http://www.jsmineset.com/2015/08/06/the-rumblings-of-war/

The Rumblings of War

Dear CIGAs,

Shock of all shocks, the IMF announced the Chinese yuan will not be admitted into the SDR until at least Sept. 2016. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-08-04/imf-says-more-work-needed-before-yuan-reserve-currency-decision What exactly does this mean? I can tell you the gold community is so shell shocked and fearful at this point, it "must be bad for gold", right? Going back a couple of weeks, China announced they had accumulated another 600 tons or so of gold to the near panic of precious metals investors. This announcement would be used as another shot at taking price down because the Chinese "don't like gold as much as we thought". This was the prevailing sentiment.

What I think happened was China played "good boy" with the West and lied about their gold holdings. They announced enough gold to allow them into "the club" but not so much as to "offend" or intimidate anyone in the West. Their announcement was clearly bogus as they are importing 600 tons every three months …and we are to believe it took them six years? China had requested both "publicly and officially" to be included in the SDR. They were publicly humiliated with this move by the IMF. The Chinese are a very proud people, public humiliation would be last on my list of aggressions toward them!

Make no mistake, they will retaliate. I believe just as the IMF did this while China is having market problems and during a period of weakness, China will return the favor to the U.S. …at a very inopportune time for us. When our markets are convulsing, probably this fall, you can expect one of two responses from the Chinese. They will either come public with a true and VERY LARGE number for their gold holdings, or they will threaten to and actually dump some Treasury securities/dollar

holdings…or both! I believe their response will be timed to hit us just as in a boxing match, when we are tired, down or vulnerable …for maximum effect.

Whether you want to believe it or not, the U.S. is in a financial war with nearly the rest of the entire world. To not include a rising China into the SDR makes no sense and is an impossible feat in the long term unless China decides it is not their desire. I see no upside whatsoever to this action. Does it "buy time" and postpone the inevitable? Maybe not. The action of poking the hornets nest may actually accelerate the collapse!

There are other possibilities but looking at the two retaliatory options mentioned above, what could result? First, were China to come clean and "admit" they have 10,000 tons of gold (or MUCH MORE), the yuan would immediately strengthen and move into the dollar's territory as a settlement currency. Markets would quickly do the math and understand if China has this much gold …where oh where did it come from? China could even do an audit publicly and count the bars out in the open surroundings of their Olympic stadium in a "we've shown you ours, now you show us yours" fashion!

The other possibility comes with an "option A or B" for the Fed. If the Chinese decided to sell some of their Treasury holdings, could the Fed sit idly by? Option A, the Fed could let the market absorb the dumped Treasuries and allow interest rates to rise and watch as bond prices crater. This is not much of an option, especially in a world where all prices are generated and created "officially". On the other hand, option B would be FORCED MONETIZATION! The Fed could decide they had to buy any and all Treasuries offered by China. I believe this is exactly what the Fed will decide they MUST do.

Not coincidentally, the Chinese know this. They also understand by using this tactic, they will be forcing the Federal Reserve to create an

"exit door" especially for …and because of them. This is the reverse of the old story, if you owe the bank $1 million they own you, if you owe $1 billion then you own the bank. You see, in this instance the Chinese have a direct lever on our credit markets. It would be bad enough if they could control our interest rates which they certainly can now influence. What makes this really bad is they can FORCE the Fed to either monetize or face the immediate collapse of credit markets and thus all markets. As I mentioned above, the Chinese will not do this until the time is right. The time will "be right" when our markets display weakness. They will smile while doing this and politely (publicly) restore honor and dignity.

Before finishing and as long as we are talking about financial "war", let's briefly look at Russia. The U.S. and NATO are now crossing some very red lines in the sand when it comes to both Ukraine and Syria. Trainings and war games are taking place in western Ukraine while the U.S. is and has authorized airstrikes (with Israeli assistance) against Syria. Mr. Putin has said in no uncertain terms he will not allow the slaughter of Russians in Ukraine. He has also stated numerous times he will not stand by idly should allies Syria or Iran be attacked http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-08-04/russia-ready-send-paratroopers-syria . These are all very real sparks in the dry tinder of current geopolitics.

The question you need to ask yourself is this, do you really believe the current fairy tale pricing of assets, ALL ASSETS will hold during a financial war with China? Or during a real war with Russia? This is not fear mongering, it is what's on our dinner table!

Standing watch,

Bill Holter

—

http://captaincapitalism.blogspot.com/2015/08/how-socialism-makes-women-barren.html

How Socialism Makes Women Barren

Arrogance and cockiness set aside, I would make an awesome dad. I did not forget what it was like to be a child. I know that once I had a child my life would be put on hold and dedicated towards raising "The Spawn of Clarey." I would not brainwash him to be a leftist, a feminist, a rightist or a Christian, but would instead impart upon it logic, empiricism, morality, philosophy, and independence letting it choose its own path in life. And above all else, unlike nearly all my Gen X parental counterparts, I would actually stay at home to raise The Clarey Child instead of outsource it to a government baby sitting farm or "day care" ~~concentration camp~~ facility. It is without a doubt that I would make a great dad.

The irony of course is that this entire discussion is moot since I had a vasectomy 10 years ago. And while the reasons for having a vasectomy was many, the primary one was that I just could not plain support a child, let alone myself. And bringing a child into this world would not only ruin what pathetic finances I had in the past, but would just not be fair to the theoretical Clarey Spawn.

Of course times change and now at the age of 40 I could theoretically afford a child. I work from home, I have a (albeit small) house. And my source of employment is stable (self employment) guaranteeing the income to put food on the table and pay the mortgage. But though this situation is specific to myself the question everybody should be asking as it applies to millions more is

"40?"

Think about it for a second. Biology and nature says I've been ready to have a child for about the past 28 years. Society, tradition, and law says I should have been able to have a child since I was 18. But why, a full 28 years after I'm able to, and 22 years after society says I "should" have children, is it now that I actually COULD have children?

The answer is economics.

I've pointed it out before, but there is a disconnect between human biology and our current political-economic system. Specifically, today's political-economic structure does NOT allow people to breed when nature is telling them they should. I first was MANDATED to go to school till the age of 18. This was largely a pointless exercise in that nobody today will hire a high school graduate, let alone pay one an adequate salary to raise a family on. This then mandated I go to college for an additional 4 years. Of course, this dumped me into a labor market that would be ravaged by the Dotcom crash and I would limp along employment wise eeking out a meager living teaching dance and working security for the next five years. There was hope working in the banking industry, but this hope was quickly dashed as it was so hopelessly corrupt and dysfunctional (not to mention low paying) that the income security needed to raise a child was never there. Throw in the financial crisis, the housing crash, and the Obama economy, and it wasn't until this Earth made 40 orbits around the sun that I would be in a position to support another human being in this world.

Of course, as mentioned before, this discussion is merely academic. But the point I'm making is that our society, economy, educational system, labor market, government, and employers are making it increasingly difficult, if not impossible to PROPERLY raise a family (and by "properly" I mean the 1950's way, not the ghetto culture, Wyoming way where women spread their legs and ask the government to replace the

daddy). And this is sad for it is other humans that is the most important thing in life, and it is usually your spouse and your children that are the most important humans.

Now I can sit here and pontificate arrogantly and cockily because I have no skin in the game. Not only can I "not" have children, I still to this day definitely do not WANT them. But, even with a vasectomy if I wanted to I could still HAVE children. It would require either a direct extraction of sperm from the testes or a reversal of my surgery. But the REAL reason I can take this position is that my sperm does not have an expiration date. My sperm can impregnate any woman from here until I'm dead, carrying on the "great Clarey genetic legacy" if I so chose to.

But the same cannot be said for women.

Naturally, we all know by now that women's eggs have an expiration date. Menopause hits by a certain age, and even then the eggs start to deteriorate in quality post 30-32 running the risk of birth defects etc. We don't need to hammer this point anymore, we are all aware of it. But while women are acutely aware of the tickity tock of their biological clock, what they are completely unaware of is the non-biological side of this formula that is also working against them. Namely the same economic, political, and sociological forces that made it impossible for me to have children until the age of 40. And while that number, 40, may mean nothing to men, it *definitely* means something to women.

After 40, frankly, forget it ladies. It's over. You're not having kids. And if you try, you're gambling not just with your theoretical child's life, but your own. But before you get all angry at me for being the messenger telling you biological truths, you need to look back and ask who and what made it so it was basically impossible for you to have children and raise a family in today's society.

First there was the same mandatory K-12 education I had to take. In all honesty the average education delivered by the K-12 system could be shrunk down easily to K-8, allowing us an addtional 4 years of youth to pursue a career that would support a family. But who do you think is at the core of stretching out this now-economically worthless education to last 13 years?

Republicans?
Tories?
Conservatives?
The Patriarchy?

No, it's your good ***socialist*** friends in the democrat and labor parties who need to ~~live off of your entire childhood~~ mandate you go to school until you're an adult so their main political contributors (teachers unions) have jobs. You're now **18**.

Then there's college. Remember, K-12 education has been so diluted, so dumbed down, NOBODY will hire you. So now you need to spend another 4, more likely 6 years of your youth getting MORE education.

Who predominantly controls academia and benefits from you postponing your life another 4-6 years?

Leftists. You're now ***24***.

Of course, unlike the first "13 years" of your education, you get to pay an egregious price for your last 6 years of education - tuition. And with that comes an inordinate amount of student debt. Certainly you can't start having a family until you pay this off. But complicating this issue is that the economy hasn't been growing this slow since the Great Depression, making good paying jobs scarce, and your student loans a monkey on your back for at least 6 years.

But who told you you needed to go to college? Who pushed you to get a masters? And who told you to vote against those "evil" corporations, rich people, investors, and all those other entities that create those JOBS you'd need to pay off your student loans?

Hmmm...that would be ***leftists***. Congratulations, you're now ***30***.

Now here things are a little different, for while at this age men are FINALLY allowed to start working off their student loans, start a real career, and maybe work up a down payment for a house, women are barraged with propaganda to do something else. Namely, what feminists have been telling them to do for their entire post-pubescent lives - live life, party, you go girl (TM), travel, climb that corporate ladder, have it all, etc., etc., etc.

And so do women starve themselves, live in basements, get out of debt, and start looking for a proper suitor to raise a family with?

Hell no!

NOW it's time to PAAAARTAAAY!!!!!

Let the flirtini's flow, the car payments commence, and the accumulation of shoes begin as you store it all in an overpriced downtown flat you can barely afford! You've EARNED IT GIRLFRIEND!

And so prompted by feminism (not to mention corporate interests of the likes of Vogue, Oprah, etc.) you party another 10 years.

But if I recall correctly aren't Oprah, Jezebel, feminism, and all those writers at all those snarkey cheeky lifestyle magazines are ***leftist?*** Congratulations, you're now ***40*** (but don't worry, you're a "cougar!")

And finally, how can we forget the final nail in your eggs' coffin driven in by feminism? The blatant, bald-faced lie that looks don't matter.

You were GORGEOUS just the way you were girl!
You are BODY POSITIVE!!!!
Big is beautiful!!!
And any man has mommy issues if he doesn't want to sleep with a human oil tanker.
He's also "shallow" and a "jerk."

Of course looks do matter, tremendously, to men. But alas, you wanted to believe sweet lies over harsh truth and lived a lie your entire life, making you not only too old to have children, but physically unable to attract a mate. So super-congratulations! You believed the (again, ***LEFTIST*** ideology of) feminism and have now not only ruined any chance of having a family, but attracting a mate as well.

I could go on, but the larger point I want all women to understand is that it is NOT

The "Patriarchy"
The Republican's "War on Women"
"Lad culture"
"Rape culture"
"White Males" or
"Evil Corporations"

who are ruining your lives.

It's the left.

It is the left who wants to enslave you at a school where you learn nothing till you're 18.
It is the left who mandates you into thinking you need a college education to have any worth in this society.
It is the left that tells you you are oppressed and need to be freed, replacing your family with a career.
It is the left that convinces you to ignore the biological programming and demands of the (necessary) half of humanity needed to bring and raise children in this world.
And it is the left that tells you you need to spend money on stupid crap to have fulfillment in life.

In reality, all they are doing is taking

your money,
your youth,
your vote,
your love,
your family, and
your life

just so they can stay in power and enrich themselves. And once they have sucked as much of your financial and life blood out of you, they will dump your ass into the real world. A world you are WOEFULLY unprepared for, and one you offer nothing of value to.

So please wake up and take the time to identify who your true enemies are. If not, enjoy your masters degree, cats, body-positive "slut walks," and articles about freezing your eggs.

—
http://bastionofliberty.blogspot.com/2015/08/let-it-burn-after-conflagration-then.html

“Let It Burn:” After The Conflagration, Then What?

One of the problems inherent in the decision to reject the *status quo* is the inability to answer the “Then what?” question: “What would come next?” The corollary question is the sting in the tail: “Whatever it proves to be, are you sure you’d find it preferable?”

The number of revolutions that were followed by a state of affairs freedom lovers found preferable is very small. The American Revolution is the one we know most about, and the honeymoon that followed that one wasn’t as long or as blissful as we’ve been led to believe:

Politics, as hopeful men practice it in the world, consists mainly of the delusion that a change in form is a change in substance. The American colonists, when they got rid of the Potsdam tyrant, believed fondly that they were getting rid of oppressive taxes forever and setting up complete liberty. They found almost instantly that taxes were higher than ever, and before many years they were writhing under the Alien and Sedition Acts. – H. L. Mencken

A change in form is not only not the same as a change in substance; it is most often used *to conceal continuity of substance.* In any sort of political system, regardless of its labeling, the substance is power.

The history of revolutions suggests that should the current American system – i.e.. the governmental arrangements of the United States not in Constitutional theory but in actual practice – be swept away, what will arise to replace it stands a very good chance of being at least as intrusive, at least as lawless, and at least as oppressive. These things, after all, are the hallmarks of power.

gs were freer *de facto* than a contemporary American. In theory, those subjects had no rights and little power with which to resist the myrmidons of the State. In practice, the ability of the monarch and his nobles to exercise power over them was limited by a combination of two

factors: the weakness of the intrusive techniques available to them, and a lack of interest. If you'll allow me a somewhat facetious comparison, George III could not control how fast the water streamed through his subjects' shower heads, but at least as important, he didn't care.

The techniques of omnipresent intrusion and control have been greatly elaborated since then. No, there's no meter on your shower head that reports your current rate of water consumption to some level of government. Rather, the EPA, by decreeing regulations with the force of law concerning the *manufacture* of shower heads, has controlled your rate of water usage "at the source." If the busybodies should some day decide that stiffer measures are "necessary" to prevent "waste," similar clamps would be applied to local and regional water distributors. New federal regulations would decree that no household shall be supplied with more than X gallons of water per day. Water meters would be retrofitted with compliance measures. If you doubt the plausibility of this, note that similar changes to the metering of electrical power consumption are already proliferating.

What makes this possible, of course, is the combination of corporate consolidation through tax and regulatory pressure with the advance of regulatory technology. The former was necessary to effectuate the intrusion of the latter. One cannot shackle millions of minuscule, independent, endlessly variable businesses. Better to compel them to coalesce into a far smaller, more manageable number. That was the main effect of the explosion of corporate taxation and regulation that began with the Wilson Administration and became obvious to the public through the New Deal.

Americans today find it next to impossible to live decent, comfortable lives without making use of the goods provided by our Fortune 3000 companies. Those companies are all under the federal

yoke...a yoke their heavily regulated products transfer all but invisibly to us.

The effects discussed above are epiphenomena: system-level consequences of intrusions committed over several decades by assorted busybodies, most of them utterly convinced that they were "doing good." They were probably not intended to bring about the current state of affairs...*at first.* But in any sufficiently large collection of persons, some will be found who consciously seek power over others. Such persons will note a tendency toward consolidation and the concentration of power, and will endeavor to ride it. Those are the persons who dominate our contemporary political class.

Perhaps the idea a man of good will must strain hardest to swallow is that *not everyone is a man of good will* -- that there are others who don't share his conceptions of right and wrong, and are completely numb to the promptings of conscience. Let the population of some nation-state grow large enough, and such persons inevitably appear. They seek power as naturally as any organism seeks food and warmth. The canniest of them become experts in the techniques -- propaganda, dissimulation, scapegoating, the creation of unreasoning fear -- that serve them best in getting it. Robert A. Heinlein put it memorably in his novella "Gulf:"

"Reason is poor propaganda when opposed by the yammering, unceasing lies of shrewd and evil and self-serving men. The little man has no way to judge and the shoddy lies are packaged more attractively. There is no way to offer color to a colorblind man, nor is there any way for us to give the man of imperfect brain the canny skill to distinguish a lie from a truth."

My main point for today is this: Unless what collapses the existing regime also eliminates 98% to 99% of the population of this country, ***such men will still exist, and will strive to continue the substance of***

what came before. There may be a change in form, possibly a quite dramatic one. A change in substance is far less likely.

However firm you may be in your conviction that the *status quo* cannot be repaired by conventional means -- that it simply must fall to make room for something better -- don't root for it. Especially, don't work actively to collapse it in perfect confidence that what follows simply must be superior.

—

http://founderscode.com/smoke-coming-from-the-hillary-server-fire-is-worse/admin/

Smoke Coming From the Hillary Server Fire is Worse

Strip the security clearance from this woman. There are many calling for this exact action and the State Department will not comment if she in fact still has it. At least during this investigation, her clearance should be suspended.

Posted on this site was a timeline and factual information when it comes to the Hillary Servergate affair. A few hours have passed and there of course is more to report.

More factual intrigue is listed below and it is not in any real date order given what and how information is being obtained. This comes as the FBI begins the data and material investigations.

1. Barack Obama drafted and signed a lengthy Executive Order #13526 spelling out the comprehensive conditions of all classified and top secret information. The Democrats and those supporting the Hillary camp in Severgate can NO longer claim restrictive laws are passed AFTER her

term as Secretary of State. Further and quite important, Hillary was ONE of 20 who were designate with authority to apply classified codes to documents making it all the more curious on how she can claim ignorance in top secret or restricted documents.

2, It is now confirmed, the second server in question which held the material involved in Servergate, located in New Jersey and seized by the FBI was stripped of data. The FBI does in fact have the skills to rebuild and retrace all administrative actions in the server.

3, Now another at the core of this investigation is Huma Abedin who was and is Hillary's personal confidant and aide de camp. To date, she has not signed nor turned over as order by Judge Sullivan the certification under penalty of perjury or the email materials which hovers in the range of 7000 communication transmissions.

4. As discussed before, not only was there 3 thumb drives of the Hillary email transaction surrendered to the FBI and 3 servers, but the FBI will likely need to obtain or gain a search warrant for 3 additional communication devices held by Hillary, those being her Blackberry, her iPhone and her iPad.

5. When it comes to the SIGINT or geo-spatial top secret email in question, it appears it was relating to a drone image of terror groups in Pakistan. This speaks to sources and methods such that the top secret designations would have originated with the original transmission of the critic (critical communications).

6. Platte River was NOT an approved facility to house or support classified material. Outside vendors are to be approved in the case of top secret material that have hardened rooms preventing espionage or eavesdropping.

7. There will be more Hillary personnel caught up in the investigation snare and those likely will include Mike Morrell, Deputy Director of the CIA; Phillippe Reines, Hillary's gatekeeper; Jeremy Bash, former Chief of Staff for Leon Panetta; Andrew Shapiro, Hillary's Policy Advisor; and several others now at Beacon Global Strategies, Hillary's personnel policy think tank.

8. The contracted server company, Platte River is now raising deeper questions due in part to a lawsuit and investigation from November 2014. The lawsuit document is found here. They stole phone numbers and metadata from White House military advisors.

The Internet company used by Hillary Clinton to maintain her private server was sued for stealing dozens of phone lines including some which were used by the White House.

Platte River Networks is said to have illegally accessed the master database for all US phone numbers.

It also seized 390 lines in a move that created chaos across the US government.

Among the phone numbers which the company took – which all suddenly stopped working – were lines for White House military support desks, the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy, a lawsuit claims.

Others were the main numbers for major financial institutions, hospitals and the help desk number for T2 Communications, the telecom firm which owned them.

A lawsuit filed on behalf of T2 claims that the mess took 11 days to fix and demands that Platte River pay up $360,000 in compensation.

More to come for sure…..stay tuned.

—

http://americandigest.org/mt-archives/5minute_arguments/only_the_black_flag_will.php

Only the Black Flag Will Bring Our Enemies to Their Senses

Stonewall Jackson and J.E.B. Stuart, 1861:

"Colonel Stuart, if I had my way we would show no quarter to the enemy. No more than the redskins showed your troopers. The black flag, sir.

"If the North triumphs, it is not alone the destruction of our property. It is the prelude to anarchy, infidelity ... ... the loss of free and responsible government. It is the triumph of commerce. The banks, factories.

"We should meet the invader on the verge of just defense... ...and raise the black flag. No quarter to the violators of our homes and firesides. Our political leadership is too timid to face the reality of this coming war. They should look to the Bible. It is full of such wars. Only the black flag will bring the North to its senses and rapidly end the war."

—

http://www.freemansperspective.com/wont-be-fixed/

It's 460 AD in Rome: This Won't Be Fixed

Another American election cycle is upon us, and large numbers of people are lining up to pour their time and money into the sewer of politics, to be lost forever.

This system will ***not*** be fixed. Period. This is Rome in 460 AD. The rulers, as in Rome, are liars, mad, or drunk (these days, drugged)… or all three.

The "fall of Rome," of course, was far more complex than we learned in school, but through all the many years of its decline, Rome was full of well-meaning people trying to reform and save it. And by the way, among the people who tried the hardest to keep the Roman game going were the Goths. They tried hard to keep Rome operational… and they failed too.

Let me be clear on this: Once ruling hierarchies get beyond a certain point, they cannot be reformed. And I am sure that the modern West is beyond that point.

- Do we really believe that central bankers will just lay down their monopolies?
- Can we seriously expect a hundred trillion dollars of debt to be liquidated without any consequences?
- Do we actually believe that politicians will walk away from their power and apologize for abusing us?
- Do we really think that the corporations who own Congress will just give up the game that is enriching them?
- Does anyone seriously believe that the NSA is going to say, "Gee, that Fourth Amendment really is kind of clear, and everything we do violates it… so, everyone here is fired and the last person out will please turn off the lights"?

- And does anyone believe that the military-industrial complex will stop encouraging war, or that corporate media will stop worshiping the state, or that your local sheriff will apologize for training his cops to be vicious beasts?
- Do we really believe that public school systems will ever stop lauding the state that pays all its bills?

I could go on, but I think my point is made: This system will never allow itself to be seriously reformed. Trying to fix this is like trying to revive a long-dead corpse.

The systems that rule the West *will* fail.

Whether the wider Western civilization fails is up to us: *Do we have civilization inside of us? Or was it all just a pattern that we followed?*

A Few Bits of Support

I think an honest look around is all we really need to assess this situation – and I'm really not trying to play the "doomer" here – but a few bits of support seem to be in order. So, I'll start with a quote from a man named Salvian, who lived in the Roman Empire a bit before 460 AD:

> Nobody thought of the state's expenses, nobody thought of the state's losses, because the cost was not felt. The state itself sought how it might squander what it was already scarcely able to acquire. The heaping up of wealth which had already exceeded its limit was overflowing even into trifling matters.

Does this sound vaguely familiar? Salvian continues:

> But what can be said of the present-day situation? That old abundances have gone from us. The resources of former times have gone. We are already poverty-stricken, yet we do not cease to be spendthrift.

Here's another from Salvian:

> The state has fallen upon such evil days that a man cannot be safe unless he is wicked.

With this last passage in mind, please consider Jon Corzine, Lois Lerner, and Hillary Clinton.

Then think about Julian Assange, Edward Snowden, and Chelsea Manning.

Who among these six told the truth? And who among them lied? Which have suffered for their actions? Which have not?

And what of the British elites who seem devoted to chasing underage girls? When do they go to jail?

Shall we really keep pretending that these systems have *anything* to do with righteousness? At some point, doesn't that become embarrassing?

As I've written before, back in the 1960s I was surrounded by well-meaning people who tried very hard to reform the system and to make life better. And now, the very same problems they were devoted to solving are the problems *de jour*: war, poverty, welfare, racism, and police brutality – the very same list!

50 years of their efforts were fully wasted. Shall we really continue the waste? At some point, doesn't patting ourselves on the back for accomplishing nothing become ridiculous?

Even If…

I think it's very important to make this last point clearly:

> *Even if this system doesn't crash for another century, everything done within it is a waste.*

The decent people of Earth deserve better than this barbarity… much better.

Not long ago, with these ideas in mind, I wrote this to a friend:

> It is fully corrupt, from top to bottom, and I don't believe there are any "good guys" inside, waiting for "the right time." It is OVER.
>
> I withdraw. I forsake them. I refuse to waste my energy on their politics. Humanity deserves better and I aim to do my part in building it.
>
> I will shed no tears when this system finally collapses – it will be a liberation.
>
> From here on, I'll build new things and will have nothing to do with the old.

My friend – a good man – agreed.

The good and productive people of this world deserve something better than the abusive dominators that seek to control their every move, and we are more than capable of building it. But we have to stop waiting for permission from the lords of the status quo – they will never give us permission to bypass their domination.

We have to make our own decisions and simply start building something better. We are able, and this system is unworthy of our efforts.

Now would be a very good time to start.

---

http://americandigest.org/mt-archives/iwar/nukes_time_for.php

Hiroshima Day - or- Nukes: Time for a Live Demo [Updated]

Dear LowInfo Citizens, It's been about five SIX *SEVEN* years since this was first proposed. It is still something to keep in mind as you hope for change and a better world via magical thinking. You may not be interested in false hopes, but false hopes are interested in you.... Duck and cover!



A bomb called Licorne. Fired at 18.30 on July 3, 1970, and yielded 914 kilotons (Think "57 Hiroshimas"). Imagine it being fired next door. *Hope* that if it is ever fired, it *is* fired next door.

Seventy years ago : *"On Monday, August 6, 1945, the nuclear weapon Little Boy was dropped on Hiroshima by the crew of the American B-29 bomber Enola Gay, directly killing an estimated 80,000 people. By the end of the year, injury and radiation brought total casualties to*

90,000-140,000. Approximately 69% of the city's buildings were completely destroyed, and 6.6% severely damaged." - Hiroshima

"Little Boy," the aptly named 16 kiloton bomb that took out Hiroshima, was -- in comparison to the nuclear devices in the world's arsenals -- sort of a light field artillery shell. There was, at the time, a second bomb called "Fat Man." Weighing in at 21 kilotons it would put paid to Nagasaki on August 9, 1945. With the erasure of Nagasaki, the world was fresh out of nuclear weapons. It was only a temporary lapse. Today we've got about 25,000 of these little items of discipline scattered about.

The largest nuclear bomb ever detonated in the atmosphere was The Soviet Tsar Bomba , or "Big Ivan" which at 50 *Megatons* was very harmful to every living think on Novaya Zemlya Island (located above the arctic circle in the Arctic Sea) in October of 1971. Whatever else you might think about them, you can't deny those Soviets dreamed BIG dreams.

No matter what our political feelings, I believe we can all agree that the world is getting just a wee bit too hot for comfort these days, and I don't mean "Global Warming." I mean that people here and there about the globe are getting just a wee bit too hot under the collar. They seem to have forgotten just exactly what comes into play like the force of gravity when whole nations or peoples get really ticked off. Time to refresh our collective memories.

I think we need to have the people of the world focus like a laser on the table stakes of going beyond these little patty-cake wars we are currently diddling around with and look, really look, at what can actually happen with one little slip.

What we need to do this is: "The Live Demo." By this I mean we need to find a small island or deserted space somewhere on the planet and

sacrifice it for the greater good by setting off one, just one, low-yield thermonuclear device in the atmosphere for all the world to see.

Think of "The Live Demo" as a remedial educational moment for the entire world; a kind of slap upside the head coupled with a large shout out of: "PAY ATTENTION!"

I believe this "Live Demo" needs to be announced -- in date, time, and place -- to the entire world with something approaching the intensity of the promotion dumped on the Beijing Olympics.

I believe that we should allow any media organization that wishes to to cover this event and provide the infrastructure necessary to film and broadcast it (from a safe distance) to the entire world in all media -- live. I believe we should re-task a satellite to give us a view of the event from space.

No matter what many may think, this event would be the essence of "appointment television" for the people of the world.

I think we should also construct some of those quaint suburbs, villages, and towns that were set up in the ancient Nevada tests to demonstrate just what happens to a family sitting down for an evening snack when the sun is brought -- for one brief shining moment -- to the surface of the Earth. (Those of you who saw the opening scenes of Indiana Jones and the Crystal Skull probably got some laughs out of this stuff, but it is not really a laughing matter, is it?)

I know that there will be an army of Environmentalists around the world that will bitch and moan about the "harm to the environment" from setting off a single nuclear device in the atmosphere. Those same people need to contemplate instead the "harm to the environment" that comes from setting off several hundred or several thousand of these devices in

one very bad afternoon. They need to, for one brief and shining moment, **sit down and shut up!**

Then there will be those who will carp about "The Test Ban Treaty." They need to take a chill pill, lie down and think of England... or Cleveland... or Tel Aviv... or Tehran.

I can assure you that having the entire world tune in for "The Live Demo" -- and the whole world *will* tune in -- shall give the entire planet pause. It's not enough for humans to be told about nukes. Every so often, we need to see to believe.

Let's touch off a nuke for world peace next year on August 6. It will be a fitting memorial to Hiroshima. Nothing else we can do will have quite the same... impact.

Lest we forget: Here's 10 minutes about the first "live demo" on a city.

I would imagine that if you repeated those grisly facts to most of the people of the world today they'd express either some polite sadness, a bit of political high dudgeon, or the classic contemporary rejoinder, "Whatever." It's not that they don't know or care, but that -- for the vast majority of the population of the world -- they simply *cannot imagine* a Hiroshima.

It has been 65 years since the incineration of a city in a second, and we've lost any sense of exactly what happens. The images only survive in black and white films of a long-ago era, films of before (a city) and after (rubble and ash). In black and white images blood is the color of shadows and that's what we have, as a race, of memories about what these weapons can do -- shadows of victims seared into stone at the moment of the blast; the moment the Sun was allow to bloom on the surface of the Earth.

---

http://bastionofliberty.blogspot.com/2015/08/let-it-burn-after-conflagration-then.html

"Let It Burn:" After The Conflagration, Then What?

One of the problems inherent in the decision to reject the *status quo* is the inability to answer the "Then what?" question: "What would come next?" The corollary question is the sting in the tail: "Whatever it proves to be, are you sure you'd find it preferable?"

The number of revolutions that were followed by a state of affairs freedom lovers found preferable is very small. The American Revolution is the one we know most about, and the honeymoon that followed that one wasn't as long or as blissful as we've been led to believe:

Politics, as hopeful men practice it in the world, consists mainly of the delusion that a change in form is a change in substance. The American colonists, when they got rid of the Potsdam tyrant, believed fondly that they were getting rid of oppressive taxes forever and setting up complete liberty. They found almost instantly that taxes were higher than ever, and before many years they were writhing under the Alien and Sedition Acts. – H. L. Mencken

A change in form is not only not the same as a change in substance; it is most often used *to conceal continuity of substance.* In any sort of political system, regardless of its labeling, the substance is power.

The history of revolutions suggests that should the current American system – i.e.. the governmental arrangements of the United States not in Constitutional theory but in actual practice – be swept away, what will arise to replace it stands a very good chance of being at

least as intrusive, at least as lawless, and at least as oppressive. These things, after all, are the hallmarks of power.

There's a good case to be made that the subjects of medieval kings were freer *de facto* than a contemporary American. In theory, those subjects had no rights and little power with which to resist the myrmidons of the State. In practice, the ability of the monarch and his nobles to exercise power over them was limited by a combination of two factors: the weakness of the intrusive techniques available to them, and a lack of interest. If you'll allow me a somewhat facetious comparison, George III could not control how fast the water streamed through his subjects' shower heads, but at least as important, he didn't care.

The techniques of omnipresent intrusion and control have been greatly elaborated since then. No, there's no meter on your shower head that reports your current rate of water consumption to some level of government. Rather, the EPA, by decreeing regulations with the force of law concerning the *manufacture* of shower heads, has controlled your rate of water usage "at the source." If the busybodies should some day decide that stiffer measures are "necessary" to prevent "waste," similar clamps would be applied to local and regional water distributors. New federal regulations would decree that no household shall be supplied with more than X gallons of water per day. Water meters would be retrofitted with compliance measures. If you doubt the plausibility of this, note that similar changes to the metering of electrical power consumption are already proliferating.

What makes this possible, of course, is the combination of corporate consolidation through tax and regulatory pressure with the advance of regulatory technology. The former was necessary to effectuate the intrusion of the latter. One cannot shackle millions of minuscule, independent, endlessly variable businesses. Better to compel

them to coalesce into a far smaller, more manageable number. That was the main effect of the explosion of corporate taxation and regulation that began with the Wilson Administration and became obvious to the public through the New Deal.

Americans today find it next to impossible to live decent, comfortable lives without making use of the goods provided by our Fortune 3000 companies. Those companies are all under the federal yoke...a yoke their heavily regulated products transfer all but invisibly to us.

The effects discussed above are epiphenomena: system-level consequences of intrusions committed over several decades by assorted busybodies, most of them utterly convinced that they were "doing good." They were probably not intended to bring about the current state of affairs...*at first.* But in any sufficiently large collection of persons, some will be found who consciously seek power over others. Such persons will note a tendency toward consolidation and the concentration of power, and will endeavor to ride it. Those are the persons who dominate our contemporary political class.

Perhaps the idea a man of good will must strain hardest to swallow is that *not everyone is a man of good will* -- that there are others who don't share his conceptions of right and wrong, and are completely numb to the promptings of conscience. Let the population of some nation-state grow large enough, and such persons inevitably appear. They seek power as naturally as any organism seeks food and warmth. The canniest of them become experts in the techniques -- propaganda, dissimulation, scapegoating, the creation of unreasoning fear -- that serve them best in getting it. Robert A. Heinlein put it memorably in his novella "Gulf:"

"Reason is poor propaganda when opposed by the yammering, unceasing lies of shrewd and evil and self-serving men. The little man

has no way to judge and the shoddy lies are packaged more attractively. There is no way to offer color to a colorblind man, nor is there any way for us to give the man of imperfect brain the canny skill to distinguish a lie from a truth."

My main point for today is this: Unless what collapses the existing regime also eliminates 98% to 99% of the population of this country, ***such men will still exist, and will strive to continue the substance of what came before.*** There may be a change in form, possibly a quite dramatic one. A change in substance is far less likely.

However firm you may be in your conviction that the *status quo* cannot be repaired by conventional means -- that it simply must fall to make room for something better -- don't root for it. Especially, don't work actively to collapse it in perfect confidence that what follows simply must be superior.