of how we feel or think about what we are told to do. Everyone cannot do what they want to do, or what feels good. If everyone did that, if everyone followed their own internal moral compasses, it would be chaos, mayhem, anarchy, madness.

Yep. A lie for *everything*.

We know it is good and right to do as we are told without regard to how we feel about it, without regard to what we think. So, when given the orders, we hit that button. And we hit it again. And we hit it again.

Zap... zap... zap...

Truth from the Future

Time travelers from the future would probably listen to all of our arguments with pained expressions on their faces. They may even roll their eyes when we propose arguments that our respect for laws of government make us moral or civilized. They might audibly sigh and shake their heads.

After listening to us, one of them might say something like this: *In your time, people hold it in high regard when 'subjects' obey the commands of those with the imagined right to rule. But your obedience has not brought you order and peace and happiness as you imagine, but has instead brought you greater and greater chaos, more war and suffering than any other time. Your perceived virtue of obedience to government, which you deeply believe, and which you pass on to your children, never led to anything good. What you are falsely taught is the purpose of government—to create an orderly, peaceful, civilized society where everyone can experience happiness and peace—has never manifested in the real world by any claimed government. Ever. People from your time will bemoan*

the evils committed by governments and will catalog all the ways that even the government of their own country is corrupt and bad, but they will still assert that government is a force for good; they will still insist that people need government. They think that government is a noble idea that sometimes goes wrong rather than an antiquated concept that is false and wrong and irrational even to its very foundations.

Yas, false and wrong and irrational even to its very foundations. Then, before sitting down and yielding the floor, this time traveler might point out how we're always taught to defer to some outside authority, to some external power, ignoring the reality on the ground, going along with someone else's program. This traveler may suggest that this dynamic is the reason why people in our era sometimes ignore their own eyes and listen instead to the disembodied voice coming out of the dashboard, and will drive directly into a lake. One of them might say, "...Calculating route..."

And then all of them might have a chuckle at our expense as they yield the floor back to us.

The Right to Rule, Part II

If government is the building where governing takes place, then government is not a myth at all. Those buildings are very real. I have been inside some of them and can verify the buildings are real. And if government is the people who assume the right to rule, then government is not a myth at all— because those people are very real.

But, government isn't a building. There are places where natural disasters occur and buildings are completely leveled or swept away or flooded. In those places, when the buildings go down, government doesn't cease to exist. The government continues to operate out of tents or trailers. So, those very real buildings are irrelevant to whether or not government is a myth.

And government isn't the people giving the orders, either. Sometimes, those giving the orders get voted out of office, or they die, or they resign in scandal. When those things happen, government doesn't cease to exist; those people simply get replaced by other people. So, those very real human beings who give orders are irrelevant to whether or not government is a myth.

This thing we call government is not the buildings where governing occurs or the people who give the orders. The buildings and the people are just the physical manifestations through which this thing called government appears to operate. Because we see very real buildings and very real people through which government seems to operate, we associate this thing called government with the buildings and the people. But government is something separate from the buildings, and something separate from the people.

This thing called government is, itself, the right to rule. The right to rule is government.

The Supreme Court issues a judgment and it isn't the building with the marble pillars that makes the judgment law and makes the court the government. The Supreme Court existed before that building was built. Likewise, it isn't the people, because there have been numerous incarnations of the Supreme Court going back for centuries. The justices who sit on the court now have not been there the whole time.

So, the people are interchangeable.

No, what makes the court the government and makes their decision law is that they assert a right to rule and those they assume to rule likewise recognize the legitimacy of the court as

government. So, it is the right to rule that makes the court the government and makes their decision “law.”

When Moses walked down the mount with the tablets, he was not the government because his name was Moses, and the stone tablets he carried were not law because they were kept in a very ornate box inside a tent. It wasn't the tent that made Moses the government or made the tablets law. It wasn't Moses himself, as the government of his people continued after he died. It was the right to rule that made Moses the government and made the tablets he carried law.

So, in every regard, no matter the buildings or the people or the form that government takes, whether autocratic or liberal democratic, Marxist or religious, it is the right to rule assumed by those who govern, the right to rule accepted by those who are governed, that makes the government.

Looked at another way, no government can exist wherever there is no claim to the right to rule or no people who accept the claim. Everywhere, government only exists where there is the right to rule.

So, what if this right to rule is as real as magical beans and faerie dust? What if it has no real basis? If the right to rule is a false myth, then isn't government, which is dependent upon this falsity, equally false?

*****An Explanation for Dissonance**

If you and I are both intelligent, reasonable people and we disagree about a matter of fact, then there are only a couple of explanations. First, if we are both intelligent and reasonable, but we disagree about a point of fact, then we must be working off of different information. That is, one of us knows something the other does not. Either you know something I don't know... or I know something you don't know.

The problem is, we cannot come to any real determination about which of us knows what the other does not until we each do an inventory to share what it is that we think we know. Once we do that, we can identify what it is you thought to be true that was not, or what it is that I thought to be true that was not.

To give an example, if we went back in time to when the world was believed to be flat, the flat-earthers would think they know something that we do not, and would attempt to explain to us our error in thinking. They wouldn't know that we, in fact, know a great deal that they do not know. They wouldn't know that the dissonance, the difference in our thinking arises out of us knowing things that they do not know.

In the situation at hand, we have these whack-a-doodles from the future who tell us our belief in government is our principle problem because government is a myth.

We believe otherwise. We believe that government is real.

Either we know something they do not know... or they know something we do not know.

...Calculating route...

*****Acquiring the Right to Rule**

How would someone go about obtaining this right to rule? And if someone obtains the right to rule, what is the process by which those they choose as subjects lose even the right to rule themselves?

What I mean is, we have two situations that both must be present in order for someone to have a right to rule someone else. For me to claim a right to rule you, for instance, I would first have to demonstrate somehow that I have the right to rule myself. If I do not have the right to rule myself, then you can just as easily claim the right to rule me as I can claim the right to rule

you. But, beyond proving that I have the right to rule myself, I must also demonstrate that you have somehow lost the right to rule yourself.

So, what we end up with in all of this right to rule stuff is that we have essentially two groups of humans. We have one group that have the right to rule themselves and others, and we have a group that have lost the right to rule both others and themselves. The rulers and the ruled.

In all of this, how do we distinguish between the two separate groups? Do the people who have magically or supernaturally gained the right to rule others have some special, distinguishing feature? Perhaps a certain eye color, or a certain sized shoe, or maybe a birthmark of some kind? And how do we identify those who have lost even the right to rule themselves? Do they have the *absence* of this distinguishing feature?

It used to be that we had tests that would reveal those with the right to rule. The gods would reveal those with the right to rule as the one who yanked a magical sword out of a rock, or brained a giant with a slingshot, or somehow communed with the diety through a burning bush. But, it would appear that, these days, we have pulled all the swords out of all of the rocks and killed all of the giants, and as for the burning bushes, while we have a great many of them due to global warming, none of them seem to be talking to any of us. It would seem that the gods, limited in imagination as they are, have found no new method for making their wills known with regard to whom they pick to exercise the right to rule.

These days, we hold elections so that people can vote for which candidate they would object least to ruling them, and then the majority of the group that votes imposes their choice of least-objectionable ruler upon everyone else.

That means the one recognized as having the right to rule is the one that the largest-segment-of-those-who-vote hated least. And that means the one finally recognized as having a right to rule is picked because he or she is the one that most of the people won't do anything about. He or she is the one they will accept.

So, in our era, the practical exercise of this right to rule is really synonymous with, what some asshole can probably get away with imposing on everyone without them rising up and toppling him or her.

But, we are still left with the question: Where does this right to rule originate? Where does it come from?

*** **Gang Activity**

Imagine you had a donut shop in a bad neighborhood and some local gang-bangers were harassing you. The enforcers for this gang wear blue bandanas and they sag their pants and most of them, if not all, are packing heat. You can be pretty sure that one or two of them have previously shot someone on at least one occasion. They all drive blue sports cars. These gang members demand that you pay protection, giving them a certain percentage of your profits to pay them for their community restoration and for services they provide. They also give you certain guidelines on how you are to run your own business, and if you do not comply, they say they will "shut you down permanently." If you do not meet their demands for protection and allegiance to their gang's program, they will subject you to violence and you will lose everything.

What do you do? Do you give in and compromise your freedom and your principles? Or do you fight them off and risk losing your business and maybe your life?

Now let's switch it up. Instead of wearing blue bandanas, the gang bangers wear blue uniforms. Instead of sagging

pants, they each wear badges on their chests. Most, if not all of them, are still packing heat and you can be pretty sure that one or two of them have shot someone before. They no longer drive sports cars, but sedans with the words, “To Protect and To Serve,” emblazoned on their fenders.

They still demand that you give them a certain percentage of your profits to pay them for their community restoration and for services they provide but no longer call it protection. They call it taxes. They still demand that you run your business according to the guidelines they dictate. If you fail to pay the taxes or if you fail to meet their strict guidelines, they will shut you down. What do you do? Do you give in and compromise your freedom and your principles? Or do you fight them off and risk losing your business and maybe your life?

In the first scenario, you’re being extorted and blackmailed by lawless thugs. In the second scenario, you’re being governed by those who assume a right to rule you. So, what is the difference between lawless gang-bangers who extort and blackmail you, on one hand, and government on the other hand?

*** Flat Earth, Part III

If we went back in time and tried to tell people the truth that the earth is round, we’d catch a lot of shit. All those folks deluded by powerful myths would try to prove they’re smarter than us, that they know something we don’t know.

At some point, we may feel frustrated and begin resenting them. We might start rolling our eyes when these deluded and closed-minded dolts spout off silly and ridiculous arguments we already know are obviously wrong. Amongst ourselves, we might start referring to these delusional jackwagons as flat-earthars. “These crazy flat-earthars,” “I just can’t deal with these flat-earthars,” “If one more flat-earthar tries to tell me...,” and so on. Then, at some point, one of us might slip and call them flat-earthars to their faces.

Flat-earthars. Oops. Sorry.

What would the time-travelers from the future—knowing this idea of government, this imagined right to rule is utterly false—call all of us who are locked firmly in the prison of our own delusional thinking? What do you think their derogatory name for us might be? “State worshippers,” perhaps? Or maybe, “Hierarchs”? Or, how about “Pyramid zombies”? If we explained to them the *necessity* of government, do you think they would roll their eyes at us and sigh deeply? Do you think one of them might mutter under her breath something like, “... Calculating route...,” and the rest would shake their heads?

State-worshippers. Oops. Sorry.

*** Benevolence

The benevolence argument: government is different from gangs because government is a force for good and we need it.

Most of us believe that to be true.

Funny, but the same malcontent ranting about the Internal Revenue Service destroying the lives of good people will tell you that government is a force for good. So will human rights activists who document disappearances, torture, and mass killings by dictators all over the world. So will those who believe Kennedy was killed by the CIA. And those who believe that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were about US control over oil and opium. Or those who think 9/11 was an inside job.

“Government is a benevolent force for good,” they will say, even though their conclusion flies directly in the face of all the evidence they can see, and even when their belief in the benevolence

of government conflicts with the reality on the ground, and even when they recognize that the worst atrocities in all of history resulted from government and those who respected the right to rule assumed by government.

They have seen that the roots and branches and leaves and fruit of the tree are completely and utterly rotten, but still conclude the tree is good.

It would seem government is a benevolent force for good... even though it acts just like a gang... and extorts us... and threatens us... and robs us... and imposes itself by force... just like a gang, which is not a benevolent force for good. Certainly, government sometimes does good things. Every act of every government is not evil and mean-spirited. But, gang-bangers who extort and blackmail hard-working business owners sometimes do good things too. I bet even serial killers will sometimes help little old ladies across the street or carry their groceries or mow their lawns for free. Does that mean gang-bangers and serial killers are benevolent forces for good, just as government is?

If government is really benevolent, why does it act just like a gang? And how does this theory of government benevolence explain why they have those Apache attack helicopters?

*** **The Right to Rule, Part III**

A street gang cannot boss us around or expect our allegiance to them because they have no imagined right to rule. So, when the street gang tries to extort us, we resist. When gangbangers threaten us, we defy them. When they try to impose themselves, we meet force with force if necessary, defending our lives and our rights and our property and our autonomy. It's a matter of principle, too. You can't just let anybody walk all over you. But when government subjects us to the very same program as the street gangs, we accept it. We don't just accept it, but we're *happy* to accept it. We pay the extortion and comply with the demands and we think of ourselves as free. Really.

But if we were truly free, wouldn't *we* be the ones exercising the right to rule? What I mean is, I don't understand how being the subject of someone else who exercises a right to rule somehow makes us free. I would think that it would make us ruled. So, if being ruled makes you free, what are those who exercise the right to rule? *Super-free*?

You'll recall that back in Parts I and II, I asked how Thomas Worthington could assume the authority to create a corporation, a government, that had the right to rule when Thomas Worthington himself possessed no such right that he could bestow upon his created corporation. If Thomas Worthington didn't have this right to rule, he could not bestow it upon his corporation. So, that means that no one can bestow a right to rule upon someone else unless they have the right to rule first. You cannot pass on what you don't already own. Right?

So, where does someone get this special right to rule? Where does it come from? If we cannot figure out where it originates, where it comes from, and how it is then bestowed on someone else, then perhaps we need to conclude that no one really ever possesses a right to rule.

If no one possesses a right to rule, then that would make this right to rule a myth. Something made up. Something not really true. That would mean that this right to rule might be referred to, in common parlance, as, bullshit. Perhaps "government," which is the "right to rule," is "bullshit."

*** **Freedom**

I don't understand how people can be ruled but still think of themselves as free. I suspect perhaps we need to think about freedom a little more deeply. I think we need to figure out just what freedom is.

I ask people quite frequently whether they value freedom. I find that everyone does, without exception. So, then I ask them what freedom is, and I get a wide variety of answers.

Some tell me that freedom is the freedom of religion or the freedom of speech, or other freedoms that we associate with the criminal justice process. These responses do not assist in developing a definition of freedom so much as they provide a laundry list of particular freedoms that people value. Such priorities tell us what freedoms are valued more than others, but, just like listing all the different flavors of ice cream will not provide us the definition of ice cream, these responses do not help much in defining “freedom.”

Others, particularly in prison, associate freedom with getting high, getting drunk, getting laid, or eating the foods they have been forced to do without. This too reveals more about the priorities of those giving the answers than they reveal about the definition of freedom.

One answer that I like for its simplicity: “freedom means doing what I want.” This is a good one, I think, because in its simplicity, it implies a great deal. Freedom is a state we occupy when we are able to direct our own activities rather than having someone else direct them. Freedom is doing what you want to do in contradistinction to doing what you are compelled or forced to do. My only objection to this definition is that freedom also involves thought and belief in addition to action. Freedom is doing or thinking or believing as I want to do or think or believe.

The best definition I think I have ever read is the excellent working one provided by Ward Churchill. I hope you agree with it: *Freedom is the absence of external regulation.*

Isn't that brilliant? The absence of external regulation.

Consider, wherever you have external regulation, something beyond you—whatever it might be—that is regulating you, you are less free. And, the opposite, wherever you have the absence of external regulation, you have freedom.

In my way of thinking, I imagine a horizontal line. At opposite ends of it, you have points. One of those points represents “freedom,” and the other end represents “external regulation.” Like so:

()-----()

Freedom External Regulation (Absence of external regulation) (Absence of freedom)

Looking at this graph, we see absolute points at either end. At one, you are absolutely free, and at the other you are absolutely regulated. In between, you have varying gradients of freedom and external regulation. The more free, and therefore the less regulated, you are, the closer you drift to the absolute point, “freedom.” The less free, and therefore the more regulated, you are, the closer you drift to the absolute point, “external regulation.”

From this approach to freedom and external regulation, we view freedom and external regulation as opposites. They are opposing forces. Their values cancel one another out.

So, some observations: If you truly value freedom, then you must oppose external regulation. To value freedom is to oppose external regulation, just as to value external regulation is to oppose freedom. You cannot be for both of them, as they are opposites. External regulation is the enemy of freedom, and vice-versa.

Now, let's discuss “external regulation” for a moment. “External regulation” occurs whenever I am regulated by something outside of myself. If a gang compels me to pay extortion, that gang would be an external regulator. They would represent something outside of myself that regulates me, compels me. If there was no compulsion, then I would merely be doing what I want to do, and where I'm doing what I want to do, there is no regulation. So, regulation involves compulsion, force. That means “external regulation” is force, or compulsion, or violence, a kind of imposi-

tion. And where there is freedom, this external regulation, this force, compulsion, violence, or imposition is absent.

Another observation: “External regulation” comes from an external regulator. That is, whatever it is that subjects us to regulation is an external regulator. That external regulator works against our freedom. So, where there is an external regulator—imposing its external regulation—there is an absence of freedom, and where there is freedom there is an absence of an external regulator.

If we truly seek freedom, we will seek to rid ourselves of external regulation, which means we must liberate ourselves from external regulators, whatever they are.

In light of these conclusions, we now come to the point: What is the common name we give to external regulators, things that are outside of ourselves that regulate us?

The term we typically use is “government.” Think about it. Whatever it is that is beyond us that subjects us to regulation is governing us. To regulate is to govern. So, anything that is external to ourselves that regulates, that governs us, is a government—however that government behaves, or however it is composed, or whatever structure or forms it manifests as. This means that government is an external regulator, that is, the source of external regulation. So, let’s re-visit that graph:

()-----() *Freedom External Regulation*
(Absence of external regulation) (Absence of freedom)

Since government is the “external regulator,” the source of “external regulation,” we can substitute some words on our graph, like so:

()-----
Freedom
(Absence of external
-----()
External Regulation (Absence of freedom)
regulation/government)

Government, that is, the external regulator, could never be the protector of our liberties, our freedom, the absence of external regulation. Government, by its very nature, governs, regulates, subjects to force and compulsion and violence and imposition. That is what government does. Governments govern. Government is the opposite of freedom. Wherever you have freedom, you have an absence of government. Wherever you have government, you have an absence of freedom.

So, how is it, then, that we can conceive of ourselves as free where we have government, when, in reality, government and its assumed right to rule are a direct threat, an opposing force, an enemy to freedom? Because we have a lie for *everything*.

...Calculating route...

*** **Magical Beans, Part III**

We need government, so whether or not anyone actually has a “right to rule,” and whether or not government is a direct threat and enemy to freedom, our practical reality dictates that we *need* government. We just *need* it.

Some famous dead guys called government a “necessary evil.” Perhaps it is true that we *need* government. Perhaps it is true that we need some of us exercising an imagined right to rule. But it also might be true that we *need* magical beans to produce the bean stalk we can climb to save

the space station. We may *need* government the same way we *need* magical beans, but our need for them won't make either of them any more real. If this right to rule does not originate from anywhere, and if no one actually possesses such a right, then government, which is based on this imagined right to rule doesn't really exist. government is merely a product of fantastical and delusional thinking. Government inhabits the same space in our world as magical beans, faerie dust, and unicorns.

Besides, we don't really *need* government. We don't *need* something that, by its nature, subjects, governs, regulates, subjects to force and compulsion and violence and imposition. Name one thing that can be done by government, by those assuming the "right to rule," that we could not do on our own if left to our devices, something we could not do just as well if not better if government weren't there to do it badly and make us pay for it?

Name just one thing. Yup. Just what I thought.

*** **The Right to Rule, Part IV**

"But the Will of the People," someone will cry. "Democracy is freedom. We get to choose to have a government, and the right to rule is bestowed on the government by The People. The People, that is the source of the right to rule. Democracy is government of the People, by the People, and for the People." That's what someone would say to these people from the future.

Poor, deluded hierarchs. Oops. Sorry.

Let's try to work our way through this argument, unpacking it as we go.

First, let's assume that the general premise of the argument is right, that we each have a right to give away our right to rule ourselves. Let's assume we have the right to choose to have a government rule us. This being the case, for purposes of argument, then I could choose to have a government rule me. But, I would still have no right to give away *your* right to rule yourself. That is, even if I possess the right to choose to be a subject to a government, I cannot make that choice for you too.

It stands to reason that if I cannot enter into a contract that makes you put a roof on someone's house, I certainly cannot act on your behalf in a matter as serious as whether or not you will be subjected for life to a government you didn't choose. So, even if we held a vote and I had a hundred friends, or even a thousand—no, make it a million—who all unanimously voted to relinquish our right to rule ourselves and to accept the rule of a government, the million of us have no right to relinquish your right to rule yourself and to reject this government that we have chosen.

As a consequence, this thing called democracy is not the Will of The People at all. Any system, like that in the US, based upon the results of votes, where the will of the majority is imposed upon even those who do not consent, is not based upon the noble and glorious Will of the People at all; it is based instead upon one group imagining they can choose to relinquish their rights to rule themselves and forcing everyone else to relinquish their rights to rule themselves as well.

The word for this is not *freedom*. The word for this is *tyranny*.

*** **The Right to Rule, Part V**

But, now we have to address the question of whether or not any of us can really relinquish our rights to rule ourselves, whether we *can* consent to be governed. Recall, in the last segment, we accepted, for the purposes of argument, that we can. But is that true? Can we consent to be governed, giving away our own rights to rule ourselves to a government?

This is an important question. In fact, this might be the most important question that we tackle in all of this drivel I've been presenting because, if we can, in fact, consent to be ruled, then the right to rule that government assumes really would have a source, an origin. That means the

right to rule would not be a myth at all, and so neither would government be a myth. But, if we cannot give away our rights to rule ourselves, if we cannot consent to be ruled, then no one has the right to rule, and government is a myth.

So, everything hinges upon the question of whether or not you can *consent* to be *governed*.

*** Consent, Part I

There are two ways you can feel about what a government demands of you. You can either like what the government demands of you, or you can not like it. That is, you can agree or disagree with the demand.

When the government demands something of you and you agree with that demand, then you comply with the demand with your consent. When the government demands something of you and you disagree with that demand, then you comply with the demand without consent, under threat of force or punishment. In the first instance, you are commanded to do what you want to do anyway. In the second instance, you are commanded to do what you do not want to do.

I would suggest to you that in neither possible scenario have we consented to be governed. And here's why: If you are commanded to do what you want to do anyway, as in the first instance, then you have consented but you are not governed. If you are commanded to do what you do not want to do, as in the second instance, then you are governed but there is no consent.

Remember, freedom is the absence of external regulation, an absence of government. Freedom and consent go together. So, where there is consent, there is no government, and where there is government, there is no consent. Let's also not forget what we discussed about external regulation, or government. Government operates through demands, and those demands operate as force, compulsion, violence, or imposition. Where there is force, compulsion, violence, or imposition, there is no consent.

So, where there is consent, where there is already the desire to do what government otherwise demands, there is no demand, no force, no compulsion, no violence, no imposition. So, there is no government. And where there is government, where there is the demand, which is force, or compulsion, or violence, or imposition, there is no consent.

No one can consent to be governed, which is to say, no one can consent to being forced. Even in a crazy scenario where someone says, "I agree to let you force me to do what I don't want to do, and I consent to you forcing me to do what I don't want to do," that consent is still only consent as long as there is voluntary agreement; as soon as there is no longer voluntary agreement, as soon as there is no longer consent, there is force—no matter what the person said.

One cannot give consent to be forced. One cannot give consent to be governed.

*** Laws, Part I

Laws are demands, tools used by government to force people to go along with the program when they cannot be persuaded to go along with the program of their own free will. Laws are tools used by those who assume the right to rule.

Key word: *force*.

Key word: *assume*.

*** Consent, Part II

To give consent to be governed, which is to say, to give consent to be forced, is like giving consent to be raped. Either it's consent, or it's rape.

Either it's consent, or it's force. Either it's consent, or it's being governed.

*** The Right to Rule, Part VI

You can't consent to be governed, that is, to be externally regulated, that is, to be forced, compelled, or imposed upon. If you consent, you aren't being forced and if you are being forced, you do not consent.

This provably being the case, no one can consent to be governed. Since we cannot consent to be governed, we cannot relinquish the right to rule ourselves and give it to someone else to rule us, govern us, subject us to force, compulsion, violence, or imposition. So much for the validity of this right to rule. So much for the validity of government, based on this right to rule.

*** **Necessary**

We *need* government. Government is necessary, even if it is mythological. Even if the right to rule is as real as magical beans and faerie dust and unicorns. The fact is, people are a mess. They need to be told what to do. If we don't have someone telling them what to do, we'll have chaos and mayhem and madness. That's what we will tell these visitors from the future. We'll strip away all the lofty arguments about government making us moral and civilized, about government being more benevolent than gang-bangers and extortionists, and we'll just get down to the real meat and bones of the thing: People are stupid and they do stupid shit. They get in bar fights and have sex with their friends' mates and drive through red lights and dive into fountains. Some of us make pretty self-destructive choices, some worse than others, and if we don't have somebody there to give the orders, everything will soon look about as orderly as three monkeys trying to fuck a rolling football.

That's the real argument, the one that all makes us a little uncomfortable to admit, the one we all know to be true. Right?

So, one of the visitors from the future, having heard us out, will stand up and address us, saying something like this:

"You assert that your fellow humans make terrible choices and are incapable of practical self-management. What you do not recognize is the simple truth that humans, flawed and fallible and prone to terrible decision-making as they are, is not the perfect argument for government at all, but instead the perfect argument against it.

"Would reasonable and rational people seek to concentrate more and more of the world's important decisions into fewer and fewer hands when those hands belong to people who, as you characterize them, get in bar fights and have sex with their friends' mates and run red lights and dive into fountains?"

"If we accept that humans are messy and flawed, is it not reasonable to assume that all humans are messy and flawed, and therefore those who you permit to rule you are themselves fallible and flawed, and prone to just as terrible decision-making as a janitor or a secretary or a plumber? In fact, by virtue of these self-appointed rulers delusionally believing they have some magical, supernatural qualities that make them fit to rule, it may be that their decision-making skills should be put to even greater scrutiny rather than less. "It is a grave error to assume that when you are dealing with humans prone to bad decision-making that, if you concentrate greater power into the hands of fewer people, you will get a better result. Eight thousand years of hierarchical structuring of your society argues against such a conclusion, as the more concentrated power becomes into the hands of fewer and fewer humans, the less organized and less orderly your society becomes. You now experience the very chaos and mayhem and madness that you seek to avoid."

As he or she sat down, the others would roll their eyes and sigh deeply.

Deluded hierarchs. Oops. Sorry.

*** **Necessary, Part II**

I would never assume the right to rule you. I would never assume the right to demand your obedience to my program, or point an Apache attack helicopter at you to compel your compliance. I wouldn't. But there are people who would, and they do. In fact, they spend millions of dollars of other people's money in campaigns to get elected, in pursuit of the power to exercise this imagined right to rule. Then they spend your money to equip their enforcers with Apache attack helicopters that can be used if you do not obey.

Perhaps these people from the future are right. Perhaps those who assume the right to rule cannot be trusted.

Based on this "necessity of government" argument, people cannot be trusted to rule themselves because people are messy. If that's the case, what sense does it make to trust a small group of messy people to make decisions for me, rather than making the decisions for myself when I know my own needs and they don't even care about them?

***** Necessary, Part III**

Notice how, when people make the "necessity of government" argument, they always say government is necessary because these other people—not you and me, of course—are so messed up that they need to be told what to do. Those "other people" are always nebulous, unidentified, unnamed. *Someone else* who cannot be trusted, not you and me.

I think we should give these "others" names. We'll call them Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill. We need government because Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill cannot be trusted. Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill are perfectly incapable of healthy, functional self-management. Without government, Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill would fuck everything up.

You and I would be fine, of course. We're very self-managing. The problem isn't us. We know the laws and rules aren't designed to keep us from acting like idiots because we never act like idiots; the laws and rules are aimed at regulating Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill. We need to keep Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill from acting like idiots.

But here comes the question: When the government passes laws to make bad behavior into *crimes*, does the passage of the law ever stop Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill from engaging in the behavior that the law has made criminal? I don't think it ever has. I think you and I could outlaw every species of bad behavior known to human kind—from cannibalism to sticking your tongue out at your sister on the bus—and, within seconds, despite our reasoned and rational pronouncements and decrees, people all over the world will be engaged in stupid shit we just criminalized, including Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill.

I would venture a bet that at least 20% of the world's population is engaging in stupid shit right now. That's 1.4 billion people. Somewhere, people are bar fighting. Somewhere, people are having sex with their friends' mates. Somewhere, people are running red lights. Somewhere, people are diving head-first right into a fountain.

Because the planet is round, roughly 35% of the world's population is sleeping at any given time, so only 65% of us have the chance to do stupid shit simultaneously—otherwise we would have already gone extinct because of all of the Charlies and Ritas and Sallys and Bills.

There are currently thousands of laws against drugs. Do we still have addicts? There are currently laws against murder in every jurisdiction of government. Do we still have serial killers? There are laws everywhere against stealing. Do we still need to lock our doors?

So, when die-hard hierarchs say we need government in order to keep Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill from doing stupid shit, I assert that Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill are do-

ing stupid shit *right now*. Government hasn't stopped Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill. Laws haven't stopped Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill.

We can write a million laws and prescribe a million punishments for a million crimes, but people will still do as much stupid shit tomorrow as they did today. In fact, the US has more attorneys per capita than anywhere in the world, and has more laws than any other country, and as a consequence has the largest prison population in the history of the world...

and still has the highest crime rate. Provably, more laws, more punishment, and more lawyers equals more crime, not less.

We have more idiots today than ever before. All of these idiots don't come from some secret Idiot Factory hidden away in some remote basement bunker, some Idiot Factory that the government cannot locate, cannot shut down. No, all of these idiots like Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill are the product of government and laws, a failed effort that has failed abysmally and repeatedly and consistently for roughly eight thousand years. Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill are products of government and laws.

We live in the idiot factory.

By my best guess, Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill are running it.

*** **Necessary, Part IV**

As humans, we suppose ourselves to be smarter than squirrels. But, squirrels, like many other animals, have developed a method of living without government. If we were smart and imaginative like squirrels, perhaps we could develop a way to live without government.

*** **The Right to Rule, Part VII**

So, do you accept that Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill have a right to rule you despite the fact that Charlie and Rita

and Sally and Bill have a demonstrable record of ruling themselves badly? Do you accept that they have a right to rule and turn the world into an idiot factory? Do you accept that Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill can rule you better than you can rule yourself, particularly since you know you and they don't? Because this imagined right to rule exercised by Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill is as real as magical beans and faerie dust and unicorns, this thing called government imposed upon you by Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill is really no different than a street gang extorting protection and imposing demands under threats of violence, except that Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill have an Apache attack helicopter. And you paid for it.

*** **Necessary, Part V**

This vagrant holy man from a couple thousand years ago reportedly told people to consider the birds of the air and the lillies of the field as models for ideal life. Then, according to the story, government executed him as a dangerous radical.

Birds of the air live without government.

Lillies of the field live without government.

If only we were as smart and imaginative as birds and flowers, we would live without government and our vagrant holy men wouldn't be executed as dangerous radicals.

The Idiot Factory

Imagine how surprised most of us would be if those people from the future told us, "Because you are chained to a lie— the lie of government legitimacy—you've allowed a small group of

opportunists to enslave all of you and turn your world into an idiot factory. A small group of opportunists continues to engineer a social program where humans are exploited, mismanaged, and abused, prevented from living full and rewarding lives, from ever reaching their full potential and thereby outgrowing any imagined need for government.

Your system purposely and deliberately turns people into idiots because idiots are easier to control, manipulate, and keep dependent. Under this delusion of ‘government legitimacy,’ the vast numbers of you have become slaves to specific opportunists that you yourselves select, who then decide what you hear, what you see, what you know, what you learn, what you think, what you eat, and therefore, how you live. In this way, this small group of selected opportunists, under the guise of a benevolent government, takes the opportunity to hobble all of you with a myth of government necessity, imprisoning all of your minds so that not only are you prevented from escaping the prison they create, but you never even recognize there is anything to escape from.”

In the heavy silence that would follow, one of us would raise a hand.

“But who would pick up the garbage?” Another hand would go up: “And who would print the money?”

And still another: “What about national parks? Who will manage them?”

And still yet another: “Will we have prayer in schools?” “Who will trim the branches from the trees in my yard that are close to the power lines?” “Who’s gonna regulate alcohol licenses?”

Fuckin’ state-worshippers. Oops. Sorry.

*** **Necessary, Part VI**

List all of the life forms in the known world capable of surviving and thriving without this myth of government. There’s a lot of them. Now list all of the life forms that cannot survive and thrive without this myth of government. Makes you feel pretty lonely, doesn’t it?

*** **Gang Activity, Part II**

There’s a gang. They’ve been extorting you, taking your money, imposing their demands on you, threatening you, keeping you dependent on them. If you resist the gang and drive them away, you will be free. You will experience the absence of external regulation. You would be able to rule yourself.

But, at the same time, you wouldn’t be able to rely upon the gang to solve your problems. If you drove off the gang, you certainly couldn’t call them to come pick up your trash or to protect you from delinquent kids in the neighborhood throwing rocks at cars and cutting into your (and their) profit margins. You would have to solve your own problems. You would have to develop responses to trash and delinquent kids throwing rocks.

You would have to go from dependency to independence. From irresponsible to responsible. You would have to find ways to work with others in the same situation as yourself, to cooperatively combine your resources and your skills, solve problems collectively, come up with systems that work for all of you.

Telling the thugs they have no right to rule you is one thing. Living it is another.

*** **Government-less, Part II**

Without “government,” there will be chaos and mayhem and madness. There will be looting and murder, destruction and death. It will be dog eat dog, a struggle of all against all, survival of the fittest. We all know that. At least, we think we do.

But, let me ask: are you going to act crazy if the system collapses? Are you going to go out on a whiskey-guzzling, machete-wielding, molotov-throwing, dog-fucking rampage? Me neither. I suspect I will have much more important priorities than drinking and hacking and burning and

interspecies fornication. I'll be busy surviving. I'll be making sure my friends and family are safe and secure and have basic needs met.

I'm sure you probably feel the same way.

In fact, I've had this conversation a million times. Everyone who has ever spoken with me about this has been certain that chaos and mayhem and madness would occur, but were equally certain that they themselves would not be instigating it.

So, if it isn't you or me or the other million people I talked to who will be drinking and hacking and burning and inter-species fornicating, then who is it?

It must be Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill. You know how they are.

I suspect this manicky-panicky sense of doom we experience when we think about the absence of government comes in part from us not knowing what will happen. It's very unpredictable. There are seven billion people and there is no way to gauge how all seven billion will behave if, suddenly, there is no Apache attack helicopter hovering over their heads. So we assume the worst.

I have to imagine that some people will certainly blow off steam. It might be something like seven billion children jumping on the furniture because mom and dad aren't home... only with guns and cars and alcohol.

Humans are messy. We do stupid shit.

But from a very practical standpoint, seven billion of us could not continue chaos and mayhem and madness for very long even if we were single-mindedly dedicated to it—which, most of us wouldn't be. We could not keep up the drinking and hacking and burning and inter-species fornication for very long because we all need to sleep... and we need to eat... and we need shelter from rain and snow... and we need to feel safe.

There's a limit to the amount of mayhem we can maintain. You also have to figure that we live in a world of limited resources and idiots don't plan ahead. Not planning ahead is part of what makes idiots, well, idiots.

The idiot shooting at random cars from the overpass after government goes away was probably an idiot yesterday and the day before that. Odds are, as an idiot, he didn't stockpile ammunition and while others are foraging ammunition he, as an idiot, is shooting at random cars. He will soon run out of ammunition and when he's hungry, he will have no means to kill a wild boar in order to fuel up on proteins.

His mayhem won't last long.

He will soon sputter out.

A government-less world, contrary to our standard thinking, really would not be a utopia for idiots. In a governmentless world, the socket-lickers will soon lick the right sockets and the sun-gazers will soon scorch their retinas. Without government, the idiot factory would soon grind to a halt. Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill and everyone who does not play well with others will quickly meet their destiny, sometimes under their own ridiculous and silly power, and sometimes with assistance from reasonable people who find Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill to be annoying and dangerous.

Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill will become mulch shortly after government goes away. That really might be the best use for Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill.

You know how they are.

So, I think that dispels the Mad Max apocalyptic future we all imagine, where crazies run everything. That imagined future looks more like the world we currently have now, anyhow. But

it also dispells the other popular misconception about a government-less future—that everyone will be violently competing for very limited resources.

If the idiot factory shuts down and the idiots quickly sputter out as we can reasonably presume that they will, those idiots become lunch for lots of other life forms, both plant and animal. You can expect exploding bird and raccoon and wild boar populations, as well as all the other forms of life that eat birds and raccoons and so on. So, reasonably, in the absence of lots of living idiots, we'll have abandoned spaces reclaimed by wildlife, a community of life that would thrive. There would be no scarcity of resources that would make the human population go bonkers and behave badly. Far from it—there would be food everywhere: swimming in the water, slithering on the ground, running through the woods, flying through the air, falling out of trees, springing from the soil. Plentiful amounts of food. A veritable Eden. In a very short time without “government,” we would have an absence of idiots and an abundance of resources. Who would pick up the trash? I think we'll probably put our heads together and figure it out.

*** **Government-less, Part III**

I try to imagine what this place called Ohio would look like in a government-less world, in a world where we finally recognize that the right to rule is a myth and we stop submitting to thugs who call themselves government, who extort from us and force us to live butchered half-lives under their imposed program.

I suspect in a government-less Ohio, most people would live in small communities where they feel safe and accepted and valued, small communities where they share the same worldviews and values of the people they are with. I suspect people in these small, self-managing communities would work together because cooperation fosters survival much better than competition and conflict. I believe this struggle for continued survival would force people to develop very deep, intimate, meaningful connections with other people— connections many of us currently lack.

I'm no utopian. I don't believe people are better than they really are. I know we frequently do stupid shit. So, I have no doubt that many people will want to do things in ways that prove unsuccessful, and it's possible that their failures will be fatal. So, some people, left to their devices will sputter out and get re-cycled.

That's how the world works, you know.

Perhaps at the beginning, in the absence of government, most people will attempt some variation of farming, of mass agriculture. They may hold onto material goods in hopes of someday using them again. Lots of shoes and electrical appliances. At some point, they will recognize that if they just do nothing at all, plant life will grow all around them anyway. At that point, I think lots of people will begin foraging, which will prove far more effective than farming. So, they will abandon sedentary life for semi-nomadic life, which is far more effective for foragers—making it so that they will not burn out any one particular spot.

These semi-nomadic foragers will quickly abandon the shoes and the electrical appliances they no longer feel like lugging around. It isn't that they have some kind of noble savage character, they just won't want to carry all that useless shit. They'll keep around some useful stuff, of course, like a good knife and some rope and maybe a few rolls of duct tape from that previous world.

These people will have a different concept of community and a different relationship to the life that surrounds them. They won't live “close to nature,” whatever that means. They will live in it, be part of it, immerse themselves in it, be a product of it.

I suspect Ohioans after government will end up looking a lot like Ohioans before government. The future will look a lot like the past. I imagine it will be quite beautiful.

I wonder what Tecumseh would think about this?

*** **Convergences, Part II**

Isn't it funny how this started with Native Americans and at the end of this, if we're lucky and wise, we'll be looking to them as our role models?

We can reject this magical bean thinking, this right to rule mythology, and we can recognize that government never had any validity at all, or else we can hold onto this lie like a lunatic gripping the hot end of a curling iron and reap the inevitable consequences.

It's up to us. Either way...

*** **Convergences, Part III**

"Unsustainable" means it can't keep going. Our current order is unsustainable. The Titanic was unsustainable as an oceangoing vessel after it hit that iceberg. The Hindenberg was unsustainable as an aircraft after it caught on fire. Our culture has hit an iceberg. It has caught on fire. It is unsustainable.

People watched Al Gore's movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, and came to the conclusion that we may have to save the planet (from ourselves). To save the planet (from ourselves) we will have to recycle our bottles.

But, the problem with our culture isn't our drinking utensils. The problem with our culture is that it is built on fundamental untruths and that we continue acting upon those untruths. We have to stop doing that.

Our culture has hit an iceberg. It has caught on fire. It is unsustainable. We are quickly approaching the point where the natural world is going to demonstrate to us that our culture is unsustainable, that it can't keep going. The natural world is going to mount a counter-attack—and, in fact, has already started—the way that an immune system will attack a foreign infection.

We can get ready to live another way, or we can pretend not to see the reality on the ground. Either way...

*** **Convergences, Part IV**

When I originally wrote this back in 2012, this is the segment that occupied this space:

The Occupy Movement isn't over. The occupation was just a beginning. When all of those people converged upon public spaces in a collective protest, they weren't simply expressing their anger at the existing system; they were practicing a new way of doing things. It might look like the Occupy Movement ended. It might appear that everyone went back to their assigned seats. Don't be fooled.

The people who participated in the Occupy Movement had a different experience of life. They tasted a moment of freedom, the absence of external regulation.

Occupy built something permanent, whether we see it or not. They built a tunnel, a way to break out, to escape this prison built around our minds.

We can soon participate in the biggest prison break in history.

It's already started. It can't be stopped. The cat is out of the bag.

That's what I wrote five years ago. Since then, friends created a website, seanswain.org where my writings are located. I was included in the Final Straw radio show with a weekly segment, syndicated and broadcast globally. Recently, a publisher agreed to publish one of my book-length works. During that same time, I was ideologically targeted by the government for having better ideas than they have, and I was tortured. I was sent to the super-duper-max prison. I now have 1297 pages of FBI files that I know about, probably more that I don't.

And still, this dropped into your lap.

It could be that these ideas are old news by the time you read them. It could be that you will say, “That silly period at the start of the twenty-first century... what were they thinking?” But, I hope not. I hope that if I got tortured for having such dangerous ideas, that you will have the chance to appreciate them, that these dangerous ideas will awaken you and others.

When I dream of revenge, it looks a lot like you... and you... and you...

*** **Necessary, Part VII**

We need government. Well, maybe there are others who need government, others like Charlie and Rita and Sally and Bill, whoever they are. I only need government to do one thing— Go away. For good.

I hope there are others out there like me who feel the same way. Perhaps we can work together and get free once and for all. Free, as in “the absence of external regulation.” Perhaps all we need now is a plan. Perhaps we can succeed where Tecumseh initially failed if only we have a plan.

*** **Back to Ohio**

For me, it all comes back to Ohio. It started here in one sense, so it should end here. And I have my own ulterior motive. As long as this State of Ohio exists, as long as it continues to function, I will remain its captive. For me to be free, this State of Ohio must cease to exist.

I think of my parents. I think of my children, never born, their lives foreclosed upon by The State of Ohio, and by the captivity to which it subjects me. For my children, yet unborn, to live, this so-called State of Ohio must die. I realize the gravity of what I’m writing. I don’t take it lightly. It isn’t a confrontation that I have chosen, but one thrust upon me by The State of Ohio. The State of Ohio is unreasonable, irrational, and uncompromising. It leaves me no alternative but to find some way to bring it down completely. I can’t do it alone. I’ll need help. A veritable *army*.

Lucky for us, we can build that.

PART IV: Tipping Things Over

A Brief Recapitulation

A lot has happened since the writing of the preceding parts. Some years have passed—pretty eventful ones. I’ve started this section of the book several times; most recently, prior to this, at Ohio’s super-duper-max. It was my second stint at the super-duper-max since writing the preceding sections... and then getting tortured for my ideology... and getting designated a terrorist. But then all of my property, including my writings, disappeared when unnamed agents in military uniforms and with no identification shackled and chained me up at 4 in the morning, tossed me into a van and drove me, without explanation, to a Virginia prison.

This is the only part of *Ohio* written from Virginia. I’m too dangerous for Ohio, it seems. Go figure.

More on that later. A lot more. If they don’t kill me. So, I start this part over, yet again. And given the long span of time since the first three parts were written, it might be a good idea for you, the reader, and for me, the writer, if we re-cap what has already been written. I have, after all, experienced significant head trauma at the hands of Ohio officials. So, here goes:

In Part I we covered the origins of this thing we call, The State of Ohio, how it came about as a consequence of illegitimate invasion, colonization, conquest, and butchery. Of course, as the contextual presentations made pretty clear, I think, the *settlement* of Ohio was not in any way unique or unusual as far as states go. The whole US was *settled* the same way. In fact, every single nation-state was founded upon genocide and extermination. So, you see where I’ve been going with all this, right? *Ohio* isn’t just about Ohio.

If I did a decent job, you finished reading Part I and came to the reasonable conclusion that this so-called State of Ohio is a complete fraud with no legitimate authority, a sham, a swindle. And that takes us to Part II.

In Part II we slogged through contract law, how states are corporations, and how corporations come into existence under the euroamerican conception of law. Corporations originate from their charters, which, in the case of states, are constitutions. Those documents are contracts and, if you never signed them, if you never agreed to their terms, you are not bound to them. No so-called state has any claim to your allegiance or to your obedience.

Thus, if (even after the fantastic and extraordinary arguments presented in Part I) we accept the legitimacy of the so-called State of Ohio, we must conclude from Part II that Ohio, if it ever were legitimate, is a dead corporation, one that died when its last signatory subject from 1853 sputtered out. Since no one renewed the charter, since neither you nor I signed a contract to keep Ohio in existence, and since no one can sign for us, and since we cannot be thought to have relinquished our rights without our consent, we are not subjects of this dead corporation if it ever existed in the first place.

Just like with Part I, the arguments I made in Part II really apply to every government everywhere, to every nationstate that ever existed. By the end of Part II, I was really feeling like I was doing something. I was pretty proud of myself.

Then, in Part III, we addressed the question of authority itself, whether the right to rule (and the corresponding duty to obey) really exists at all, whether there is a rational basis for anyone to ever assume a right to rule. If you accept this final argument for Ohio's illegitimacy—and I hope you do— then you can only reasonably conclude that no human being has a right to rule another and that no human being owes another a duty to obey. That would mean this thing calling itself The State of Ohio—and, really, any government anywhere—has no right to exist. It would mean that any effort by any so-called government anywhere to impose itself upon any of us is a swindle, a sham, a fraud, committed by usurpers robbing us of our autonomy, reducing us to being subjects, to being slaves.

I hope that by the end of Part III you felt like running into the street and tipping over a cop car. But, instead of running into the street and tipping over a cop car, why don't we instead walk out into the street and tip them all? All of them.

Taking Down *What???*

I know. I lost some folks right there. Understandably so. Lots of people are afraid of confronting the power structure, whether they want to admit it or not. They might want to read about it, or talk about it with close friends, or troll about it anonymously online. But they really have no intention of trying to topple anything.

Then, another contingent of folks are fairly comfortable... perhaps not exactly happy, but happy enough that they don't want to wipe out the entire power structure existing in our world and face some great unknown. For them, the misery we experience is better than the misery we don't know.

Others are comfortable with their identities as rebels against the system and cannot conceive of a world without it.

Still others imagine the effort it will take to bring down the existing system, the sweat and blood and fire. They know this system will never go down without a fight. They don't really want to put sweat and blood and fire into the struggle.

Another faction, probably the largest, includes those who really don't believe anything can happen. They imagine the system to be ten feet tall and bullet-proof. Made of kryptonite. They conceive of the system as having always existed, and they imagine that it always will. For them, resistance— with the goal of trying to topple an un-topple-able system— is really futile, but they like hanging out with others who wave fists and talk about doing more.

The good news is, we don't need any of them. We don't need a majority or even a sizeable minority. In fact, we're better off with small numbers of seriously dedicated resistance fighters, rebels who truly believe that toppling the system is not just possible, but is, on a long enough trajectory, inevitable.

Fuck numbers. Radical change never came about through majorities or mass movements. Radical change is always the consequence of radical action by small groups or individuals.

So, every reader who just said, "Take down *what?*," and then set the book down? I'm glad.

I didn't write this for them. I wrote this for *you*.

No Other Option

We have to take the entire system down. We have no other option.

Consider: If we understand that we are slaves, that we are subjugated by enemies robbing us of our own power, that we can only be truly free if that power is restored to us, and that those who have stolen our power will never give it back voluntarily or peacefully, then we come to conclude that the only real option is a kind of total war until we are free—and that means bringing the system down completely.

To approach it another way, ask yourself at what point, short of bringing down the whole system, can you stop resisting? How much of your enemy's power system can you leave intact without that remnant of the old system posing a threat to you and your freedom? To resist and to stop short of toppling the entire system would be like cleansing a pool by draining out most of the water. Why would you do that? To cleanse the pool, you must drain out every drop of water. Anything less, you accomplish nothing.

For me, it is very simple. I seek freedom. And I know that, to be free, to be truly free, I must experience life without the Apache attack helicopter looming on my horizon, even in the distance. If it's there, it's a threat and I am not free; I am only temporarily not in the crosshairs.

I am reminded of the words of a Jewish vagrant radical who himself became a target of assassination from the state officials of his own time. He urged his followers not to leave even "one stone upon another." He recognized the need to raze the entire system to the ground.

I'm reminded also of the words of Bob Dylan who addressed himself to this system as if it were a living thing:

And I hope that you die and your death will come soon I'll follow your casket in that pale afternoon and I'll watch as you're lowered into your death bed and I'll stand over your grave until I'm sure that you're dead...

We're talking some serious vigilance. I'm down with that. I hope you are too. There's no other option.

The Audacity of Total Abolition

To be clear, I'm not talking about taking down a government or bringing down an economy. I'm talking about taking down *all* governments and bringing down the *global* economy. The whole thing. I'm not just suggesting that it's possible, but that I have in mind a kind of strategy that would accomplish this bold and ambitious goal, and I'm inviting you to join me in carrying it out.

I know. It sounds crazy. I don't expect you to believe me. I just expect you to keep reading and giving me the benefit of the doubt until I stop making rational sense. Once I stop making rational sense, put the book down and feel free to reconcile yourself to the conditions of slavery to which you are subjected.

But, before I share with you my approach to compiling a strategy for bringing down swivelization, let me first share with you my approach to my approach. What I mean is, there are some premises that are underlying my approach, and you have a right to know what they are. So, here are some of the premises relevant to my approach, in no particular order: **premise:** What goes

up, must come down. Anything that can be built can be destroyed. The bigger it is, the harder it falls.

premise: I'm not alone.

I guess it's no mystery that I'm something of an unhappy camper. I don't like this system. I want freedom and this system offers no real freedom. But, in a human population of over seven billion, I have to suspect I'm not alone. I have to imagine there are others just as dissatisfied with swivelization as I am.

premise: Two heads are better than one, even if one of them is made out of cabbage. We increase our chances of success by working together, whatever our personal flaws or incapacities. Struggling together is better than struggling separately.

premise: To bring down the entire global system, you must dedicate yourself to bringing down the entire global system. What I mean is, if you really want to topple the entire swivelization program, you can't do it by aiming at something else. You can't, for instance, struggle for some other cause and bring down swivelization as a kind of accidental afterthought. If you want to bring down swivelization, you must focus completely on the question of how to bring down swivelization. You can't get the right answer to a question you're not asking. ***premise:*** There's no one right way to do this. There's no single method for effective resistance. So, anything truly effective must present the widest varieties of strategies that can ambush the program in thousands of creative ways. I suspect that if someone would propose some singular approach for taking down the system, it would be an abysmal failure.

If we employ the widest variety of effective strategies of resistance and thereby attract the widest variety of rebels, then the collective impact will be greater and far more overwhelming to the system, which is very regimented and slow to adapt. ***premise:*** It doesn't take a rocket scientist to tear apart a rocket; it doesn't take a brain surgeon to scramble a brain. It may seem quite arrogant that someone proposes to know how to bring down the whole swivelization program. But, it's not, really. I don't think I possess any special knowledge that anyone else cannot gather. I don't think my experiences are any more significant than anyone else's. One luxury that I have had, a luxury many do not have, is a lot of free time to ponder the question of how to take the entire system down. To do what I'm aspiring to do, you must be the right combination of smart and stupid. You have to be smart enough to synthesize many effective strategies and avoid those that would prove ineffective, and have the brains to articulate all of that in a way that makes coherent sense and inspires people.

At the same time, you have to be stupid enough to broadly share such ideas, which makes you a target of hierarch control-freaks everywhere. You become hated and despised by every government and profiteer in the universe, who no doubt will use their power to try to crush you.

If I'm successful in this endeavor, it's only because I'm the right combination of smart and stupid, which is probably a common characteristic shared by millions of humans, many of whom would be better at this than I am. I hope you're one of them. And I hope you use what I'm presenting as a beginning.

premise: Enough is enough.

I don't have to come up with a perfect plan. It just has to be good enough. There really is no way to develop a perfect plan because so much is unknown. There are lots of moving parts and lots of variables, and no way to know just exactly what responses will occur in what order and to what effect. So, really, the most anyone can do is brainstorm a kind of laundry list of strategies and propose how those strategies might work, laying the groundwork for maybe getting the ball rolling. Then, from there, it's a matter of adapting and adjusting in real time to the events that unfold.

So, again, the plan must only be Good Enough. If this plan doesn't meet that threshold, feel free to fix it.

premise: If you build it, they will come.

Resistance is a lot like the Field of Dreams. If you make the call-out, rebels will respond. This was demonstrated by the example of the Army of the 12 Monkeys, which tore apart Mansfield Correctional in Ohio in 2012. The 12 Monkeys did nothing special: they floated flyers by the thousands all over the prison compound, a call-out for sabotage and disruption. Prisoners responded and tore the prison apart.

News flash: Wherever there are prisons, the prisoners want to tear the prison apart.

News flash: Swivelization is a prison.

So, if we build it, they will come. If we present the call-out and provide the framework for how to proceed, rebels will respond. The rebellion will continue and attract broader participation and reach a critical threshold, and from there it's simply a matter of the program unraveling.

So, those are some of my premises, my approach to an approach.

To Abolish Anything, Start Anywhere

I think probably that if you really apply analytical thinking to the problem of creating cataclysmic systems failure for the swivelization program, much of the solution readily presents itself. So, we just have to agree on where to meet.

I realize that all resistance is local, that rebels everywhere are far more invested in resistance in the geographic spaces with which they identify; they have much deeper connections with resistance that seeks liberation of their own stomping-grounds. But, as a practical matter, I propose that this widely-distributed local resistance diminishes our collective power. That is, if you are resisting in Spokane and I'm resisting in Cleveland, and friends of ours are resisting in Miami and Atlanta and Detroit, all of our instances of resistance can be met with the full force of local and state authorities. We can be easily neutralized because, as dispersed as we are, nowhere do we overwhelm the system.

I would suggest that what we need is a convergence point, an area on the map where all of our resistance can collectively focus, where we can all descend together like a biblical swarm of locusts and overwhelm the local system. Our goal in converging there is to cause massive disruption, not just to that locale but to the larger system, creating a blockage, a hole in the productive,

distributive, and consumptive processes—a hole with much wider ripple effects, potentially crippling the swivelization program and sending it into a panicking, hysterical tailspin from which it cannot recover.

That point where we all converge would really be just about anywhere. We could probably spin the globe and plop down an index finger and, so long as it doesn't land in the middle of the ocean, announce the location of our convergence point.

We could. But that would hardly be optimum. To get the maximum damage from our attack, it would make sense not to pick the location at random. Instead, we should apply some analytical thinking and develop a list of possible locations, those that have specific and particular importance to the swivelization program.

There are lots of them. There are numerous nations that have regions or cities that arguably play integral roles in keeping the swivelization machine rolling. Still more regions or cities have symbolic importance. We could converge on Moscow or Athens, for instance. Both are central fixtures to the global economic and political systems. Or, we could converge on Paris or Rome, which have important symbolic value.

But the name of this book is not Moscow or Athens, Paris or Rome. The name of this book is *Ohio*. I think you probably see where I'm heading with this.

Why Ohio, Part I

It seems to me that if we want to take down the swivelization program, and if we want to do it by converging upon a critical point, we need to identify the nation-state or nationstates that are most essential to the program's continuation.

In that regard, there are a few nation-states that are economic engines for the global economy. A few nation-states are military superpowers. In their spheres of influence, there are a handful of nation-states that are cultural centers, influencers of custom and fashion and so on.

Very few nation-states are all three of those. Very few are economic, military, and cultural powers. Of those, I would suggest that the US is the main one.

Economically, the US is the engine of the global program. As the US goes, so goes the world. Several of the last recessions began and ended with the US, as the US economy is so tied into everyone else's. The US is a major food producer in the world, as the American Midwest is a leading producer of corn and wheat and potatoes for the world. This alone ties the US directly and indirectly into the economies of dozens of other nation-states.

Militarily, the US overshadows the nations of the world. It spends more on the military than the next dozen or more nations combined. The US is prepared to fight a multi-front war against seventeen or more adversaries. This ridiculous buildup and saber-rattle mentality makes the US influential by virtue of threat and coercion.

On top of that, many of the current consumer trends find their inception in the US, from music and the arts to fashion and technology. Consumerism is the religion of the US, and culture drives consumption. So, in this way, the US is a triplethreat. It is difficult to make an argument that any other nation is more significant to the current swivelization program than the US. I think that's a pretty objective assessment.

Geographically, the US takes up a big chunk of space. Probably only Russia and China have comparable inhabited land. Also, the population size is probably in the top three. So, if we dis-

rupt the production-distribution-consumption process of the US, we disrupt the global (dis)order. Given this exigency, I would suggest that if you want to abolish everything, and if you want to do it by concentrating on a single point, then you want to focus your energies on a point inside the US.

An observation: This thing calling itself the State of Ohio is inside the US. As I previously said, you probably see where I'm going with this.

No Other Option, Part II

If the arguments presented in the first three parts of this book don't convince you we need to take down the entire hierarch delusion, there may not be any help for you. You might just be beyond repair. Lots of people are. But, let me give this one more try...

If we don't take down swivelization, we're all going to die. There is no future unless we act, and act quickly.

You see, eight thousand years ago, we settled and grew crops. We call it the Agricultural Revolution. We think of it as the beginning of our history. We feel pretty good about it. This began our ability to mass-produce food. Rather than hunting and gathering, we collectively turned our planet into a factory. It mass produces food.

Everything is made out of food. More food equals more population, so when we began mass-producing food, we also began mass-producing humans. Our recourse to mass production of food caused a radical explosion of the human population. Our mass production of food created a runaway train of population growth. We quickly spread everywhere, then over-populated, then crossed oceans and planted more food and over-populated. It's what we do. We eat pizza, we create genital friction, and bam—a new generation of pizzaeating, fornicating humans.

When we lived as semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers, our population doubled about every nineteen thousand years. We now face the prospect of doubling our population in less than twenty years. As tribal people, our population increased slowly, at a glacial pace. Now we are increasing our population crazy fast. Our doubling gets faster and faster as the population gets bigger and bigger.

If we had not settled and grown crops eight thousand years ago and instead remained content with tribal life, the human population today would be somewhere between one hundred million and two hundred million people.

Not seven to eight billion.

If we had not gone to mass-producing food, we'd have a fraction of our population. Lots of elbow room.

That means lots of land base without humans on it, lots of healthy forests and jungles and plains. That also means healthy, unpolluted air. Healthy oceans with coral everywhere producing oxygen and providing a living environment for aquatic life. The human population would be small enough that it would not leave much of a footprint; the natural world could easily heal and rejuvenate after humans passed through.

It would be Eden. Paradise. Life thriving everywhere.

But, that's not what we have. What we have is a population of seven billion people, ever-expanding and mass-producing food. We have an overtaxed land base that cannot replenish itself; toxic air, toxic soil, toxic water. We have a tattered ozone. We have something like 124 species

of life each day pushed out of existence forever, extinct, never to come back, as a consequence of our monopolization of limited land and resources at the expense of other living things. The word is “unsustainable.” “Unsustainable” means, “You can’t keep living like that.” It means, “That doesn’t work for very long.”

At the heart of swivelization is the mass production of food, which is the engine of population growth. Our population growth is killing our world and is therefore killing us. Swivelization is a mass-production machine that is simultaneously a mass-DEstruction machine.

You must extract and kill and expand and destroy in order to mass produce. So, our culture, one based upon massproduction of food, is a weapon of mass destruction. We are devastating the world and we are on the path of eventual selfdestruction.

This death machine requires the hierarch program to maintain itself. It is a global complex of production-distribution-consumption that must be centrally regulated and controlled. So, if we seek to take down the death machine, if we seek to project our existence long into the future, to facilitate our own survival and to preserve life on the planet, then we have to take down the hierarch program upon which swivel- ization is vitally and inextricably dependent.

If we don’t, our continued expansion is going to further outstrip and scorch our world, our land base, our ecosystem, and then we are going to exterminate all life on this planet— including us.

Swivelization is a Kool Aid cult.

So, what I’m suggesting is that what confronts us is more than a principled dilemma regarding freedom, more than just a theoretical and philosophical imperative as presented in the first three parts of this book. What’s really confronting us is a matter of life and death. What I’m saying is that what we’re up against is more than a matter of freedom and nonfreedom, more than something that skeptics and trolls can reduce to a mere lifestyle choice. It’s a question of whether or not we’re going to save the world. No. Really.

So, what I’m presenting is my vision for how we might collectively save the world. I hope that got your attention. If it didn’t, I don’t know what will.

Why Ohio, Part II

Historically, The State of Ohio was the beginning of the US as we know the nation today. It was the launching point for westward expansion and for an idea that became The United States.

Before the encroachment into Ohio, there were thirteen colonies. Those thirteen colonies lay east of the Allegheny Mountains. Now, this invasion of the territories had been absolutely and without question an act of genocide, a crime against humanity but, by all indications, under British rule there were no plans to continue expansion westward. In fact, British settlement had occurred and the dust had settled and the situation, as unjust as it was, had somewhat normalized.

Before Ohio.

Independence of the colonies soon claimed justification from Manifest Destiny, an idea that westward expansion was a kind of historical and swivelizational duty. The expansion into Ohio began a new era, a new phase in the growth from a colony to a superpower.

The US, as we know it, as an idea, would not have existed if not for the expansion into Ohio. Ohio was the launching point, the gateway westward and the gateway to imperial destiny. Without the expansion into Ohio and beyond, the US would never have become an economic power-

house, the center of gravity to the global economy; it never would have become a military and cultural power. It would have remained an agricultural backwater, the butt of jokes told in other liberated colonies with more significance and influence, like Haiti or Cuba.

Historically, Ohio became the site of major resistance. Resistance certainly happened in the thirteen colonies, but in Ohio, invaders faced a federation of tribes. Tecumseh had convinced tribes from other locales that they too had a vested interest in defending against the invasion of what we now call Ohio, and he gathered those tribes in an organized resistance against the colonizer, using the colonizer's own fighting forms.

The defeat of this resistance opened the door to further westward invasion and the creation of the mythology of the US. So, to converge upon Ohio is in a sense to revisit that historical moment, to reconstitute resistance to invasion and colonization and empire, to embody the spirit of Tecumseh. If successful, we would be un-doing the events at the origin of the American empire, driving a stake through its heart, sending irrevocable ripples throughout the sprawling empire and the larger swivelization program for which the US is crucial, opening spaces of resistance elsewhere as the whole thing unravels and decays.

Ohio is, after all, the Heart of It All. Just look at the signs.

No Other Option, Part III

Our population is now radically outstripping the planet's ability to renew itself. We have in excess of seven billion people—which is 6.8 billion more than we would have under semi-nomadic hunting and gathering. Where are we going to cram the *next* few billion people? What are we going to slash and burn and destroy in order to plant more food? And what do we do when we finally begin killing the life forms that are essential to our own survival—assuming we haven't already started doing that?

We can resist or die.

We don't have time to begin a global education program and build consensus and draw up plans for a population draw-down, however that would look.

We need to resist. We have no other option. And I suggest that if we are going to resist, we need to do it in a way that we can win, and winning means bringing the swivelization program down. We don't need to resist in some symbolic way, by methods that are all about letting us feel good because we are on the moral side, opposing this impending global disaster. Symbolic resistance doesn't save anything. We need to think about and talk about and work toward developing a blueprint, a framework of resistance that can be implemented and reproduced and improved upon, a framework of resistance for attacking and crippling and bringing down the swivelization program.

Why Ohio, Part III

What I'm proposing, if I were to suggest employing it anywhere other than Ohio, might constitute "terrorism." At least, according to the definition for "terrorism" used by those who assume the right to rule, the hierarchs who operate the death machine driving all of us, willingly or otherwise, to omnicide (the death of everything). If I proposed converging anywhere other than Ohio, those who assume the right to rule might just charge me with terrorism.

Somehow, the definition of terrorism has changed. It used to be that terrorism was any effort to instill terror upon a population, a people. But, at some point, the word came to mean any effort to instill terror upon a government, or upon those in power. So, “terrorism,” really, is when those without any power say or do anything that those in power can allege to be threatening or disturbing or even annoying.

For the powerless to annoy the powerful is to cause a momentary disruption and, therefore, they say it constitutes terrorism. Believe me. I know what it is to be a terrorist. I have 4,000-plus pages of FBI files and I have never so much as stepped on worms on the sidewalk after it rained.

At any rate, it matters not how terrorism is redefined and then re-redefined. Ohio is special. We can propose converging there. We can plan to disrupt and destroy the hierarch program in Ohio. I can openly share with you my vision for bringing it down, and urge you to employ my ideas, and we can collaborate and conspire to make it happen.

The reason is, Article I, Section 2 of the Ohio Constitution. That section sets forth the right of the people to “abolish the government” whenever they may “deem it necessary.” That means that Ohio, in its charter, its constitution, provides for the right to abolish the government that is formed by that constitution.

I’m a person. So are you. Together, we are people. I deem it necessary to abolish the government. I hope you do too. If so, then it is time for us to exercise our rights under the Ohio constitution and abolish the government of Ohio. Not only does it permit us to abolish the government, it seemingly invites us to do it. It talked about it and described it centuries before you or I ever thought about it.

How cool is that?

Now, please don’t get it twisted. Don’t get to thinking I have become some poor, deluded hierarch, that I have some crazy idea that constitutions are valid or legitimate. I know that they are not. The Ohio Constitution is not worth the paper it’s printed on. Ohio is not a state, not a real thing with any real authority, and every pronouncement it has ever made is as real as magical beans or faerie dust. But, having said that, the delusional hierarchs that run everything do, in fact, put a lot of stock in their ridiculous constitutions and charters, and they derive their sense of their own legitimacy from these silly things. So, to the extent that they derive their own power from this ancient, archaic, worthless document, they can’t very well ignore it.

They can’t very well shove a black bag over my head and fly me off to Guantanamo Bay with electrodes on my testicles just because I managed to get this manuscript to a publisher and the publisher got it into your hands and now we are that much closer to effectively taking down the whole swiveliza- tion program by focusing on the destruction of Ohio.

Then again, if nobody has heard from me lately, please call my attorney.

The Audacity of Total Abolition, Part II

What makes anyone think that a system as vast and complex as this one can even be brought down? Good question.

Let’s start here: I’m not suggesting that I can design a system as vast and complex as this, or that I can run it or maintain it. I think it would take battalions of brilliant engineers with big, big brains, piling on a generation of ideas atop the last generation’s ideas for centuries in order to create this. I can’t do that. But, quite frankly, any fuckin’ idiot can break it.

An analogy: computers are complex machines with complex workings. A monkey cannot design a computer or effectively use or maintain or improve upon it. But, a monkey can smash it. We don't have to be brilliant engineers to tear down something complex. We just have to be as brilliant as a monkey with a rock.

If you can shriek and fling poop, you're qualified.

Together, we can break something. And save the world.

Political Violence, Part I

It's time, I think, to address the proverbial elephant in the room...

Any mobilization that attracts liberal, privileged whites seems to inevitably draw in a whole pile of pacifists. Not only does the involvement of liberal, privileged whites bring with it the pacifists, but quite often it brings the absolutely worst variety of pacifists: the exclusivist ones, the ones who insist that everyone else in The Cause, whatever it is, also maintain perfect nonviolence. These exclusivist pacifists demand that all others abandon the calls of their own respective consciences and, instead, follow the conscience of the pacifists. These are not live-and-let-live pacifists, or, more accurately, live-and-let-kill pacifists. They are, rather, the brand of pacifist that impose their own morality upon everyone else, regardless of whether those others believe.

These largely liberal privileged whites with their exclusive pacifism usually believe they can dictate terms to everyone. Usually, they're right, because pacifists constitute *numbers*. Most often, without the pacifists and their *numbers*, rebel forces at any protest or event are somewhat marginal. So, in order to muster significant *numbers*, everyone else capitulates to the exclusivist pacifists. In this way, liberal privileged whites of the exclusivist nonviolence variety hold the worldwide rebellion hostage: their way or the highway.

It becomes a kind of catch-22. In order to have enough numbers to succeed, whatever that means in any given scenario, a rebel event must adopt at least the rhetoric of perfect nonviolence. But, by adopting perfect nonviolence, the rebellion dooms itself to the predictable, foreseeable failure that nonviolence always produces. Because despite the glorious, embellished, totally ahistorical claims of nonviolence apologists, nonviolence has never worked as advertised. Every challenge to the existing disorder that adopts exclusivist nonviolence is doomed to fail.

So, just to be clear, what I'm proposing is *not* that kind of party. If you're a pacifist of the variety that requires everyone else to maintain your ideal of nonviolence, don't show up. You're not invited.

We don't want you and we don't need you.

If you're not down personally with violence for whatever reason, that's okay. We've got plenty of activities that do not require violence. In fact, even those employing violence will spend most of their time engaged in nonviolent activity. But, there will *be* violence. It will be necessary. And, with any luck, it will be swift and successful where exclusivist nonviolence has always failed, and will bring about a world where less violence exists.

To repeat, if you have a problem with violence, stay home. We don't need *numbers*.

Why Ohio, Part IV

Check out a map of the US. You've got the east coast ports, in cities like Boston and New York, that bring in millions of tons of consumer goods and material. Most of that stuff gets sent westward—by truck, by air, by rail, maybe by water if it gets shipped into the Great Lakes. If the stuff is sent west by truck, it travels through Ohio. If it goes by rail, it travels through Ohio. If it goes by ship, it most likely reaches port in Ohio. Then, of course, there are multiple international airports in Ohio for the air transport of products and material. And everything coming into ports on the west coast and getting transported east will flow through Ohio (if it gets that far).

Imagine for a moment that Ohio disappeared. Maybe it was hit by a meteor or perhaps aliens put a giant plexiglass dome over it. Whatever. If Ohio were gone, how would you transport goods and materials across the country? All high-way transportation would have to take a cumbersome and indirect route through Kentucky, where, due to the new volume of traffic, everything would bottleneck and grind to a halt. Highway traffic could not very well go north of Ohio, as everything would drop right into Lake Erie before getting to Michigan. Boat traffic to Detroit would then resume, as would highway traffic across Michigan, and bottleneck in Gary, Indiana—not a pleasant place to bottleneck.

Rail traffic would be done without Ohio. Detours south would be a nightmare. It would be easier to load freight onto a covered wagon and travel like the Donner Party (prior to the snow storm).

My point is, transport is one of the top five industries in Ohio. Everything criss-crossing the country as material for production purposes or as consumer goods passes through Ohio coming from somewhere and going somewhere else. Take Ohio out of the equation and you've got chaos, mayhem, bedlam, madness—you've got productive and distributive processes suffering starts and stops in the milder scenario, or just plain grinding to a halt in the most dramatic scenario. The ripple effects would be devastating.

Welcome to Ohio. The Heart of It All.

Political Violence, Part II

I have not always been a vocal advocate of political violence. I once ascribed to nonviolence, and was a big fan of Gandhi. I read everything about him, was familiar with his *swaraj* and *satyagraha* campaigns. I read and studied Gene Sharpe's *Politics of Nonviolent Action*. I had diligently highlighted copies of all three volumes. In 2002, Rosa Parks herself personally nominated me for recognition for my peace work in prison. No kidding. I still have a copy of the certificate she sent to me.

I probably would have remained a pacifist of the white privileged variety if not for one event that changed everything for me: In 2012, Ohio prison officials tortured me for my beliefs.

The year before, friends had relaunched a website, seanswain.org, that featured my writings and a presentation of my criminal case and how I got railroaded. Soon after relaunch, prison officials were secretly *investigating* the site. The word *investigating* is a kind of euphemism for prison officials seeking an underhanded and sneaky way to punish and torment me and others they believed were responsible for publicly exposing and embarrassing them. In a little less than a year, in September 2012, prison officials (in their words) “ideologically profiled” me, and deter-

mined that my thoughtful critique online of the prison system's JPay policy made me a match for hooligans who tore up a prison. Therefore, my thought crimes in having critical opinions about prison officials' corruption and ineptitude made me a match with those who broke rules, and I was therefore responsible for the misconduct they committed. I was not just a member of their "anarchist group," I was their leader. The leader. Of a group that rejects leaders. Based on an ideology that expressly rejects leaders.

Then I was tortured.

The FBI was on site. According to the prison system's lawyer who supervised every aspect of the torture program, Trevor Matthew Clark, the FBI was behind the scenes giving the orders. Of course, this is the same lawyer who (according to the portion of my FBI file that I have gotten through the Freedom of Information Act) lied to the FBI—provably and repeatedly.

The torture regimen went on for about a year in the Special Management Unit of Mansfield Correctional. Sleep deprivation, filthy environs, isolation from guards and other prisoners, suspension of contact with the outside world, starvation rations that caused me to lose a third of my body weight, and freezing conditions for the entirety of the winter. There were other periodic torments and terrors as well, but you get the picture. I had an ambitious support crew, a website, a lawyer, and access to oversight committees and to courts and I was still convinced that the Ohio prison system might kill me anyway. No amount of calls or lawsuits or petitions or protests would stop it.

Popular opinion doesn't matter anymore. I mean, officials care if you expose them for incompetence, but when they torture you for exposing them, no amount of public bewilderment for their crimes against humanity, even expressed directly to them, will in any way persuade them to alter their criminal behavior. They don't care. What are you going to do? Vote torturers out of office? They all torture. Or they will. So, they do as they want and care nothing for consequences... because there are none.

But, in the middle of the torture program, I learned of an important event: A former prisoner in Colorado held a grudge against that state's prisons director who had locked the prisoner away at supermax for years. So, one day, that prisons director answered his doorbell. He said, "I didn't order a pizza." Then he got shot in the face. He died.

And so it goes.

An Ohio prisons director was having me tortured at the time of that shooting. He could have me tortured while the former prisons director of Colorado could not, and that difference was explained by one fact, and only one fact: No one had shot him in the face. If only someone had shot him in the face, his torturing days would have come to a screeching halt.

And so, I became a vocal advocate for political violence.

Why Ohio, Part V

The same arteries that run through Ohio, delivering product and material from everywhere to everywhere else, can just as easily deliver rebels to a prearranged convergence point. So, some of the very things that make Ohio crucial to the swivelization program also make it convenient for us to converge there.

We could select other sites that are critical to maintaining the US as the central fixture of the global swivelization program. We could descend upon Washington, DC, for example. It is, after

all, the capitol. If we burned down DC, that would certainly catch the world's attention. But, on the downside, DC is not central to the movement of product and its burning, though probably fun, would largely be symbolic. Those assuming the right to rule would simply issue orders from rented offices in Baltimore until janitors swept up the glass and buildings got repaired. Probably, nobody on Wall Street would even blink. Also, because DC is on the east coast, the number of rebels who could get there would be cut drastically.

We could converge on New York or LA. Those cities have much more impact on flow of stuff, and also would have big symbolic impact. But, again, convergences in either place would be smaller because of their distances from the opposite coasts.

Chicago may be more centrally located. But, traffic passes around Chicago, not through it.

So, if we want to converge in the midwest, Ohio makes most sense, I think. Ohio provides multiple urban areas— Toledo, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Cincinnati—as well as great expanses of rural space. It is the center, figuratively and literally, of the distributive universe in the US.

We just have to converge on it at the same time. Like a twenty-first century Woodstock. With less music. And a lot more smoke.

Convergences, Part V

Convergences have a history. I'm not exactly inventing the wheel here. I'm just cherry-picking ideas that others have already tried, ideas that worked in at least some limited ways in whatever applications they were employed.

In 1999, organizers managed to successfully converge on Seattle to protest the World Trade Organization, which was meeting there. Hundreds of thousands—possibly as many as a million people—descended upon that city and thoroughly clogged it up. The law enforcement apparatus was completely overwhelmed as protesters blocked streets and normal functions of daily life ground to a halt. The Battle in Seattle temporarily disrupted the specific area of Seattle.

Of course, those folks descended upon the city to protest, to accomplish the very limited goal of a temporary disruption, not to permanently destroy the city and make it impossible to restore. They didn't intend for their rebellion to have ever-widening ripple effects, inspiring other rebellions in other locations, eventually crippling the entire swivelization system. So, the Battle in Seattle didn't have quite the same ambitious goal, but it did serve as a prototype for what can potentially be accomplished through a convergence.

Then you had the Arab Spring and Occupy. The Arab Spring appeared to be a series of spontaneous convergences that toppled national governments. Since that was the limited goal, once it was accomplished in each instance, normalcy resumed and, in some cases, the governments that eventually came to power were not easily distinguishable from the previous ones. However, for the limited goal of those who converged, the convergences worked.

Occupy was somewhat different. Modeled on the Arab Spring, it began, seemingly, as a somewhat localized protest. But, protesters soon flocked to the site of protest and local encampments quickly popped up across the country. The Occupy camps soon morphed into a number of simultaneous convergences.

It appeared to me as an outside observer that the Occupy effort so greatly exceeded original expectations that nobody quite knew what to do next. As a consequence, momentum was lost and a moment that could have been powerful and transformative was somewhat squandered. But,

in fairness, Occupy did not organize with the goal of bringing down the entire system; most of the organizers apparently intended something more symbolic and didn't know what to do when events escalated.

In the convergence I propose, we will know what to do long before we arrive. The intention for this convergence is to gather forces of rebellion concentrating on one focal point, not to accomplish something symbolic or temporary, but something permanent.

By this plan, we ruin the space upon which we converge— at least, ruin it from a swivelized perspective, the way that a smoldering WalMart is seen as ruined rather than as an improvement to the ecosystem. Our goal is to put the convergence's geographic space out of commission, permanently. We converge and overwhelm and utterly abolish the space as a state, as a habitable area in the swivelized sense, as a trans-

portation hub, as a first-world community with plumbing and electricity and wi-fi and Starbucks coffee. When we finally retreat from the convergence point, it will be in permanent retrogression, looking much more like the Ohio that Tecumseh would recognize.

Assuming, of course, that we converge on Ohio...

Political Violence, Part III

I've been told by Ohio prison authorities that I am not permitted to advocate for political violence. Advocacy for political violence somehow violates prison rules according to their self-serving interpretation of them.

Of course, the same prison officials who tortured me, who themselves participated in political violence, are the ones who prohibit me from advocating political violence. Consider the irony.

Political violence is defined as violence "of, or pertaining to, the state." Prison officials worked for the state when they tortured me. The torture they inflicted upon me was violence. Therefore, Ohio prison officials—including then-warden Terry Tibbals, investigator Angela Hunsinger, then-Director Gary C. Mohr, and his legal counsel Trevor Matthew Clark— participated in political violence. Those officials and their friends tortured me, subjected me to political violence, and now forbid me from so much as *advocating* political violence. It is often difficult for me to understand what they are saying to me. It is hard to make out the words with those corpses falling out of their mouths.

My point, of course, is that political violence is something that the state does. The state engages in political violence on a routine basis, every time a cop roughs someone up, or a drone launches missiles on a third-world wedding party.

Political violence is a *language* that government speaks. It is fluent in that language. Political violence is the language of police, of handcuffs and billyclubs; it is the language of troops, aircraft carriers, bombers, and attack helicopters. If you do not speak the language of political violence, the government cannot hear you.

It used to be that, in a previous era, people protested and boycotted and petitioned and disinvested and voted to change things and governments sometimes listened. Not anymore. Now, you can do all of that and nothing will change. Case in point: for decades, people of conscience protested and boycotted and petitioned and disinvested and voted in their effort to change US policy related to Palestine. In all of those decades, no sitting US president ever so much as uttered the words, "two-state solution" in relation to US policy in Palestine. Then, on September

11, 2001, hijackers smacked jetliners into some buildings. The following morning before lunch, the president publicly acknowledged the policy of pursuing a two-state solution in Palestine.

Want to impact things? Want to be heard loud and clear by government? Don't protest or boycott or petition or disinvest or vote. Instead, take some flying lessons and get ahold of some box cutters. If you smack a couple planes into some buildings, governments will respond to you.

Political violence is a language that government speaks. If you speak it, government can hear you. If you don't, it can't. You may as well be speaking Portuguese to the King of Denmark.

Why Ohio, Part VI

Columbus is the capitol of Ohio. Each year for the last few years, an increasing number of protesters have gathered on Columbus Day to protest colonization. It seems an appropriate location to do that. Refer back to Part I of this book if you have forgotten the history of genocide on this continent.

So, with regard to the protest, there exists a tradition of at least symbolic protest organized in Ohio at a specific time every year. Just a thought, but when we get serious about really decolonizing, about taking out the entire system that has been propped up by invaders and colonizers on the skulls of the colonized, perhaps we can take the opportunity of Columbus Day protests to descend upon Ohio with our own numbers and our own agenda and, in a sense, enhance or supplement the symbolic protests with some really substantive resistance of our own.

Maybe we can schedule our convergence to begin on the Friday preceding Columbus Day.

Taking down the whole system in Ohio should only take a few days. By my thinking, it takes decades or even centuries to build up such a complicated and complex system. It just takes a few days to burn it down and blow it up... to clog it and block it and then leave it utterly unusable. We can do it cheaply. We can do it quickly. And it will be good, clean family fun.

We'll be exercising our right to abolish the government. Not to mention we'll be saving the world.

Reality Doesn't Matter

Another important premise to share...

premise: When dealing with hierarchy and capitalism, two systems built upon myth and unreality, reality does not matter; perception of reality is all that really counts.

Memorize that premise. There will be a test later.

In the Arab Spring, a number of governments toppled where populations took to the street in protest. In some instances, they occupied the capital city's main square *en masse* and after a few weeks, the government fell and a new regime came to power.

Now, same facts, same story, different perspective. Let's look at this from a purely analytical point of view. A bunch of people sat in the street, essentially camping... and the government collapsed. Why?

I mean, we really have a scenario where a large chunk of the population went camping downtown. That's really all they did. So, why would there result some kind of cataclysmic collapse of a government because of mass camping? It would seem, reasonably, that as many people can go

camping for as long as they want and it would have virtually no impact whatsoever on a government's ability to continue shuffling its daily paperwork. It would seem that government could just wait them out.

Sooner or later campers go home, right?

But, that's not what happened. In the cases of Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, and others, the campaign of public camping didn't make the exercise of governance impossible or even difficult in any practical or logistical way, but it still made governance impossible in some all together other way: Those in power felt humiliated and impotent, embarrassed and demoralized, and the real benefits of power were stripped from them—the sense of prestige, the opportunities for self-enrichment, and the feeling of being benevolent and having a legacy. As a consequence of having no real benefit from the exercise of power, those who had it were less motivated to maintain it. Reality was irrelevant. What mattered was perception. The idea of crisis trumped the reality, a reality where nothing logistically threatening was going on.

Now, how that applies: What I propose in the pages that follow is a devastating attack on the existing system. It really is. We're not just going camping, we're going to fuck some shit up. We're going to actively and effectively kick a big, fat dent in the hierarch machinery.

But, if we attack Ohio and cripple it, and that in turn has some impact on the US's economy and political reality and culture and so on, how does that bring down the entire swivelization program? I mean, in the absence of anyone else wilding out anywhere else—which will certainly happen— what would make the global system collapse?

Well, the answer, of course, is the same thing that made governments resign as a result of mass camping. What we do and what we are will create a crisis. Hysteria. Stock markets will go bonkers anticipating how the world will end. Folks in other places will duplicate our disruption, and the spectator population will imagine that the chaos will never end, that the sky will fall. That population includes those who assume the right to rule.

There will be runs on banks as panicking people attempt to hoard cash. Food riots will hit the stores. Shelves will be wiped clean of bottled water and guns. The crisis will be both real and unreal, and both the real crisis and the perceived crisis will contribute to the ever-escalating real crisis. It will heighten general anxiety and influence the conduct of whole populations while the over-responses and under-responses by those assuming the right to rule will contribute to whole new waves of panic and fear and hysteria, ripple effects that we can anticipate and exploit to hasten the complete unraveling of swivelization.

Recall Y2K. That was the panic scenario at the end of the last century. If millions and millions of people will panic and go hysterical over nothing, imagine how they will respond over *something*, over an all-out attack on the existing system by savage cannibal maniacs like you and me.

Reality doesn't matter. Perception is what counts.

Political Violence, Part IV

State torturers who subjected me to political violence tell me that I'm wrong for believing in political violence. If, by "believing in political violence," they mean that I believe political violence exists, they're wrong. I don't believe political violence exists. I know that it does. Political violence

is everywhere. The state itself is political violence. Political violence: force, compulsion, intrusion. All of that is the very fabric of the hierarchical system.

I don't believe in political violence like someone believes in magical beans or faerie dust. I see it, I hear it, I smell it, I have felt it pounded into my flesh and bones. I have experienced the conditions that the CIA described as "the simple torture situation" and have been the subject of assassination plots by state officials. I *know* political violence exists.

Shock-u-py and Awe-cu-py

Imagine Occupy on steroids. Not Occupy as it occurred, but Occupy as it could have been, as it should have been if everyone knew then what they know now. Imagine a convergence, not dozens of them all spread out, but one convergence where everyone meets, one that everyone expects to be the convergence to end all convergences, the convergence to end swivel-ization. Imagine a convergence that is consciously aware of its

own inherent power, one that seeks to push the envelope beyond what anyone might rationally expect to be possible.

We're talking about an insurrectionary version of Shock and Awe, an attack so incredibly overwhelming as to absolutely paralyze the enemy hierarchs' system and make an effective response to all of the various attacks and disruptions impossible. We can turn Occupy into Shock-u-py and Awe-cu-py.

Marching Orders and Invitations

There are two ways to proceed with something as big and ambitious and complicated as the Shockupy I have in mind. There's the hierarch method of centrally directing it, or the anarchist method of issuing an open invitation and letting the whole thing develop on its own. Two methods. Two approaches. Two philosophies about how things best manifest themselves in the world.

If we pursue things the way hierarchs do them, we would have a general barking orders at the center of all of this, and providing marching orders to everyone. That's one method. The one employed by our enemy.

Another way to do it is to issue an open invitation and let rebels gravitate toward the activities that resonate with them, that get them excited and inspire them to struggle. With that approach, you have hope and faith that, with broad participation, with a good idea that inspires and a widely-circulated invitation, all of the roles that are crucial for overall success will get filled, if not duplicated.

So, instead of centralized authority and top-down orders, all we need is a universal invitation to shockupy Ohio. Congratulations. You're currently holding it.

Political Violence, Part V

State terrorists who tortured me and subjected me to political violence tell me that I'm wrong for "believing in political violence." If, by saying I believe in political violence, they mean that I believe political violence works, that it is effective, then state terrorists are wrong. I don't believe political violence works; I know that political violence works.

In the early 1990s, at Mansfield Correctional, before the federal government yanked educational PELL grants from prisons, I took a sociology class. It dealt with the issue of social change and had a whole segment on political violence. According to the statistics of that time, political movements that employed strategies of violence had more than an eighty percent chance of getting at least some of their demands met. This includes groups such as the Irish Republican Army and the Red Brigades and the African National Congress.

On the flip side, political movements that espoused nonviolence had more than an eighty percent chance of failure. So, according to my college classes, according to social science experts—who know more than me and who know far more than the state terrorists who tortured me for having an ideology—political violence works and nonviolence largely does not. If you have a political objective you want met, and if you want to take your odds from less-than-twenty-percent to more-than-eighty-percent, shoot somebody or blow something up.

Decades of nonviolence had no impact on US policy in Palestine. What did? Jetliners smacking into buildings. That radically changed US policy within hours.

I do not *believe* political violence works, I know it does. And so do state terrorists who assume the right to rule us, which is why political violence is their first option for every problem.

Somehow, knowing this—knowing that something is objectively, provably, irrefutably true—is wrong. So, we have some kind of obligation to believe in untruth and to disbelieve in truth? Well, yeah. That does sound like something that the hierarchs would say.

The Army of the 12 Monkeys

Full disclosure here, I need to fill you in on how I got tortured and labeled a terrorist and now have more than 4,000 pages of FBI files. This is somewhat relevant to the topic at hand.

In 2012, shortly after I finished Part III of this book and it got released as a zine, the Army of the 12 Monkeys happened at Mansfield Correctional—the prison where I was then held. In each of the sixteen blocks on the compound, the 12 Monkeys circulated materials, including an organizing manual for forming guerrilla columns, a pretty comprehensive resistance manual, and a shitload of cool flyers with inspiring graphics that invited the prisoner population to wild-out and attack the prison, listing disruptive actions that prisoners could undertake (like running sink water and electricity to increase the costs; flushing toilets simultaneously to bust pipes; jamming staples in locks to obstruct all civilian and unit staff from getting work done; cramming potatoes in chowhall drains to flood the kitchen; uniting gangs to fight collectively against the prison administration; attacking staff; smashing windows with batteries; sabotaging the equipment in the prison factory to disrupt production; and so on).

Significantly, in all of their literature, the Army of the 12 Monkeys made no effort whatsoever to explain to prisoners why they should wild-out. The 12 Monkeys operated, apparently, from the valid assumption that every prisoner needed only an invitation and a very general program for rebelling. Prisoners fucked that prison up. It was chaos, madness, bedlam, havoc, mayhem. The insurrection went on for weeks and cost the prison six figures just in infrastructure damage, not to mention lost production at the prison factory. The normal operation of the prison was paralyzed by millions of small acts of rebellion that clogged drains, jammed locks, busted pipes and windows. Seemingly, the entire population that had the previous day been passive accomplices in their own captivity, suddenly became an army of resisters. Prisoners didn't do it because the

12 Monkeys offered an eloquent argument for participating; they did it because it was fun. It was fun.

The FBI was on site within two weeks, attempting to profile prisoners. They clearly sought to contain the 12 Monkeys. They didn't want this kind of disaster infecting other prisons or they could lose control of the entire complex.

I was one of three prisoners rounded up and tortured for a year, and I was the only one of the three picked up exclusively and explicitly and admittedly for having an offensive ideology.

The 12 Monkey materials are still out there online. One hopes, by the time you read this, 12Monkey.net will be online as well. It needs to be. In the lead-up to Shockupy bringing down Ohio, and thereby bringing down the US, and thereby bringing down the swivelization program that is driving us to omnicide, there needs to be groundwork laid with Ohio prisoners. Rebels in the so-called free world need to collaborate with prisoners and conspire to introduce those online materials into every Ohio prison. That way, 12 Monkey insurrections at every Ohio prison can coincide with Shockupy, exponentially multiplying the crippling disruption that will overwhelm state terrorists when it all jumps off.

What happened at Mansfield can be easily duplicated everywhere. Mansfield was not special. The prisoners were not special. The conditions leading to the insurrection were not special.

So, as part of Shockupy, you can take the prisons away. What do you call a state that has lost its prisons and its power to punish? A failed state.

The Barbarians

Do you know how the Roman Empire fell? The barbarians poured in, running around naked and shitting in the bushes. In no time, the empire totally unraveled. Rome was then a military superpower and an economic powerhouse but the barbarians proved too disruptive.

We can be the new barbarians.

We converge on one space, like... Ohio. We figuratively run around naked and shit in the proverbial bushes. Only, in our case, we engage in a carefully-planned and -coordinated campaign of shitting in the bushes, with the deliberate intent of unravelling everything. Fun times.

Political Violence, Part VI

State terrorists who torured me and subjected me to political violence tell me I'm wrong for believing in political violence. If, by saying I believe in political violence, they mean that I believe that political violence is a valid and legitimate means to an end, that it is just and right and proper, or they mean that I believe that the results of political violence are acceptable and good, then, yas, they are absolutely right.

I am a believer in political violence. I am as much a believer in political violence as they are practitioners of political violence. I am as much a believer in political violence as they are.

The fact of imprisonment and torture being political violence notwithstanding, state terrorists, just like all other Americans, provably and irrefutably believe in political violence. Consider, Americans pay taxes to the US government. That government was established a few centuries ago through the process of political violence. Let's not forget that the so-called Founding Fathers of the US were unrepentant cop killers and terrorists. They shot the agents of the sovereign

crown in the back, in a campaign of terror, and they engaged in deliberate economic sabotage and terrorism, burning British boats into the sea, destroying the cargo, and crippling the government. The Boston Tea Party was the most effective act of economic terrorism prior to September 11, 2001.

Through political violence, the cop killers and terrorists were able to gain British recognition as a separate nation. So, anyone paying taxes to the government of the US rather than to the British crown is, by their own actions, affirming the legitimacy of political violence and its outcomes.

Everyone in the US agrees that political violence is perfectly legitimate. We only differ in our beliefs as to whom.

What Stops Torture, Part I

I learned valuable lessons from getting tortured for a year. I learned that I could have a website with a moderate number of followers and regular updates; I could have concerned family and friends who called authorities and media; I could have a support team dedicated to helping me; and I could have direct face-time with the director of the legislative oversight committee... and the torture machine would just keep grinding along, unabated.

Torture. It was mind over matter. They didn't mind. I didn't matter.

I learned that there did not exist a single mechanism for halting crimes against humanity, that every official form of redress was under the operation of collaborators to the state terrorists, or else they were nothing more than false fronts that responded with apathy and form letter replies to urgent cries for help. There was no one to hold anyone accountable. Trying to hold state terrorists accountable by appealing to their golf partners was useless.

State terrorists suck. Oversight committees suck. The media sucks. Lawmakers suck. Non-profits and lawyers suck. So, I came up with a kind of direct action plan. I called it BLAST!blog. I wrote the proposal for it about six months into the torture regimen and sent out dozens of copies to all kinds of friends, who themselves sent it to dozens of friends. In 2015, blastblog.noblogs.org went online. I have never seen it, of course. I have never been online. But, from what I hear, the site has the home addresses of the state terrorists who tortured me, along with photos of their homes and a map feature that shows the quickest route to get from wherever you are to those addresses.

I don't know who created blastblog. I don't want to know. I don't need to know.

Ohio prison officials, including those who had me tortured for my beliefs, insist I'm in charge of blastblog. They tell me I run it. They prefer a self-serving narrative that I give orders to an army of hacker-minions who mindlessly do my bidding, and that I run the internet from my prison cell... rather than believe that they, state terrorists, are so reprehensible, so loathsome, that others who are genuinely empathetic to me and bewildered by state terrorists' crimes against humanity, that those caring and courageous people devoted time and energy to strike back, to try to change the world and create a disincentive for torture.

For prison officials, this public exposure is very discomfiting. They don't like it. In light of what happened to the Colorado director of prisons when his home address found its way into the *wrong hands*, resulting in the director getting shot in the face, prison officials viewed blastblog as dangerous.

Political Violence, Part VII

I hope I'm not kicking a dead horse here. Really, I do. But from birth we have been so conditioned to thoughtlessly accept that all peace is good, and that all violence is bad. So, what I'm trying desperately to relate to you must somehow penetrate this massive bulwark of conditioning, must somehow get through this mental filter that is inserted into our minds to keep us in our assigned seats, keep us working and shopping and dying for the hierarch machine.

Two points to make here.

First, violence is neither good nor bad. In the history of life on this planet, there has never existed a perfectly nonviolent organism. If ever such a thing did exist, it died immediately for lack of food. Eating is the consumption of other ostensibly living things; eating is violence. Don't eat, you die... and starving yourself to death is self-murder. Murder is violence.

So, again, violence is neither good nor bad. It just is. If a serial killer is chopping up kids with an ax, your dedication to nonviolence and your refusal to employ violence to stop a serial killer is not a moral response. There are situations where the dedication to nonviolence doesn't make you moral but instead an accomplice to atrocities.

Second point, if we refrain from political violence, we are not opting for a situation of peace. In the absence of our political violence, we are merely in a situation of *unilateral* violence, one where the government employs violence and the threat of violence against us, where those who assume the right to rule point attack helicopters at us, make demands of us under threat, steal our money, wreak havoc in our names, and maintain a vast death machine that is quickly killing our world and all of us along with it.

They have guns pointed at our future's head. If you call that "peace," there's something seriously fucking wrong with you.

Looked at another way, if we continue the useless wheel-spinning of this nonviolence shit (which has always yielded the same results), we can expect the same outcome as always: the death machine grinding along with no real challenge to its existence until the damage and injury to our world is so beyond its capacity to heal that we are all doomed and all life is slowly extinguished.

Or we can employ political violence and conceivably make the system unwieldy and unstable, unable to maintain itself, and possibly preserve life, some life, any life, long into the future.

The reality is that dedication to nonviolence is complicity to unilateral violence, which is, ultimately, complicity to omnicide. Dedication to political violence as a component to our overall resistance strategy is a life-affirming act, a collaboration to save the world.

So, again, if you are dedicated to exclusivist nonviolence, don't show up. We don't need you. You'll just be in the way. We don't have time to argue with you. We'll be busy saving the world.

What Stops Torture, Part II

In June 2015, I was housed at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility in Lucasville, Ohio, otherwise known as Shitville. One day, I was summoned to the sergeant's office. In strode Ed Voorhies, the second in command of the entire Ohio prison system. He looked like a hairless rat with spectacles. A couple of lawyer toadies came in tow and sat by as Voorhies lowered himself into the chair behind the desk and eyed me.

He told me that in the position he held, he had never had a one-on-one interview with a prisoner, and he shared that in order to impress upon me how serious he felt this situation was. He said, "There's a website. It has the home addresses of prison employees there, with photos of some of their homes. Some of those people have kids... We consider it a threat. We want it taken down. Now, I can't prove it, but I know you did this. We want it removed."

I assured him that if I had taken those photos of those homes, I would not have jumped the fence in order to get back to my cell in time for count. He answered, "No, you didn't post those. I know that. But you know who did."

At some point in the conversation, I told Mr. Voorhies that if he needed me to use whatever influence I might have with blastbloggers to get them to remove posted material, I needed the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction to end its domestic torture program and to expunge the disciplinary frame-ups that the ODRC generated to equate beliefs with terrorism, so that, absent the frame-ups, I could get to lower security and gain the parole I had otherwise earned. Mr. Voorhies responded, "Well, if it's parole that you're concerned about, I should think you'd want to get that site removed before the parole board sees it."

Now, to interject: That really pissed me off. It was insulting, as if I'm so stupid as to believe the parole board was not aware of it, as if they had not been given marching orders to fuck me for life, as if my potential release chances could somehow be improved by getting that site down and thereby give those who tortured me a free pass... while they did not so much as even offer an *empty* promise to refrain from torture.

So, that's what pissed me off. And that's why I replied like I did. I said, innocently, "Why? Don't the parole board members have home addresses too?"

There was a moment. A pause. After that moment, after that pause, I saw anger rise up into the features of his scrawny rat face. But do you know what I saw in his eyes before the anger? I saw fear. Unmistakable fear. He vowed to make my life "a living hell" if I did not get blastblog to come down. (It did not come down.)

At any rate, I learned something. Those in power do not want to be exposed, to be vulnerable, to have their personal information splashed all over radical websites where crazies and gun nuts and professional anarchists can encounter it. They don't want it to be possible for the tortured and the tormented and the terrorized to abandon useless modes of redress created by those in power, the modes rigged for failure. They want to avoid directly confronting the tortured, tormented and terrorized, by not letting them ring their doorbells.

We must have an extensive database online in advance of any Shockupy so that planning participants can get some ideas, and so those who think they run things can get a sense of just what kind of biblical plague is headed their way. It's one thing to have a general, nebulous sense that you have crushed lives and made enemies. It's a whole other thing to find that those you have crushed are waging war on you and that they know where you live, and that thousands of their closest friends are coming to obliterate you and the system you worship.

So, by my thinking, we need that database before we get disorganized. I say "disorganized" so that, in our own minds, we distinguish between the enemy's model of organization and our own. It stands to reason that we don't like the current program, so we certainly don't want to replicate it in our own social systems. It also makes sense that if you want to defeat something, you should approach it with something unfamiliar, something unexpected and foreign to itself.

We're going to be disorganized in a way that truly befuddles the swivelized mind. Also, disorganizing takes a lot less time and effort than organizing.

Guerrilla Warfare, Part I

Many associate guerrilla warfare with Marxists. To be fair, a lot of guerrillas have been Marxists. But Marxists don't have a monopoly on the strategies and tactics of insurgency or irregular warfare.

Really, in the broadest understanding of guerrilla warfare, it preceded Marxists and preceded Karl Marx himself, who probably never even heard the term, by a few million years. Tribal people long before swivelization engaged in ambushes and sneak attacks and all of the other methods that comprise the practice of guerrilla warfare. Tribal people perfected ambush and sneak assault, lightning attack, and appropriation of resources, then melting away as quickly as they appeared.

In the American Revolution, rebels emulated the fighting strategies they plagiarized from Native Americans to defeat the British. They hid behind trees and fired from behind and harassed the enemies' superior numbers, or attacking vulnerabilities like docks, burning the boats.

None of that was novel. It wasn't new. It was only new to the European mind that had long forgotten its own tribal past.

Guerrilla warfare is a method of armed combat typically understood as a kind of hit-and-run method, one that favors small numbers against larger ones, a less-equipped and outgunned force against one better-armed and better-trained, a method where the guerrilla attacks where its enemy is weak or vulnerable, or where the enemy is ill-prepared. The goal is to inflict damage and casualties in the timespace before the enemy can gather and effectively respond, to demoralize the enemy and to capture resources, but never to take or hold territory or to confront an enemy force face to face in conventional warfare.

The idea is to hit then run, disrupt, harass, demoralize, capture, and avoid encirclement and capture. Always exercise initiative, always fight when the conditions are favorable to the attacker and always retreat when attacked.

By the traditional theory, the guerrilla continues this strategy until such time as the number of guerrilla forces match the enemy forces, and until guerrilla forces obtain equivalent firepower. Once guerrillas reach that equivalency, they convert to regular tactics as a conventional fighting force. This theory evolved, however.

Mao Ze Dong was a school teacher in China who went revolutionary and developed a theory of guerrilla warfare. Mao said that guerrillas never actually have to win a battle in order to prevail. Mao said, the opposing regime is the enemy, not the soldiers themselves. So, outcomes of engagements are really irrelevant. By Mao's conception of guerrilla warfare, the guerrilla's most important mission is largely symbolic. Attacks against symbols or institutions of the enemy's prestige and power matter far more than killing some soldiers. The symbolic attacks inspire the population to support the guerrillas and shift allegiance away from the regime. Consistent with this, Mao developed the "thirty-second attack." In the thirty-second attack, guerrillas execute an ambush at a designated time, and, with great discipline, they fight with all-out ferocity for exactly thirty seconds. At the end of thirty seconds, whatever the situation, whether good or bad, the guerrilla forces stop fighting, fall back, and disappear. So, in every engagement, the regime forces likely never have a chance to return fire. Mao won. He toppled the regime.

This conception of guerrilla warfare was employed by the Vietnamese who defeated, first the French and then the Americans. Vo Nguyen Giap, Vietnamese General and guerrilla strategist, contributed to the evolution of guerrilla theory. Giap said that it is essential for guerrilla forces

to project the sense of “perpetual warfare.” That is, the guerrilla can demoralize the enemy by convincing the enemy that the guerrilla can continue fighting forever... and will.

Algerian guerrillas adopted this method to a more urban setting, incorporating bombings and sabotage and taking hostages, which undermined the French occupation.

The Vietnamese guerrillas won. So did the Algerians.

We move next to Cuba. In Cuba, guerrilla theory evolved again, in two critical ways. By the theory articulated by Ernesto “Che” Guevara, it was unnecessary for guerrillas to wait for the “proper conditions” to develop before undertaking hostilities. Prior to Cuba, it had been believed that the population must first reach a level of dissatisfaction, a level of political consciousness before guerrilla warfare could succeed.

Cuba proved otherwise. Cuba was an example that guerrilla warfare could essentially create those revolutionary conditions where they otherwise didn’t yet exist. The guerrilla can radicalize and make revolt contagious simply by resisting.

Second, Che Guevara asserted that it was unnecessary for guerrillas to achieve equilibrium with regime forces and then convert to conventional warfare. He said that the guerrilla could remain a guerrilla and never match forces, and the regime would eventually collapse anyway.

Cuban guerrillas never numbering more than five thousand defeated a regime with a military armed and trained by the US and numbering more than eighty thousand.

This example inspired the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, the FMLN in El Salvador, the FARC in Colombia and the EZLN in Mexico. In each instance, the local situation shaped the different expressions of guerrilla warfare that each group employed. Each adopted and evolved the methods to serve their own needs. Each succeeded and continued to succeed as long as they maintained the support of the population for which they struggled and only failed where they lost that popular support, where the populace lost faith in the rebels’ intentions.

In Mexico, the Zapatistas were popularly hailed as the first anarchist guerrillas. This may not be wholly accurate, but the social structures in the communities of the Zapatista guerrilla zone are largely self-governed through mostly horizontal, consensus-based processes.

We now see further evolution of the guerrilla theory in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria, with numerous groups operating autonomously to defeat the Soviets in Afghanistan and then the US.

Demonstrably, the guerrilla column doesn’t have to be Marxist. Guerrilla columns can operate by consensus as small, mobile, self-reliant fighting units that hit and run, appropriate resources from enemy forces, demoralize the regime, and become a symbol of the regime’s impotence, an inspiration to rebels, and an example of the dignity of rebellion... until achieving inevitable victory.

Good Danes

In World War II, the Nazis invaded Denmark. They expected cooperation. They anticipated that occupying Denmark would get them free labor and resources and help turn the tide in the war. They were so fuckin’ wrong.

The Danes resisted the Nazis with a nationwide campaign of sabotage. In fact, the resistance was so epic that the word “sabotage” comes out of the Danish resistance, from “sabo,” for “shoe,” as in, “throwing one’s shoe into the machine.”

Early on, the Danish resistance printed handbills that circulated widely among the population. The handbills instructed on how to resist, how to obstruct the Nazi war effort in every way imaginable. The handbills concluded by urging everyone to “be good Danes.”

While that circulated, the Nazis were busy dealing with the question of government administration. The King of Denmark, a shrewd fellow, convinced the Nazis that the Danish people would wild-out if he was removed, and that he could be a useful tool for keeping the population under control. They believed him, and so they left him as king.

The Nazis, in exchange, expected him to read a statement prepared for him. He reviewed it and suggested that he write his own statement, so the Danish people would hear him in his own words and it would sound more authentic, more persuasive. So, the Nazis agreed. They let the King of Denmark write his own radio address and the Nazis approved it. In that address, the King of Denmark told the Danish people to cooperate fully with the Nazis and concluded by urging them, above all else, to be “good Danes.”

Everyone knew what that meant. The Nazis were clueless, but the whole population had seen the handbills and knew the reference, and knew exactly what the King of Denmark was covertly urging.

The sabotage increased. The population obstructed the Nazis in every way possible. The Nazis diverted more troops and resources in an effort to gain control and Denmark became a bottomless pit for Nazi money and human resources. Guerrilla fighters picked off Nazis, harassed isolated units, blew things up. Nazi reprisals involved random executions of civilians, which in turn drove more of the population into the Danish underground.

It is impossible to put a soldier on every single man, woman, and child of an occupied population. It just can't be done. And even if it could, it would drive the occupier to bankruptcy.

In Ohio, the enemy cannot put a soldier on every official's home, on every courthouse, on every government building, on every college and bank and predatory corporate employer. Things are invariably left unguarded.

We take what they give us. Everything they give us. And we destroy it. Gas is cheap. Matches are free. We have to be “good Danes.”

Why Ohio, Part VII

Perhaps I have my own biases. I may have a personal vendetta that blinds me. Maybe my experience colors my perception. It's possible.

I mean, Ohio went out of its way breaking its own laws to lock me up for life for a provable non-crime, for following the laws. Then, Ohio targeted me for my beliefs because I know hierarchy sucks. (It really sucks.) Then they tortured me and called me a terrorist... so they could make me die in prison... for a provable non-crime. And when I exposed them, they tried to arrange my assassination... and got caught.

That could really rub a guy the wrong way.

Based on what they have fabricated, equating criticism with terrorism, belief with crime, they have manufactured excuses to make me die in prison. They rob my loved ones of my presence, including my elderly parents. I'm their only child. Their health is bad. They need me home.

They have held their breath for the better part of three decades. The State of Ohio has been holding them hostage and murdering them in installments for decades. My rage and hatred for these monsters, for what they do to my parents, is vast.

As a practical matter, for me to get home, I must take down the State of Ohio. I must find allies and co-conspirators dedicated to destroying the State of Ohio, once and for all. It really is a fight to the death between the State of Ohio and me. So yeah. I might be biased.

But, all the same, everything I said about Ohio and its centrality to the larger control system is still true. The arguments for disorganizing Shockupy there still apply.

I have a plan. Tecumseh would love it.

So, my biases notwithstanding, I might just have a vendetta against the one spot where we really ought to converge and fuck things up. Let's find out.

An Analogy, Part I

Imagine a dam. The size doesn't matter. It could be a small dam, just a few feet tall, blocking a stream, or it could be the Hoover Dam, with a four-lane highway running across the top of it. Makes no difference. But, for this analogy, let's imagine it to be the largest dam ever. Reason being, if it applies to the biggest, it certainly applies to the smallest.

Okay. To destroy the dam, to render it useless as a dam, we need not knock the whole thing down entirely. It is not necessary to blast it to pieces... and then smash every piece into even smaller pieces... and then crush the small pieces into powder... and then let the rushing water carry away the dust. To destroy the dam, just punch a hole in it. Just one hole. Preferably below the waterline. A dam with a hole in it is not a dam. A dam with a hole in it is a big strainer: water flows through it.

We don't have to crush every piece of swivelization to powder. We just have to punch a hole through it, preferably below the waterline.

Reality Doesn't Matter, Part II

When things start going wrong for hierarchs on big levels, they usually don't respond effectively. They frequently, for example, over-respond. Their heavy-handedness will usually do very little, if anything, to stop or diminish the catastrophe that confronts them. Their fear and incompetence will be costly to them, will alienate the population and undermine confidence, contributing, eventually, to escalating chaos.

Regimented thinkers are really predictable. We know what they'll do before they do it.

In important ways, hierarchs frequently also under-react, failing to devote the necessary resources to a catastrophe they see coming, for fear of causing panic, for fear of confirming the scope and breadth of the cataclysm they really face.

Regimented thinkers are really predictable. We know what they'll do before they do it.

Guerrilla Warfare, Part II

Even if you have a contingent of rebels dedicated exclusively to the strategy of guerrilla warfare, the vast majority of their time is spent nonviolently.

Historically, guerrillas seek always to hold the initiative. For a few reasons, those attacks are typically planned to occur at or around sunrise and sunset. The enemy is usually occupied with eating or other mundane activities at those times. They are distracted and ill-prepared for combat, giving guerrillas a distinct advantage. Also, at sunrise and sunset, the sun is low on the horizon. If guerrillas attack from the vantage point of having the sun behind them, their enemy is blinded while the guerrillas have a perfect view of everything. This also gives the guerrilla a distinct advantage.

It is rare for a column to plan two attacks in one day, but if some guerrilla did, at both sunrise and sunset, then those two attacks would probably continue for perhaps a few minutes each. Recall, guerrilla ambushes only last for a very short time, as guerrillas seek always to hold the initiative and to inflict damage and melt away before the enemy can gather strength and respond.

Remember, Mao used attacks of thirty seconds, an ambitious goal. But even if a guerrilla column spent five minutes on an attack, that's roughly ten minutes per day involved in active fighting.

Very few people get killed in guerrilla warfare. The accounts from the Cuban Revolution are pretty instructive because we have verifiable, historical data, more than for other guerrilla conflicts, and we have no reason to think that the Cuban example is in any way outside of the norm. I suggest we accept the Cuban Revolution's numbers as representative of guerrilla warfare generally.

In Cuba, guerrillas never numbered more than five thousand and, for most of the fighting, were considerably fewer. They took on more people at the end, when victory became pretty obvious.

On the opposing side, the Cuban military numbered about eighty thousand. Not all of them saw combat. Probably very few.

The conflict lasted roughly eighteen months. In that period, by most accounts, the guerrillas killed between two hundred and three hundred troops.

By those numbers, the vast majority of the Cuban guerrillas didn't kill anything. It means the losing side in the conflict had a survival rate of 99.625%. Again, that's the survival rate of the government troops, the side that *lost*.

More people will likely die in the US in an eighteen month period from pool drain accidents. Pool drain accidents during eighteen months will kill more people than Cuban guerrillas killed in the eighteen months of guerrilla warfare in the Cuban Revolution. Guerrilla warfare is almost as dangerous as swimming in hotel pools on vacation. Pool drains are more dangerous, more deadly, more violent than a few thousand armed guerrillas struggling for liberation. No shit.

Like anything else in human existence, guerrilla warfare is not as we would expect it to be. Like everything in human existence, reality is not nearly as important as perception. In the case of guerrilla warfare, it matters very little that, for the most part, guerrillas are running around in the forest shooting absolutely nothing. What matters is that the population perceives the guerrillas as noble and courageous rebels struggling against the oppressor, and that the government understands the guerrilla's very existence as an affront to the regime's authority, and so must commit to the complete extermination of every single enemy.

For the oppressed, the guerrilla is a symbol of hope and inspiration. For government, the guerrilla's existence is a symbol of its own failures and potential erosion of prestige.

Given modern government's brutal repression of even nonviolent protest, and given the actual rate of violence occasioned by guerrilla warfare, I think a reasonable argument can be made

that, if pacifists truly wanted to decrease the amount of violence, they would pick up automatic rifles and ski masks and immediately begin a campaign of guerrilla warfare.

And avoid pool drains.

Guns and Bombs, Part I

I find it curious the number of anarchists who have an absolute aversion to guns and bombs but simultaneously want to topple the power structure. I find this curious in light of the long history of those who establish and maintain hierarchies through recourse primarily to guns and bombs. Also, I find this curious in light of the fact that hierarchs have rarely, if ever, abdicated power and gone away peacefully without being confronted by guns and bombs.

So, if you despise a thing that relies principally on guns and bombs, and if you want it gone, and if you know that it has historically only ever yielded to guns and bombs, wouldn't you seek to become fluent in the language of guns and bombs?

The government's forces are fluent in the language of guns and bombs so if anarchists, those who seek the abolition of government, expect to overcome and defeat government forces, just what, exactly, do they intend to use? What strategies and tactics do they intend to employ, if not guns and bombs?

Some anarchists object that right-wing extremists are the ones who are enthusiastic about guns and bombs. Because right-wing extremists are enthusiastic about guns and bombs, it seems, anarchists seek to disavow guns and bombs as a way to disavow right-wing extremists and their politics. Rightwing extremists routinely use toilet paper too. Is that cause for anarchists to disavow toilet paper and scoot across the carpet, bare ass, like a golden retriever? It seems to me that a gun is a tool, just like any other tool. It performs a function. Just like any other tool, the gun does not know the politics of its user. The gun does not know if it is a right-wing radical or an anarchist pulling its trigger. The gun has no politics.

Neither does the toilet paper.

So, if anarchists disavow guns and bombs while their enemies stockpile guns and bombs, they are not engaging in some noble exercise in principled political purity; they are simply surrendering. Anarchists are arming the hierarchs and yielding all guns and bombs to the hierarchs while voluntarily disarming themselves. Is that a strategy?

Another argument posed by anarchists deals with asymmetrical power relationships and armed resistance. The argument goes that if anarchists resort to guerrilla warfare and some develop expertise with guns and bombs that others do not, then, even when hierarchy is toppled, when the fight is over, there will be an armed elite that has expertise with guns and bombs, and that armed elite will have more influence and more power than those not versed in guerrilla warfare. This, then, creates a toxic social dynamic of asymmetrical power, which is, really, a de facto hierarchy.

I get the argument. The argument is correct. The conclusion, however, is absolutely ridiculous.

Essentially, this is saying that, to avoid some anarchists attaining more influence by gaining mastery over a specific skill set, all anarchists must remain unskilled. This argument could really apply to any specialized skillset. Because I am a writer and exercise the craft of putting words on paper, my literacy provides me asymmetrical influence compared to anarchists who cannot read. Is the solution, then, to disavow books?

Accepting that use of guns and bombs as a skillset provides some anarchists power and influence. The solution is not to disavow guns and bombs. Rather than establishing a vanguard with specialized skills that everyone else doesn't have, why not teach everyone how to use guns and bombs? Just like the rational solution to the problem of my asymmetrical influence is to teach everyone else to read, and thereby diminish my advantage, so it is with recourse to guns and bombs.

That sounds like a fantastic solution all the way around. If all anarchists are trained and skilled in guns and bombs, the hierarchs couldn't push them around. The very thing that gives hierarchs the advantage would give anarchists equality. It is hard to dominate and occupy and enslave people who are skilled in guns and bombs.

I pose this argument to militants and pacifists alike. Smarter folks than me, including Ward Churchill and Peter Gelderloos, have asserted that if you do not have the expertise for employing violence, then you are not really choosing nonviolence over violence. For someone without the expertise in violence, nonviolence is not a choice, it is all there is.

I would suggest that even the most fanatical follower of Gandhi should take gun lessons, should learn maintenance and use of firearms, should become a skilled marksman. I would suggest that the most zealous pacifist ought to learn demolitions, how to make and detonate bombs.

Particularly in the US, there are guns and firing ranges everywhere. Lessons are cheap, perhaps even free. Reliable instruction in bomb-making might be trickier to locate, but it's out there. After this, if someone chooses not to pick up the gun or the bomb, it is by choice. I'm just saying, there's a difference between you making a choice, and the choice making you.

If just one person from each anarchist collective took lessons and then returned to teach the rest of the group, anarchists everywhere would be fluent in the language of guns and bombs. Nobody would have any advantage over anyone else.

And the global swivelization program would be fucked.

An Approach to an Approach

Here's how I proceeded as I developed my strategy for this proposed Shockupy: I asked myself, "If I were the Fartgoblin King, and if I ran this sprawling hierarch system, what is it that I would fear more than anything?" When I came up with the answer, I asked, "And then what?," and answered that question about a thousand times. The idea being, of course, that there is no one right way to do this, and the more tactics we present, the more exhaustive the list of possible actions, the greater the chances of overwhelming the swivelization program and hastening catastrophic systems failure.

Anyone can do this. It isn't brain surgery. It really isn't. There's one way that this larger system functions perfectly, and there are millions of ways to fuck it up.

Guns and Bombs, Part II

A great deal of disruption can come through threat of guns and bombs without actually even having any guns and bombs.

You can find news stories about people responding to artful clothing, high school senior pranks, and movie publicity stunts with full security forces. And that kind of intense response becomes more and more likely, as social forces get more chaotic and more violent.

Potato Guns, Super-Soakers, and Bowling Balls

The world is full of accessible things that can be used in fun and exciting ways. Especially in unusual juxtaposition with each other. Experiment! Find friends who like to play and experiment too!

Lessons from the Viet Cong

In the illegal invasion of Vietnam, the United States bombed a poor, small, undeveloped nation into oblivion. Rebel guerrillas often hid in underground tunnels in the dark, maybe for weeks at a time, eating rats and waiting for a chance to pop up out of a hole and shoot an American.

When shooting from the sewer, they learned to fire at what is called “six o’ clock hole.” They didn’t fire at torsos, at “center mass,” because, first, Americans had bulletproof vests and, second, they weren’t shooting to kill. Killing Americans is not as effective as injuring them. When someone is badly wounded, there is a lot of screaming and bleeding, and with all that screaming and bleeding, the day’s planned activities get postponed.

Isolating and pinning down arriving ambulances forced the Americans to abandon their offensive plans in order to rescue responders, so those responders can then save the injured. The Viet Cong did it. The Viet Cong won.

From the Air

The Viet Cong didn’t have helicopters, but the enemy did. Helicopters are a great advantage for communicating information to forces on the ground, for transporting forces and dropping them into position, or for attacking from the air with snipers firing directly from the helicopter.

People fighting on the ground have had to scare the helicopters away or else bring them down. People have used rifles with phosphorus tracer rounds. Tracer rounds glow and leave a faint trail as they go. Helicopters typically scramble if the pilot sees tracer rounds, say, every five rounds. Tracers make it very real. The pilot can literally see the bullets zinging past. Fireworks have also worked. Often, helicopter pilots cannot distinguish fireworks from other, more serious munitions. People have used pen lasers. Lasers are often used for sighting in weapons, so a pilot may assume a missile or rocket of some sort is being aimed. And people have used multiple drones, each with hanging bicycle chains and long strands of barbed wire. If the chain or barbed wire catches the blade or the rotor and gets sucked in, that has wreaked havoc.

Unready

Anarchists often make the argument that they would like to be effective in resistance, would like to actively and directly oppose the existing order, maybe even to include armed violence where it would have a good chance of success... but, they say with regret, they are “unready.”

Just an observation, but everyone lacks skills and expertise until they develop them. Then they have them.

Let me tell you a true story about one guerrilla. He was, sadly, of the hierarch variety. but that's irrelevant to the point to be made here. This guerrilla started out as a lawyer, and he challenged his country's rigged elections. When he lost the challenge, he gathered friends who were just as outraged and they hatched a plot to seize an armory and hand out guns to the poor and oppressed, and take down the corrupt regime.

In the middle of the failed seizure of the armory, this guerrilla and his friends were captured and sent to prison for life. Others bribed the government and this guerrilla was released from prison and sent off into exile.

When he reached the new country he was to call home, he gathered rebels and trained in guerrilla warfare. They sought a boat so they could sail back to their country but all they could find was a yacht. They crammed a hundred guerrillas onto a yacht. They had no room for weapons, so weapons would be waiting for them with other guerrillas when they arrived on the beach. The guerrillas sailed off with great hopes... right into a hurricane. They went days off course. Salt water ruined their refrigeration so their food spoiled. They ran out of water. Their radio failed.

By the time they got back on course, their awaiting comrades had already been arrested and the weapons were confiscated. An ambush awaited the guerrillas on the beach. When the guerrillas finally arrived, hungry and dehydrated, they faced a barrage of enemy fire. In panic, they ran the yacht aground on a sandbar a hundred yards from shore and had to swim into enemy fire.

Survivors ran off into the jungle and got lost. Most gave up the revolution and headed home, disillusioned. It was rainy season.

A farmer on whose land the guerrillas were wandering began gathering these cold, hungry, shivering refugees in his barn. All but twelve had quit, surrendered, or had gotten captured. The remaining twelve had six weapons, one of which was inoperable. They had to decide what to do.

They decided that after all of that abysmal failure, they would wage a guerrilla war against a military of eighty thousand that had the backing of the United States.

Eighteen months later, that guerrilla who had gotten arrested and had sailed a yacht into a hurricane and had wandered hungry and lost through the jungle in the rain became the next president of Cuba.

His name was Fidel Castro.

I get it. Many anarchists feel unready to undertake serious action. Many fear a lack of skills and expertise, and believe they do not have the necessary experience.

So, I have to ask: Could we do worse than Castro? Would we get arrested and sail into hurricanes and beach a yacht and lose all our weapons before we ever even get started? The most incompetent, laughable losers on the planet could gather together and plan a guerrilla campaign to take down the current system and not fuck up as bad as Fidel Castro. And yet, Castro toppled the regime and succeeded it. His righthand man, Ernesto “Che” Guevara became the poster child for revolution everywhere. He still has his face adorning t-shirts.

So, if you say you are “unready,” I say, well, let’s fuck up. It’s better than doing nothing. We can go bumble around and get our faces on some t-shirts.

Block Everything

A few years back, some rebels put out an article on anarchistnews.org entitled, “Block Everything.” It advocated that we all employ the strategy of “blocking,” obstructing roads and highways and all of the arteries of transport, clogging the entire system and creating thousands of disruptions with their own ripple effects. The article reminded me of an event I had seen reported on Toledo news, where hundreds of used shoes had been dumped, perhaps by accident, on a key overpass that led to downtown. The shoe blockage had wreaked absolute havoc on morning rush hour traffic into the city, causing massive bottlenecks.

So, I loved the idea of blocking and knew from that pile of shoes that it could work. And, if all of us do it in our own local communities, it will certainly have an impact. There are so many possibilities, coordinated, uncoordinated, so many kinds of materials, both fun and educational.

Molotovs

Some tips from savage cannibal maniacs on how to make superior Molotov cocktails: Use the heavy vodka bottles and score the outside of it with a flathead screwdriver, gouging a hashtag pattern into the glass.

This helps ensure that the bottle will shatter on impact. Fill the bottle first with Styrofoam peanuts and then pour in gasoline. As the peanuts melt, add more gas and continue mixing. It should create a kind of gelatin, much like napalm.

When that gelatin splatters on something, wiping it only smears it; it won’t put the fire out. Dip the tips of the rags in gasoline and put the other ends down into the bottles.

Veterans

Most veterans went into military service believing a lot of star spangled lies. Many leave the service feeling exploited and disillusioned and used. Some of them seek out some kind of explanation, a social and political viewpoint that gives them a story to be in. More often than not, they end up pulled into the Alt Right, more due to the guns and the acceptance of political violence than the rest of the package.

A comprehensive presentation of a vibrant anarchist direct-action campaign might inspire veterans to flock to it.

Military vets have useful skill sets and they are self-motivating, self-disciplined, and loyal to the team. Problem is, they’ve been on the wrong team.

They have skills and training to bring into the movement and would benefit from the anarchist community and a place to belong, learning a new socialization and relationships. I’m thinking of the collaboration between anarchists, veterans, and Native Americans in resisting pipeline construction on indigenous lands, but with a much more integrated relationship.

Drones

Drones can be useful for a number of applications. Probably, you will think of more and better ideas than the ones I'm presenting.

As already described, drones can be used for harassing helicopters or even potentially taking them down. But they can also be used for reconnaissance, spying on police and enemy forces through cameras attached to the drones.

They can be used for adjusting the aim with potato guns, as spotters can watch in real time and direct the gunner to help hit designated targets.

Creatively, drones can be used to carry ends of cables from one building to another, facilitating movement from rooftop to rooftop. They can be used for deliveries of messages, ammunition, or medical supplies where things are hectic and humans cannot get through.

Drones are an excellent tool. An imagination is even better. A drone and imagination...?

Government and Control

Freedom is the "absence of external regulation." Where I am being regulated, I am not free. So, where you have external regulation, you have an absence of freedom. To "regulate" is to "govern." So, where I am governed, I am not free. Freedom is the absence of government; government is the absence of freedom.

We want a "crisis of control" rather than a "crisis of authority" because we know that those who claim power have no real authority. They're not legitimate. But, they do normally exercise control; they impose their will and maintain the system largely through the cooperation of the population, conditioned and indoctrinated to accept external control. But, with what I have rolled out here, we can make that system of control look more like three monkeys fucking a rolling football.

So, in any increasing mayhem, what opens is a kind of "free space," an ungovernable space in which to operate, one where laws and rules are completely suspended. In such a space, many things otherwise off limits or well-guarded are left completely vulnerable. It is a scenario where the limited forces of the enemy are stretched so thin, so harried, so pinned down as to make them virtually nonexistent everywhere.

Back to Greeneville

Several tribes were party to the Treaty of Greeneville. I bet a quick search online can locate them. Then someone can make that phone call: "Hello? Yeah, I'm calling from the area formerly known as Ohio. Do you guys want your territory back?"

Decolonization

This view of decolonization requires us to take down the institutions and the bulwark, the interconnected systems that maintain colonial domination. We have to take it down like a building demolition so it collapses in its own footprint. We do that by utterly overwhelming one specific, geographic jurisdiction, one that is unprepared for something so radical and so violent and so

catastrophic all happening at once. We create cataclysmic systems failure and in the ungovernable spaces that open, we maximize our impact, making sure the larger colonizer system can never recuperate, can never reconstitute itself.

Everything the colonizer uses is gone.

Everything the colonizer values is gone.

Essentially, at that point, we could say, "Okay, we're done. You can have it back now." We could leave and let them do whatever they want, and they still wouldn't be able to do anything with it. We will have wiped away their world, all of the structures and systems that were the hallmarks of their swivelized existence.

The land would begin retrogression back to wildness.

Tanks and Bombers and Nukes, Oh My

I have heard the objection every time I present visions of resistance. Someone will inevitably say, "They will never let us do that. They have tanks and bombers and nukes. If it comes down to it, they'll roll in with tanks, then bomb us, and if that don't work, they'll drop a nuke on us before they let this happen."

They have tanks and bombers and nukes. They certainly do. And, all things being equal, there is nothing in the application of the laws of our physical world that would prevent the hierarchs from rolling in with tanks or dropping bombs or even launching a nuke. They can do it if they so choose.

But, reasonably, there are factors that greatly mitigate against those in power making such choices.

Probably, the tanks are coming. Probably not bombers or nukes. And the tanks won't do much.

It isn't that those in charge have great regard for human life or that they are too moral or principled to unleash weapons of such magnitude on their own people. They are not. Let's not have any illusions about the ruthless sociopaths at the top of the hierarch food chain. They are puppy killers. But, they want Ohio. They first want to keep possession of it and they second want to get it back once they lose it. They don't want to ruin it. They don't want to destroy it. You no longer have a useful Ohio worth getting back if you roll through it with tanks and blast indiscriminate holes in buildings, or if you carpet-bomb it and lay waste to city blocks or whole swaths of agriculture, or if you launch a nuke and leave the land and water and air radioactive.

Keep in mind, a nuke hitting Ohio would ruin the Great Lakes and ruin the agriculture of the entire Midwest.

The hierarchs will want Ohio back, the same way a landlord seeks the return of an apartment if he can only evict those squatters. The landlord would never demolish the building. Same here.

So, all of those powerful weapons at the disposal of the hierarchs are really off the table. Despite all that scary hardware, they will never resort to such responses. They will realize too late that they lost Ohio, and will realize much too late that there is no Ohio left to get back.

From another standpoint, let's hope I'm wrong. Let's hope they do nuke Ohio. That will do a much quicker job bringing down swivelization than we will.

Twelve Rebels and a Yacht

Let's consider some of the fateful and fatal assumptions of this larger system. As complex and complicated as it is, it requires the millions of us to know and maintain our roles as workers and shoppers and consumers and subjects. It trains and indoctrinates us to remain in our assigned seats, to march in lock step, to work and shop and pay taxes and die. It expects, demands, and requires our cooperation and participation.

The optimum operation of this larger machine is only achieved when all of us are working for it obediently. If a faction withdraws its obedience and its labor, the operation of the machine declines. That decline is in direct relation to the amount of obedience and labor withheld. But, the decline from optimum does not necessarily equate with crisis. The system still functions, maybe even fantastically—just not optimally.

And we're not talking about any kind of active resistance here. We're only talking about those who do not contribute, who withdraw and do not buy in. Generally, the machine is resilient enough to handle a certain quantum of noncontributors. But, logically, there is a certain threshold where even the withdrawal of labor and obedience will begin catastrophic systems failure if left unaddressed.

But, even more, if a small number goes beyond withdrawal and dedicates itself to opposing the system, to attacking it, disrupting it, sabotaging it, and eventually destroying it, even a small fraction of the population can have an inordinate impact. Even small numbers, normally insignificant in the orderly preservation of the system, can be highly significant in the destruction of the system, contributing to starts and stops in production and distribution and consumption, causing small disruptions in the interconnected complexes of control, creating thousands of events that show the glaring inconsistencies between the indoctrination and mythology on the one hand and the stark reality of life in subjugation on the other.

We don't need voting majorities. We don't need mass movements. We don't even need the significant numbers that the liberal privileged white pacifists can bring us. Give me twelve rebels and a yacht. We'll shock the fuckin' world.

We need a small number of rebels too stupid and too stubborn to acknowledge that the vision for which they struggle is utterly impossible to achieve. I'm that stupid. I hope you are too. If so, nothing can stop us.

An Analogy, Part II

Imagine you just bought a brand new computer and pulled all of the components out of their boxes and got everything put together. Now imagine some jackwagon like me asking you, "When this computer eventually fizzles out, what do you think will be the cause?"

It's a ridiculous question. The computer is brand new, first off. But on top of that, there's just no way that anyone can predict what might go wrong with such a complex machine. There are thousands of interrelated components. One thing can go wrong and cause damage to hundreds of other parts, impeding functions until finally something critical to the machine eventually stops working entirely.

The same goes for the hierarch program. It operates optimally only when the millions of components function perfectly. Each small departure from that perfect functioning diminishes, in

small ways, how the larger machine functions. Enough components operating badly or, even worse, operating in direct opposition to the machine, and, over time, what begins as minor glitches becomes a series of catastrophes, and those catastrophes become a crisis. That crisis, if not addressed effectively and swiftly, causes a complete systems failure.

If you want to fix a computer, you need expertise and skills and tools. If you want to destroy it, you randomly yank on wiring. You need no expertise or skills or tools. We all know what to do to bring down swivelization. Just start yanking.

No Other Option, Part IV

What else are we going to do? Now that I've shared the general framework of this vision of resistance, I return to that original question: What else are we going to do?

I ask in genuine sincerity because if anyone else has a better idea, I want to help in any way I can to make that plan work. I want to be part of it.

We have an obligation, each of us, to do everything we possibly can. Our lives hang in the balance. Quite possibly, all life on the planet hangs in the balance. We do not have the luxury of waiting on someone else to act.

Swivelization will not stop of its own volition. Those running its program will not peacefully surrender.

It's up to us to do something.

An Analogy, Part III

An old man was walking down the road when a troop of the king's mounted soldiers came up behind him. Because the road was not very wide, the old man stepped to the side in the snow, leaning on his walking stick as the soldiers passed. The first soldier rode by without looking. So did the second. And the third. The fourth soldier glanced down at the old man and kept on riding. The fifth soldier did too. The sixth nodded at the old man. The gaze of the seventh soldier lingered a bit longer. The eighth soldier pulled on the reins of his horse and paused before continuing. The ninth nearly stopped.

Finally, the tenth and last soldier stopped and asked the old man, "Do you need a ride?"

The old man thought for a moment then asked the soldier, "All of the other men rode by me, so why did you stop?" The soldier pointed at the road behind him and said, "There is nobody else."

It's up to you and me to save the world.

See anyone on the road behind us?

There is nobody else.

Too Dangerous for Ohio

The response of Ohio's prison officials tells me I might just be on the right track. I have to think that their response to my efforts is a good indication that they believe it can take them down.

Consider, shortly after I wrote Part III and it got released as a zine, the FBI dragged me away and tortured me for about a year for my ideas. Then I got sent to the supermax for “leading an anarchist rebellion.” The FBI would accumulate a file numbering more than 4,000 pages. No kidding. And just to give you some context, according to the Freedom of Information Act Office, my file would cost \$40 and would fill three compact discs. That’s roughly the same as the Sex Pistols box set. So, if you have a choice between the two, I would suggest you can’t go wrong with the Sex Pistols.

After supermax, my communications were frequently suspended for as long as years at a time on orders of Trevor Clark, the prison system’s FBI agency liaison, cutting me off from the outside world and silencing me.

They tell me I started the 12 Monkeys and I’m responsible for blastblog.noblogs.org, and that I wrote an article describing how to drop guns into prisons, posted for a while at <https://tinyurl.com/swainarticle>.

I was tossed in the hole at Warren Correctional in 2018 and slated for transfer back to Lucasville. Thing is, prisoners at Lucasville had already contacted prisoners at Warren to warn me that guards at Lucasville had already been discussing their plans to kill me when I arrived, hanging me from a bed sheet in J-block, where there are an unusual number of suicides.

Lucasville has long been the location where prison officials send their critics to be assassinated. The chair of the parole board ordered Timothy “Little Rock” Reed delivered there in 1993 so he could be murdered. When he fled to New Mexico and sought asylum, he proved the plot by prison officials to assassinate him and was granted asylum by the New Mexico Supreme Court.

Once prison officials learned their plot to assassinate me had been publicly exposed, they transferred me back to the supermax instead.

A few months later, in the midst of writing this volume, I was awakened at 4:00 in the morning by unidentified agents in military uniforms who cuffed me and chained me, without packing any of my property, including what I already had written, and they tossed me into a black van. I wasn’t told where I was going.

Nine hours later, I arrived in Virginia. No explanation. No process.

I can be disappeared, state to state, at any time.

If you’re reading this, I found a way to smuggle this notebook out of the prison... and friends found a way to transmit it to a publisher.

I hope you’re reading this. I hope it inspires you.

Columbus Day

This year, Columbus Day is October 14, 2019. Likely, that day, some well-intending folks, probably at least a few of them being liberal privileged whites of the pacifist variety, will gather in Columbus, Ohio. They will protest against the celebration of a war criminal. They will draw some media attention.

Elsewhere, thousands of savage cannibal maniacs will live mundane lives assigned to them, subjugated and exploited, dreaming of being more, of doing more.

Nobody that day will light anything substantial on fire. Nobody will tip over cop cars. They will not be wielding rifles. Statues of Columbus will remain standing. The Statehouse will remain standing. The day after Columbus Day, the stock market will continue its normal operation as

life grinds along. The planet will become more toxic. Roughly 124 species will go extinct. Likely, we won't be one of them. Yet.

But, there will come a year. Maybe not 2021. Maybe not even 2022. But there will come a year that Columbus Day will not be so peaceful, so uneventful. There will be real, open rebellion. Violent rebellion. The kind of rebellion fought like lives depend on it.

Because they do.

Rebellion fought like all life on the planet depends on it. Because it does.

Violence will be focused in the right direction for a change. The right things will blow up and burn down. The mass destruction system will finally begin to grind to a halt.

There will come a year. Maybe not 2020. Maybe not 2021. But rebels will find the urgency, the desperation to fight. With any luck, there will come another year. One no longer assigned some sequential number. There will be no Columbus Day celebration. No such remembrance. Instead people will use weapons of wood and stone to acquire their food. They will wear leather for its durability. They will grind corn on chunks of concrete that once served as some nameless superhighway.

Life will flourish where once there were dead zones. The people will light a fire for cooking the community meal where they will gather and tell their story to the young. In lighting that fire, a small child may tear out this page, a curious thing from a forgotten time, and the flames may make good use of it, consuming it.

If that happens, that means we won.

Anarchist Prisoner Sean Swain is the only child of loving parents retired in New Mexico. He has been held without a legal conviction or sentence since 1991 for the self-defense killing of a court official's relative who broke into Sean's home. In response to his outspoken criticism of their criminal agenda, Ohio prison officials tortured him in 2012. They have fabricated justifications for calling him a terrorist and transferring him illegally to another state, making it impossible for Sean to gain parole.

Sean wrote Opposing Torture, recounting the repression to which he was subjected when exposing the domestic torture program in the US, and cowrote Last Act of the Circus Animals with Travis Washington. He contributes weekly segments to the Final Straw radio show, now on the Channel Zero Network and available to subscribing Pacifica Radio stations. Updates on his struggle for freedom can be found at seanswain.org and on Facebook and Twitter, @swainrocks.

The Anarchist Library
Anti-Copyright



Sean Swain
Ohio
The Truth about Bob's Lanes
2021

OCR'D and formatted via PDF from Little Black Cart

theanarchistlibrary.org