

I've thought about culture, along with religion, how it affects the lives of others and self defense, with some bonuses. This is all just my opinion, not much more than that. Come back soon for updates (perhaps every week or 2). And if you can, please leave a comment. Note: I do NOT intend to be racist or hateful in any way. I am just stating the facts and my thoughts as is. If you are easily offended and/or sensitive, then you might not want to read this. By the way, if something looks incomplete, it means that I'm probably doing work on this.

I had an old south Asian (probably Indian) friend at school (let's call her Mary S. to protect the actual person's privacy and real name), and she was very beautiful. However, a friend of mine claimed that either her mother or both of her parents banned her from being around males for religious reasons, which probably explains why she doesn't think girls and boys should play close contact sports (and so, it is possible that she's a Muslim, (though I am now more willing to bet Catholic because captions to a picture on their social media profile says "T--a's First Holy Communion", probably being her sister. And when I saw her at school, she was wearing a Christian cross. So she might be using the word "religion" in place of "culture", and then again, I'm sure that Indian, Bangladeshi, Pakistani or Sri Lankan Catholics are going to be different from, say, Latin American, black or white American or European Catholics, and I am slightly more familiar to the latter 2.) as that I don't know any other religion that makes it taboo for males and females to be together). I will NOT say Mr. and/or Mrs. S. are fundamentalist idiots who are so religiously obsessed they can't tell the difference between religion and real life (as that I don't know them), but I definitely believe that it is wrong to teach her to be mentally weak. And, if they think the rule will protect her, I would say that it's totally absurd. In fact, I have my own term for feeling unsafe then only feeling safer when it actually has little to no effect: paranoid sense of security (that means that you feel insecure and endangered yet a simple rule automatically makes you feel better). In my view, if they really want to protect their daughter, they should've taught her self defense, though I would NOT suggest to issue her a weapon (such as a pocket gun or derringer) until she develops mental strength (the reason is explained on [Gun Grips Episode 18: The Psychology of Gun Ownership](#), [Gun Grips Episode 39: "The Survival Mentality"](#) and [Carrying A Gun Will Get You Killed](#)).

If Mary's parents really worried about their daughter getting harmed, then what should they do? Go buy a Marauder armored personnel carrier as the main family car, and have a armored suv (filled with survival related items) stashed in the garage just in case (though as you can see in a scene from the movie "Heat", armored cars aren't invincible). Or, worse, lock her up in a bunker for eternity. In my view, the latter strategy would be counterproductive as that Mary's life would get ruined and her health wouldn't also be real sharp (Vitamin D deficiency, lack of activity and extreme boredom is just the start). So, I would suggest to let her take a risk or two and decide for herself rather or not she wants to hang out with others.

So better yet, after she gets some self defense training, give her a pocket pistol (such as a 25 NAA "Guardian" or Seecamp .380), a mini revolver (such as a NAA "Mini master magnum" with folding grip and 4 inch barrel, specifically in the ["NAA-BW-C"](#) configuration) or derringer (such as a [Bond arms derringer](#), or if she could handle this, though practicality is doubtful and I personally don't recommend this, [a M-4 Alaskan survival](#) derringer).

For home alone defense, until she grows into something more upscale such as an M-16/AR-15, Galil ACE, Fostech Origin-12, AA-12, etc, I would give her an M1 carbine and Remington 11-87 youth (if possible, a Mossberg 500 with metal trigger group and a "youth" stock).

I wonder if Mary's parents also have the "all or nothing" mentality. For example, if I suggest that they teach Mary self defense and perhaps giving her a weapon, they may be like "unless she's wearing an EOD bomb suit and dual wielding miniguns, teaching her self defense is not worth it", which is like saying "unless you eat healthy every single time you eat, you might as well eat unhealthy like a hog 'cuz what do you got to lose?".

I hope that parents would teach their kids self defense more often, and that people stop using easy solutions because they're easy as opposed to being the best.

Also, if Mary's parents come to me and ask what weapons they should start training with and carry when out with their daughter, and what their "non-crisis/emergency" setup is when out and about (when doing activities outside of home), and this is assuming that they are willing to go to the FULLEST extent without being overt. And please note, I am NOT a self defense instructor, so don't blame me if you take my idea into real life.

I would suggest wearing concealed body armor with rifle plates in the front and back as non-crisis/emergency body armor.

For the sidearm to put into a fanny pack, I would recommend carrying a FN Five-Seven, or better yet, a Glock 20 (for ammunition availability, power, customizability, simplicity and reliability) with either a 9x25mm Dillon or .460 Rowland barrel in it, and I recommend the former because of its lower recoil and (presumably) longer range (be sure to carry barrels in more common calibers because the 2 that I mentioned are proprietary and rare). I would not recommend carrying a Desert Eagle because if .357 Sig replicates the performance of .357 magnum, then 9x25mm Dillon would be even better, and .460 Rowland rivals a .44 magnum, so why carry a gun that holds only 8 or 9 shots when you can carry one with 20 or 30 shots that is not only just as if not more powerful than the other but fits the hand better, can be converted to use more common ammunition, simpler, more reliable and overall more practical? I would not recommend carrying .50 AI because it is more than what you need for self defense, and thus, has very high recoil, coupled with a limited 7 shot magazine. And I would definitely skip the S&W 500 for the same reasons AND holding only 5 shots. But, if you live in an area with a LOT of dangerous animals (such as Lions, Tigers, Bears etc) OR VERY ANGRY men, then I may recommend [following in Dirty Harry's footsteps](#) and carry heavy caliber handguns. Like what FPSRussia said on [GOLD DESERT EAGLE 50 CAL](#), "I don't know what you would do with this normally maybe you shoot a bear with it, or... a very angry man".

For a "backpack long gun", I would recommend carrying a Mossberg 590 with folding stock and short barrel or a Kel-Tec, or better yet, a Kel-Tec SU-16C. I recommend the SU-16C because not only could you fold it up and have it be civilian legal without doing any paperwork or filling out tax stamps (like you would with a short barreled rifle, for example), but also, a 16 inch barrel is much better than, say, a 9 inch barrel found on compact carbines because it provides longer range and more accuracy. Plus, since the SU-16 takes regular STANAG (M-16/AR-15/M4) magazines, which are common in North America and are not proprietary. I would recommend having the 1st magazine be a 20 round magazine, and the rest be 60 or 100 round SureFire

magazines, which is plenty of firepower. I would not recommend going for a compact PTR-91 or SA58 simply because their barrels are too short, recoil is too heavy, magazines are rarer and thus are less practical.

For what to store in their Ford Excursion or Chevrolet Suburban (assuming that they drive one), I would recommend heavier body armor, food, medical supplies, weapons ammunition, and so on and so forth.

If they are willing to be overt, then their loadout could be more extreme. And just as a disclaimer, I do NOT recommend this because it is simply too much. I am a middle school student, not a professional military or self defense instructor.

For body armor, if you wouldn't get Dragon skin, then get AR500 body armor (like what you see on <http://www.ar500armor.com/banshee-plate-carrier-and-armor-advanced-loadout.html>), complete it with groin and biceps protectors like you see on [http://www.bulletproofme.com/TACTICAL\\_Body\\_Armor.shtml](http://www.bulletproofme.com/TACTICAL_Body_Armor.shtml) , and complete the rest of the suit with forearm protectors and ballistic leggings with steel toed boots. For the helmet, either wear a helmet with gas mask or a Batlskin helmet with the mandible protector, and under it, a ski mask with ballistic glasses. Wear a military NBC suit under the armor and wear steel toed boots for footwear.

For the main weapon, if a Minigun cannot be obtained, then carry a Fostech Origin-12 with 30 round drum, or better yet, a ARAK-31 and a 100 round Beta drum, or perhaps a MGI Hydra with .50 Beowulf upper (I recommend sticking to the SCAR-H).

For sidearms, if a MP7 or Modern Sub Machine Carbine could not be obtained, then go with a Kel-Tec PLR-16 or SAM-7K "pistol". For spare guns, go with a customized Glock 20 with a 9x25mm Dillon or .460 Rowland and put in 30 round magazines or a FN Five-Seven with 30 round magazines.

To be honest, this is about as heavy as (I think) is civilian legal in the United states.

But here's the critique; aside from what you could read on

[http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/explainer/2010/10/why\\_dont\\_soldiers\\_wear\\_bulletproof\\_face\\_masks.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/explainer/2010/10/why_dont_soldiers_wear_bulletproof_face_masks.html), and

<https://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20130209154313AAJbHvg>, intermediate cartridges (such as 7.62x39 and .223/5.56X45mm) can penetrate ballistic leggings. Full sized rifle cartridges (such as .308 or 7.62x54r) will punch right through the helmet. Also, if you are seen in public like this, chances are, you would probably have (\*gulp\*) S.W.A.T. and/or the National Guard called on you, and things would go south from there.

But, before Mary's parents would do that, I'll ask them; "If you are essentially going to be a living tank just to protect your kids (at least your daughter), then why did you even bring them into a world that you, at least presumably, fear so much? I know that you want to protect your kids, yet you are acting like that some really evil person is out to get them if you are equipped like that".

Sometime I'll rant about overly strict parents. This probably wouldn't come in a long time (I don't manage time like I should).

Here are my thoughts on the [militarization of law enforcement](#); I am willing to bet that a lot of people would be shocked at this (especially from someone who is so strongly pro self defense and right to keep and bear arms and pro limited government involvement in personal issues), but I am ([conditionally](#) and [for the most part](#)) , pro law enforcement militarization. Yes, I know that [the powers that be](#) would like to militarize law enforcement so they can come under control (directly or indirectly) and do the dirty work of bigshots and the “haves” to rule over average people and the “have nots”. Yet, there are more reasons than what is explained in articles such as “[Law Enforcement Militarization](#)”, “[Police militarization necessary for law enforcement](#)”, and “[Police militarization and one cop's humble opinion](#)”.

My reasons, for the most part, hinge on 4 main things; saving taxpayer’s money, the lack of preparedness of civilians (especially ethnic and/or religious minorities), the threats currently faced by the west, and the question of “Why have equipment and tools that are less effective at the job?”. I am not trying to suggest or actively advocate this, just my personal opinions.

Reason #1; what is the military supposed to do with used but still functional equipment other than scrapping it or selling to private individuals or groups? How about handing some over to law enforcement agencies that need them?

For example, a new Lenco BearCat, depending on its version, options and so on, would set you back anywhere from [188.793-300.000](#) U.S. dollars. But a used MRAP, in comparison, is already paid for, and you only need to pay for things such as [modifications/upgrades](#), maintenance and so on. Along with this, a military surplus M4 carbine or M16 rifle is already paid for, while a new M4 would cost about [700 U.S. dollars](#), and a M16 perhaps a little bit more and so on.

Reason #2; lack of civilian preparedness. How many people you know are hardcore preppers who do their absolute best to be prepared for all survival situations that they could possibly prepare for (something comparable to “Doomsday preppers”)? Especially ethnic or religious minorities (especially Orientals/Asians), who often are, unfortunately, even less into crisis prepping than everyone else? In fact, I am concerned over the survival of minorities if there ever was a crisis, and most extreme cases are in Australia and in most of Europe (except for Switzerland) and so on where weapon laws on civilians are strict. What if some bad scenario happens where the powers that be now are going to directly and openly control populations by force, and military/law enforcement obeys, and/or foreign troops come in and obeys or something (I know this sounds like I am contradicting myself a little bit, but I am just trying to give you an idea)? How are they initially going to resist?

Fortunately, while this trend is changing, a majority of American firearms owners are still [white males who live in the south](#). If I had my way, I would arm everyone except for those with a violent history and exempt those who are mentally too impaired to use a weapon (for example, a combat veteran who does not want to touch a weapon again due to psychological damage or something in that matter).

Reason #3; threats currently faced by the west. With the rise of religious militarism (like ISIS) and, as long as the west (or at least the U.S.) has a heavy presence in the middle east, there is going to be attacks against the west. We can only wonder when these attacks stop being bombings, sabotage, or lightly armed shooters and evolve in heavily armed shooters and/or large groups engaging in direct combat. You can’t just wait for the national guard; as far as I

know, the National guard is often quite a way's away, and the killings can be over and done with and the attackers could get away and possibly launch more terror attacks against civilians. A SWAT team, by comparison, can be just minutes away and respond to the threat quicker.

I'd also like to add that in the aftermath of incidents such as the North Hollywood shootout not too many people complained when a SWAT team came in and fought the 2nd suspect, Emil Matasareanu (I think Larry Phillips jr was already dead when SWAT was close in enough to deal with him) and put him down, thus ending the conflict.

Reason #4; why would anyone whatsoever want equipment that is less effective for the job? For example, let's say that there is an active shooter, and law enforcement is coming in to stop him/her and evacuate civilians. What do you think is better for this job? A soft skinned van or box truck or an MRAP or armored cargo truck borrowed from a armored car company? No brainer, isn't it?

Or how about an active shooter wearing body armor that is handgun and shotgun rated and perhaps in carrying a rifle as well? What do you think would be better for the responder to carry to the fight? A shotgun or a rifle? Easy answer, isn't it?

Here is my response to [Teenage Romance Forbidden in Chinese Schools | China Uncensored](#) ; I totally disagree with forced separation of genders and such control over what students can and cannot do. And you cannot interact with each other at all? I just do not see how gender segregation and having students be separated by force helps (though I have no problem with voluntary, or willful segregation if it is necessary).

When it comes to how mixing genders made me feel, I have a positive feeling and experience. I do have friends of the opposite gender, and I just consider it more or less a good thing.

Some people may end up talking about teen pregnancy and STD's, which is something (at least almost) all of us dislike. Yes, I know the risks of those. But isn't there an alternative to keeping kids isolated from the other gender 24/7!? I'm sure there is.

I'd also like to add how Japanese culture affected their weapons development and the outcome of World War 2. As explained on on

[https://www.youtube.com/results?search\\_query=Japanese+guns+of+world+war+2](https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=Japanese+guns+of+world+war+2) , the Japanese, unlike the Americans, were not deeply into firearms, and were playing technological and industrial catch-up with Europe and North America. The way I'm thinking is that, if the Japanese cared about what troops carry into battle more, they could've at least hold out longer. To give you an idea, just think, what if things were different? Imagine the following in ALTERNATE HISTORY; if the Japanese troops' firearms were vz. 58 V and/or Type 81-1 assault rifles (with 40 round magazines or 100 round drums), [M-14E2](#)/BM59 Mark III or perhaps FN-FAL or SIG 510-4 battle rifles, M2A1 Browning machine guns, M1917A1 Browning machine guns, PM-63 RAK or UZI submachine guns/machine pistols, and PKM machine guns. If their armored vehicles were things like M3 halftracks, King Tiger and T-34-85M tanks (with TK-D and TKS (the latter equipped with a 20mm autocannon) tankettes and the British "Universal Carrier" fitted with 3 inch mortars, sometimes flamethrowers for particular use by airborne units). If they used self propelled artillery guns such as the ISU-152M, Jagdtiger and Sturmtiger. If their light trucks were M-718 and M151A2 MUTT Jeeps (and maybe UAZ-469's and the UAZ-452 series), and the



International Harvester R-100 (or better yet, Mercury M-350, or GMC Advance design 3800 pickups). If their medium and heavy trucks were the M55A2 and M246A2's. And their helicopter being the Bell H-13.

While I do not mean to attack Japanese people or Japanese culture, I'm just saying that this is barely touching the surface of how culture can really shape history (yes, I know some of the vehicles I mentioned were anachronistic. I just mentioned them because I thought that they could've been produced with the technology of the time).

I'd like to mention another way culture can have an effect on things, and the 9 alignments (you can read about it on [THE 9 CHARACTER ALIGNMENTS](#) ). From what I have seen and heard, people in cultures that are particularly religious and where people care about things such as honor codes, and are deemed "Lawful" (in places such as Japan) handle things differently than cultures that are not as religious, and more individualistic and free spirited, and are deemed "Chaotic" (such as the United States). It is not that I mean to bash any culture(s), it is just what I think.

A HUGE pet peeve I have with certain cultures is the resistance to change. For example, as you can read on [Women's rights in Saudi Arabia](#) , believe it or not, a lot of (religiously and socially) conservative Saudi women "do not support loosening traditional gender roles and restrictions, on the grounds that Saudi Arabia is the closest thing to an "ideal and pure Islamic nation," and under threat from "imported Western values"". While I have no problem with choosing to live a certain lifestyle, it should be a CHOICE, and should not be forced. In their view (especially them being female), it is deemed okay to keep the things pretty much like they are now. In my view, growing up in the United States and not being in a religious family, it is outright asinine (if force is used to keep things the way they are). And in my opinion, if they WANT to live that lifestyle, it is fine. But if they don't, then it is wrong because I just do not believe in forcing your way of life onto others.

Another part of certain cultures that I have disdain for is discrimination based on gender, especially in places such as India, China, and parts of the middle east, along with (in certain parts of) Islamic culture. For example, as you can read on [Women in India](#) (and in [Women in Hinduism](#) ), females are not treated very well. They face a whole bunch of junk that I will not even begin to describe, though one issue I will highlight is rape. You can read the issue yourself, though one specific pet peeve I have is what they give females for self defense; which if you do some research, are often only (kitchen) knives and chili peppers. I mean, what the heck are these people thinking!? If they cannot fix culture, then at least they can issue females more effective weapons, such as firearms. If India's government were more open to civilian weapon ownership and had people go through some good self defense courses, maybe the occurrence rape won't be so bad as it was. You can read up on how a while back in Orlando, Florida, there were a lot of crimes against women going on, and in response, many started getting weapons and learning how to use them. From what I've read, they did not face so much junk anymore. Is this a coincidence? I think not. So, at least currently, I would recommend places such as India to arm people better and train people in not only self defense but also in other (related) things such

as solving conflict nonviolently and de-escalating situations. Heck, if I had my way, I might even issue females shotguns, machine pistols and more and see how that turns out.

And I wonder what the reaction in places such as India are going to be if, say, a armored transport security company with mostly female employees drove vehicles that looked something like

[http://www.carcabin.com/luxury-freightliner-pictures/armoredcarssale.com\\*vehicledata\\*freightliner\\*s2\\*f1092\\*armored-swat-vehicle-1\\_1280x960-073215.jpg/](http://www.carcabin.com/luxury-freightliner-pictures/armoredcarssale.com*vehicledata*freightliner*s2*f1092*armored-swat-vehicle-1_1280x960-073215.jpg/) and

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/58151595@N06/6144502251/> on duty while driving vehicles that look like <http://sportchassis.com/p4-xl/exterior> and

<http://manonthemove.com/2011/08/29/armoured-absurd-ford-excursion-hollywood-florida/> while off duty (or maybe doing security work). I'm sure misogynists would hate that.

Another specific pet peeve I have is [Victim blaming](#) . I again will barely even get deep into this with the exception of talking about punishing the victim. There are places on earth where females are blamed for the crimes of males. One example is the case of [Nazanin Fatehi](#), where she killed her predator (a rapist), and got punished for it. In my opinion, if someone is going to harm your body, it is right for you to resist, and if necessary, kill them.

But, there is some grey area in this. For example, let's say that you live in an area where it is customary to undergo ritual body modification, often against the will of the participants. You are brought up, and whatever weird thing that they can come up with is done to you. In your possession, is a firearm (preferably something you can conceal, such as a Ruger LCR or S&W Model 640), and you must now decide rather or not to use force. Yeah, sure, you are about to undergo an unpleasant and probably even painful experience (for little to no practical reason), and some would say it is justifiable to use force, and understandably so. Just remember not only the legality involved but also how morally and ethically questionable it would be to put a bullet through another human being when all are they going to do to you is cut part of your you know what.

Anyways, sadly, this practice has went on for a LONG time, and you can even look up how Medusa (from Greek mythology) ended up the way she did.

When it comes to [Women in China: Population control](#) , I simply view it as messed up to put most to all of the pressure on one gender but not the other (in China's One-child policy, females are put under more pressure than males and males are preferred a lot more than females).

When it comes to [Honor killings](#) , I have this to say; I think this practice is F---ING F----ED up. In my view, punishing someone by killing them for actions that almost never, if not, NEVER should count as a crime, let alone warrant a death sentence, is one of the most ridiculous ideas I've ever heard. What practical benefit do we gain from this? How did it even originate? Who came up with such a way of dealing with what originated as small issues?

One culture that I also have big pet peeves with is, believe or not, American culture. I'll barely get into the left/right paradigm. I'll get into arrogance, ignorance and outright stupidity later. But what I will get into is how some of us are seen as "bloodthirsty", and "think that an enemy is needed" and all of that jazz.

I'll date this back to the [USS Maine explosion](#). In a nutshell, a American ship exploded, and the Spanish, who were rivaled with Americans at the time, were blamed, and we went to war. Interestingly enough, it could've been as simple as a boiler explosion. If a steam engine is not properly maintained, it can detonate from too much pressure and/or heat. This was probably known back in the day of steam locomotives. But, for reasons that you should research yourself, the Spanish were blamed.

Fast forward to more modern times, I suggest you read [Israel's Racism Breeds Hateful Atmosphere for American Muslims](#). This makes me concerned, which is explained on [A warning to today's people \(especially Muslims\)](#).

When it comes to the stereotypical arrogance, ignorance and outright stupidity that fellow Americans seem to have. I'll start with overall knowledge; I cannot flipping believe a kid knows more about things like weapons and weapon laws than grown adults. It is absolutely aggravating that, for years now, mainstream media people have been calling semi automatic rifles that look too much like real military/law enforcement assault rifles even though they do not function like the "real deal" and sometimes don't even interchange all mechanical parts nor are they easily convertible to fully automatic (as in the case of a 1981 BATFE ruling on machine gun parts, and post 1993 AR-15 bolt carriers). A lot of people also want to restrict these so-called "assault weapons" for private possession or ownership by civilians (which is rather incoherent for reasons explained on [Connecticut Shootings What No One Dares Say](#)), but seem to not notice the fact that most assault weapon features are cosmetic, and that the only feature that can be considered to be the "game changer" may be magazine capacity or how fast magazines can be changed, the former of which is highly disputed.

Another area of blatant American ignorance is the knowledge about other cultures. For example, at school, I've heard classmates call headscarves "burqas". And a lot of anti-Muslim people want to ban the hijab, which I feel is hilarious considering that Sabains, or, more closely, some orthodox Christian females wear headscarves which look very similar in style to the Islamic hijab. I mean, what the heck is going to happen? A group of so called "Christians" attack a group of females wearing what looks like hijabs, only to find out that they attacked orthodox Christians (then again, most, if not, all of the people that hate on the hijab are not orthodox Christians). And I actually mention this issue in my [World revolution & war stories](#) (though you must go to <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/420171840211814419/> ). There is also a bunch of ignorance surrounding groups like Haredi Jews, and I can think of the same scenario involving them (so much for the chosen people, eh?).

The issue of the American mentality is touched upon [Zionism. The State of Israel & the Rise of Antisemitism](#), [Fake Skeptics & The "Conspiracy Theorist" Slur](#) and [Calling Out FAKE Liberals](#).

Yet another specific issue I have are stereotypical American liberal's seemingly shocking, and sometimes, blind loyalty to the United States government, even when they OPENLY KNOW that the government that they live under are doing morally/ethically questionable things (like being brought out and working for corporations and mistreating civilians). I do not know why this is the case, though I have a feeling that they are, for some reason, mentally weak in some areas.

But I will say that I view it as absolutely preposterous to stand with an institution that has killed and opposed so many people and to take serious action against or even question that institution is somehow morally wrong. And as if calling something "treason" means a difference in the real



world, and as if it only applies to the people, not those who oppress the people. In short, I HATE it when people choose laws and rules over morals and ethics, and value the life of a predator over the lives of innocents. By the way, I am NOT calling for an immediate overthrow of the current government for reasons explained on [So You Want to Topple the U.S. Government?](#) . All in all, I am sure that there are many factors that go into this. Just to name a few, I'll mention the consumption of [Fluoride](#), [Alcohol](#) and [unnecessary drugs](#) and perhaps even mercury and chemicals in vaccines.

Okay, I'll admit that I am no expert and am not exempt from ignorance

(<https://www.pinterest.com/pin/420171840208196869/> ), I'm not ridiculous about it (though you must gauge what "ridiculous" is).

One other pet peeve I have is how much other cultures are disrespected. For example, I have read about "Pork based gun oil", which I myself disapprove. While I would not mind it being used against people such as major leaders of aggressive, violent groups or convicted mass murders, I prefer that people not use it in general combat or even self defense. In my view, it is just unnecessary disrespectful to other cultures and beliefs. Before people cry "Political correctness", let me put it to you this way; let's say that a Muslim has committed a crime, and their home is going to be searched, and that search includes dogs. If they don't like that, then I would recommend putting "shoes" on the dogs. But I do NOT want to call off the search altogether for their objection alone.

In a nutshell, avoid offending people if it won't negatively affect your effectiveness. But at the same time, if you have to do something that may offend someone, you will have to do it. This type of issue is addressed in [Emotional Manipulation Tactics](#) .

And, for the same people who approve of this simply because the target group is, intentionally, Muslims, this is somehow morally or ethically justified, I wonder if the same people would object if, say, ISIS were forcing Christians to wear clothes with mixed fibers (Leviticus 19:19), eat pork (Leviticus 11:7-8), eat shellfish (Leviticus 11:10-12), trim hair on temples and beards (Leviticus 19:27), and get tattoos (Leviticus 19:28). This issue is mentioned in [Are MUSLIM Shooting Targets OFFENSIVE?](#) , and I'd like to mention an article called " [Jan Morgan: idiot, bigot, or both?](#) ".

By the way, this issue reminds me of " [Dragnet episode 115: The Gun](#)", and what you can see between 18:56 and 19:40.

I'd also like to add that I feel like that, due to a difference in mentality, American conservatives are, at least arguably, more likely to alienate outside groups than people in other socio-political "camps". I won't get deeply into this except for throwing in the " [Southern Poverty Law Center's job well done](#) " playlist (don't worry, the name is just link bait), and videos from #7, being " [Pro-Gun Arguments \(Do's & Don'ts\)](#) " to #13, being " [Gun Owners: Stop Baiting Police \(Rant\)](#) ".

One HUGE pet peeve I have is how much people value human life over things such as faith or how they were killed. For example, I see Christians on Pinterest with the " [Christian/Jewish Persecution & News](#) " board, Muslims with the " [SUFFERINGS OF THE MUSLIMS!](#) " board (though I'll admit that I am part of the latter), and people saying things like "Stop gun violence" instead of "Stop all violence" or "Black lives matter" (or related sayings, such as "White lives matter", "Red lives matter" (Native American), "Blue lives" (law enforcement, especially police)

matter, "Brown lives matter" (Latin American and perhaps middle eastern and North African), "Yellow lives matter" (Asian) and things like that) as opposed to "All lives matter" in general. I disagree with valuing human life in any way other than what each one does. I simply feel that it is asinine to value lives simply over faith or how it was ended or things like that. This issue is explained on [NRA News Commentators Episode 2: Dishonest Solutions](#) and the last paragraph of [Zionism. The State of Israel & the Rise of Antisemitism](#) .

I mean, guess what? When you take the "gun" out of "gun violence" or "gun death", there is still "violence" and "death". When you take "Christian", "Jewish", "Muslim" or something like that out of "Christian persecution", "Jewish persecution" or "Muslim persecution", you still have "persecution".

At least I feel a little relieved when people break away from stereotypes like what you see on <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/420171840211869838/> and <http://www.forgottenweapons.com/light-a-candle-to-stop-violence/> .

I'd also like to add my thoughts of immigration; in my opinion, immigration should be allowed, just as long as the system can support the immigrants and major troublemakers (such as those convicted of serious crimes such as murder or those who steal when they don't have to do so for survival, ie, if they could get a job) get kicked out. I am for "balanced" immigration, though you must gauge what "balanced" is. Anyways, while I personally don't have much of a direct issue with immigrants in of themselves, the last people I want to come in are dangerous people, help-refusing substances abusers and so on and so forth. And I don't want people with serious diseases to come in until they get better or they are quarantined so they won't make everybody else sick.

I do not want to overrun or overpopulate any country with immigrants because if they are not yet "ready", there would be too much of a strain of jobs and resources for everyone. Do I want to help poor immigrants and refugees? HECK YES!!! In fact, you do not know how much I want to PUNISH lazy, selfish scumbag lowlifes that run bigshot corporations but treat employees poorly (and have the money from fines go to the people as compensation. By the way, this is a reason why I want a [maximum wage](#) law set in place for company C.E.O.'s and bigshots). But I do not want to overload the system, which would ruin things for everyone, both immigrants and non-immigrants.

I also want to address people who hate on and wish to deport immigrants. Well, while I will not say rather or not (legal) immigrants really take away jobs, I recommend looking up how places such as the United States of America [may get into economic/financial trouble without immigrants to do certain types of work](#) . This issue is (at least partially) explained on [Would America's Farms Collapse Without Immigrants?](#). Not to mention that [many doctors are Asian](#) and we already have a [shortage of doctors](#) in the United States of America. So if we, say, deport all or at least a lot of Asians, it will probably make the shortage even worse until non-Asians can fill in (if there are even enough of them to do so). Not mention that many work in the [Science and technology](#) sector.

Not to mention that immigrants may also [create jobs](#). Though off course, there should be a balance.

I'd also like to add why I consider myself a supporter of voluntary (definitely NOT forced, and to hell with forced segregation, slavery and discrimination) segregation and a melting pot as opposed to multiculturalism. As mentioned in [Human Diversity - 3 Human Biodiversity & Peace](#) (just to let you know, I do NOT agree with a lot of David Duke's opinions on things such as immigration or, at least in his past, his views on race, particularly on non caucasians. As always, question EVERYTHING. And in this case, Duke is leaving out other factors such as economics, substance ie drug use, or even the specific groups in question), forcing groups to be together when they really do not want to be together just does not turn out well (in the long run). If groups are able to work together and mix, it is perfectly fine by me and I personally appreciate that. But if groups hate each other to a violent level, then they should avoid getting too close to each other just as if you know someone who you may get into trouble with you may avoid them.

This also reminds me of instances like [how some Israelis treat gentiles & Jews who disagree with them](#) and [hardcore Muslims mistreating people](#) just to name a couple of cases. I mean, c'mon, people! I get that you may not be fans of outsiders, but doggone, if you dislike them so much, how about form a small, gated community with a sign that says "Outsiders not welcome" or "Outsiders unwanted" or something in that matter. And if you dislike certain types of people and you are in a place where the types of people you dislike are too common then, please, move somewhere else. I myself am really for religious freedom, but not the freedom to mistreat other people or force them to do things for you. Just respect other people's rights and the law and you shouldn't expect too many issues because there would be less ammunition to use against you. Sheesh.

I've found that many people dislike "offensive" speech and wants the state to take action. Here's my argument; As said on 3:40 of <https://youtu.be/EW2fQMU76eQ> , Jesse Ventura says that part of freedom is the freedom to be stupid. If you don't think that laws can be abused for political gain, look up the lies made by the Southern Poverty Law Center. Without letting people speak, smart and stupid alike, we may not be a free nation today. Let me elaborate.

What if the laws you want do come in, & there's success in cleaning out the hogwash idiots have puked. But what if the law gets interpreted to cover things such as disagreeing with certain groups and/or institutions, like say, the Israeli government (because a lot of their politicians are Jewish and Neo-Nazis also disagree with the Israeli government and may use it to accuse all Jews of crimes they had little to nothing to do with)? And then the laws could expand to also cover political &/or religious dissidents.

As crazy as all of this may seem, it has happened in history and will repeat unless we learn from our errors and change. To partially understand this, go watch 2 videos called "America, Flirting with the Dark Side of History" & "Economic Collapse & The Rise of Fascist & Racist Elements". While the examples shown in the videos can be labeled to be "extreme" it does show a quick glance of how quickly the thought police can grow once placed in power. "Oh please! That's ridiculous! But don't free people have the right to be ridiculous?" - John Stossel on raw milk, from his "Illegal everything" episode. "The moment you declare a set of ideas to be immune from criticism, satire, or contempt, freedom of thought becomes impossible." - From controversial author (who I'm not even a fan of), Salman Rushdie.

And also watch [Freedom of Speech: How Is Offensive Speech Good For Society? | Learn Liberty](#).

Bonus; I've thought a little bit about how seeing situations without statistics can lure people into either paranoia or a false sense of security. For example, what if I was to pick a local delivery job, and I wonder which one would I be safer with; Armored car while open carrying a [Kel-Tec PLR-16/custom Arsenal SAM7K pistol](#) (with [100 round Surefire magazine](#) for the PLR or [40 or 50 round magazine](#) for the AK) or custom [Glock 20/21](#) (perhaps converted to 9x25mm Dillon with [30 round magazines](#)) ([and perhaps a long gun or 2 in the truck](#)), or regular delivery while conceal carrying a [Springfield XD-S 9](#) or [S&W Model M&P340 CT/Ruger LCR .357](#) (and if possible, a SBS Mossberg 590 or more likely, a Kel-Tec SU-16C snuck into a bag). For example, let's say that I am not a deep thinker, and I am choosing rather to work for [Garda armored](#) (sorry Dunbar & fellow competitors) or [UPS](#) (sorry FedEx), on the basis of safety. And if I don't think, I would chose Garda because I get to open carry a full sized handgun, which gives me a better sense of security (no pun intended). But, statistically speaking, I am probably better off working for UPS because I am willing to bet that regular delivery drivers are targeted less often than armored car workers (statistically speaking). Sure, if I was in a direct fight, open carrying the weapons I described would be better. But how often does it even happen? Another somewhat related case is getting scared without checking statistics. When I was a little kid, from watching too many murder investigation shows (plus action movie advertisements), I was paranoid into thinking that literally at any second there would be tatted up bad guys brandishing assault rifles (like what Hollywood shows), mostly M-4's and AK-M's. But in reality, as I said before, that is quite rare, and I felt safer after actually doing the math.

On 6/18/2015, somewhere between 1:00 and 2:00 eastern time, Kim Peterson on the Kimmer show (I think) touched upon "civilized" countries and their record on "uncivilized" actions, and he criticised President Barack Hussein Obama (who I also do not like) possibly for saying something about civilized nations that Kim Peterson disagreed with. Anyway, Kim started talking about how bad things happened in the U.S., and (supposedly) how Obama said that we have the worst history of violence of any civilized nation, despite what happened in other nations such as France (remember the Charlie Hebdo debacle?). Well, in my view, every country, ethnic and (at least major) religious group has done something that most people are not going to appreciate, even what is considered to be "civilized" nations (remember the European colonial era?). I'm barely even going to get into THAT chunk of history, though I guess the definition of a civilized nation is a nation that is politically (and perhaps financially/economically and/or socially) stable, has a decent standard of living and people treat each other with reasonable decency (though I think that it would be unrealistic to expect all humans to be perfect). But he really "flipped my switch" (bugged me) when he included Israel in his sample of civilized nations. Apparently, just as you can expect in mainstream American politics, Kim is probably kissing the rear end of a political party (in this case, the republicans) and aligning with the American left/right herd mentality that can still be felt strongly today, he is not paying attention, does not want to pay attention and/or face reality, and/or he is a Zionist puppet or something in that manner.

Israel is civilized? Kiss my tailgate! Just go look at [My address to Israel supporters](#), and tell me with a straight face that Israel is civilized. Sure, I know Palestinians have done things that I do not appreciate (especially with groups such as Hamas), but to say that Israel is civilized (after looking at the information provided) is utter bull crap.

When it comes to the American political herd mentality, I am not going to even bother describing it myself when [Calling Out FAKE Liberals](#) says it all.

On July the 17th, 2015, somewhere between 12:00 and 2:00 PM, in the wake the the Chattanooga killings, Kim Peterson stated that all the rights of Muslims should be taken away over the actions of a few and baits the killer's character (referring him as "Muslim"). I hope he is not serious (the Kimmer show is somewhat of a satire/comedy show and is not meant to be taken seriously 100% of the time), because not only is it morally and ethically questionable in the 1st place (to collectively punish people for crimes that they have little to no real link to), but also, it is a violation of freedom of religion. I see this type of knee-jerk reaction in the American mainstream media all of the time; punish everybody for the actions of one or a few. I see this all the time, and things like what Kim suggested reminds me of things like petitions to ban all guns for civilian ownership in "honor" of Sandy Hook victims or some irrational, emotionally driven garbage like that.

Let me put it this way; Kim suggests (not sure rather jokingly or seriously) that we should strip all Muslims of their rights and partially treat them like criminals under the justification of terror threats and terrorism cases which resulted in, so far, very few deaths (though I will not deny the threats, still, not that many people have been killed so far). Isn't that what the Nazis did to Jewish people, with little to no justification (I have done a little research into the subject, and I have come across many highly biased sources. In a nutshell, I have read claims that Jews have caused a bunch of trouble in the past, and is a reason why people hate them so much, though I have yet to come across good evidence to support this. But, even if this was true, I think that such harsh punishments, particularly the death penalty, are wrong to give to individuals who did not commit such crimes. Besides, does it make sense to punish an entire group of people for their ancestor's crimes?) and short of violence, and isn't that almost like what ISIS are doing to non-Muslims and Muslims who don't conform to their ways?

Not only is the [effectiveness](#) of [collective punishment](#) questionable, but it is also [morally and ethically questionable](#). And, alienating a group is bad in the 1st place for reasons explained on [Motives behind the Charlie Hebdo attack in Paris](#).

Back to my analogy on knee-jerk reactions, IF Kim was to hate all Muslim Americans over some low end garbage F ups, then he maybe should turn around and hate on all Christians for [their share of using unnecessary violence](#). I hope he does not endorse the [Persecution of Muslims](#). Also, if people hated civilian weapon ownership for tragedies which takes the lives of less than 1% of their national population (divide, say, 30,000 by, say 290,000,000. And this is to include ALL firearm related deaths and perhaps [exaggerated numbers](#), which includes things such as suicides and negligent/accidental discharges.), then those same people should become anarchists because, in the 20th century alone, an estimated [262 MILLION people](#) were killed by their own governments, 6 times MORE than military personnel (or at least soldiers) in all wars COMBINED. Along with this, if people hate gun owners and the civilian firearms industry, then



they should hate doctors and the pharmaceutical/medicine/drug industry even more, because they [kill a lot more people in comparison](#) .

In short, I wish human beings would drop double standards, take a few steps back, take a look at the big picture and think more deeply.

This logic is addressed in [Alex Jones Calls For Deportation Of Muslims](#).

Along with this, just as I prefer people such as [Jim Jefferies](#) stick to his current career as a comedian, I prefer that people such as Kim Peterson sticks to his current career as a radio show host.

Note: I do not listen to him myself. My father listens to it while we are driving from one place to another.

One pet peeve that I decided to throw in, while not being cultural, is [Liability](#), especially the legal type. For example, as explained on [911 Says "No Guns!"](#), there were cases where the 911 operator wanted to decrease liability and may not have the best interests of the person in mind. What I have an even bigger issue with is [Law enforcement "no chase" policies](#). I am not sure why they have this, though I am willing to bet that this has something to do with liability, law enforcement jurisdiction or things like that depending on the agency or government in question. While I may see the danger and questionable necessity in chasing someone for, say, property crime, traffic violations or things like that due to the potential danger involved.

But, I feel that it would not be reasonable if, say, a gang of terrorists killed a bunch of unarmed people, stole an armored car and started a rampage with the vehicle, then I feel that the officer would have to say "F\*\*\* the rules!!!" and hunt down the bad guys (if possible). Whatever legal garbage he/she will have to put up with can be dealt with later; he/she has to face the real threat now (the lives of innocent people are at stake, as that not only can the suspects continue their reign of terror and/or come back and do more damage). This is one case where Laws, Rules and Regulations clash with Morals, Ethics and Common Sense.

One thing that bugs me with some individuals is that some people (like my bratty, snout nosed little sister) who cannot tell the difference between types of [people who wear uniforms, badges/shields and guns](#) . For example, while on vacation, my sister saw a sheriff's deputy, and called him a "police officer". It is totally ridiculous to a person like me, especially when their shoulder patches and badge had the word "Sheriff" instead of "Police" on it.

This makes me worried as that things she would recognise anyone who wears a uniform, badge and handgun as a law enforcement officer, rather they are a [armored car or security guard/officer, or State Trooper](#) or [Sheriff](#). I know that she can read well, but [she doesn't know the difference](#) . This makes me worried as that, someday, she can be placed under false arrest by someone wearing a uniform, badge/shield and handgun (especially security guards/officers working outside their workplace or an armored car worker).