

FREE!! - BROUGHT TO YOU BY BUSINESSES LOYAL TO LIBERTY - FREE!!

**Armed School Guards
Best Bet**

**The Boneta Bill
Right to Farm**

Discovery of Freedom

**Germany Repatriates
Its Gold**

Front Page

Page 3

Page 5

Page 8



VOLUME 5, ISSUE 2 BY AND FOR FREEDOM LOVING ALASKANS



Armed School Guards Are Our Best Bet to Stop Future Newtowns

By [Stephen P. Halbrook](#) | Posted: Mon. January 28, 2013, 4:01pm PT Also published in [The Kansas City Star](#) on Thu. January 24, 2013

When he heard police arrive at Sandy Hook Elementary School, a “gun free zone,” Adam Lanza ended his murder spree by killing himself.

Days earlier, in Portland, Ore., Jacob Roberts had slain two at the Clackamas Town Center mall. When a licensed gun owner pointed a pistol at him, Roberts likewise killed himself.

James Holmes murdered 12 at the Aurora Century movie theater in Colorado, another “gun free zone” that prohibited armed security personnel. Holmes surrendered when police showed up.

Rampaging gunmen seek victims at places where they expect no immediate resistance. They continue their evil deeds until they are no longer in control due to the intervention of armed defenders. Then, they typically seek to remain in control by taking their own lives.

The tragic Newtown, Conn., school massacre was instantly politicized by calls to ban “assault weapons” and magazines holding more than 10 cartridges. Violent video games were deplored, but there were no pre-written bills to ban them. Mental illness was a hot topic, but no firm solutions were offered. Increasing police presence at schools was not in the cards during the media-driven frenzy.

Virginia’s Republican Gov. Bob McDonnell suggested that not only police, but armed school officials who so chose could be trained to stop aggressors. A loud chorus responded against “shootouts” in schools. Perhaps unopposed executions are better.

Auto Trim Design 2550 South Cushman 456-4800



BIGHORN ENTERPRISES LLC
P.O. Box 58095
Fairbanks, AK 99711-0095
Phone: (907) 451-7310
Fax: (907) 451-7312



THE WOODSHED PAGE 2

For now, consider just increasing the law enforcement presence.

When the NRA's Wayne LaPierre proposed armed security at every school, the media reacted with a tidal wave of derision and contempt. How could anyone dare say that we live in a society where our children need armed police protection, and need it now?

Shall we live in a fantasy world and kid ourselves into thinking that we can simply pass new laws and such tragedies won't happen again?

In the days after Newtown, school authorities nationwide notified parents that police were patrolling schools more often and that security was being tightly monitored.

The Washington Post, openly advocating a gun ban, derided the NRA proposal—a verboten topic, apparently, for the nationwide “conversation.” Curiously, the Post then published an article noting that police had stepped up patrols at schools in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia and that some schools, particularly in D.C., had permanent security guards. Law enforcement presence is focused mostly at urban middle schools and high schools, not at elementary schools—doubtlessly to control drugs and gang violence.

So the issue is not whether armed security personnel should be present at schools—nationwide, some 17,000 sworn officers already serve in schools, according to the Center for Problem-Oriented Policing—but whether their presence should be increased to protect against the inevitable copy-cat killer.

No guarantee exists that the presence of an armed officer would stop the next disaster. But it would give the potential victims a chance.

Remember, the massacre at Columbine High School, a “gun free zone,” took place after passage of the federal “assault weapon” ban. The killers didn't use the banned guns; they didn't need them.

Somebody intent on mass murder has many weapons from which to choose: fertilizer-based explosives were used to kill 168 in Oklahoma City; box cutters were the initial weapon used by the 9/11 hijackers who left 2,977 dead.

Murder and mayhem are not abolished by banning possession of selected physical objects by law-abiding individuals. No “conversation” is needed to know that armed security can protect schools, just as they protect courts and other public buildings, airline travelers, banks, and even convenience stores.

Stephen P. Halbrook, Ph.D., J.D., is Research Fellow at The Independent Institute and author of the books, [*The Founders' Second Amendment: Origins of the Right to Bear Arms*](#) and [*Securing Civil Rights: Freedmen, the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Right to Bear Arms*](#), which were cited in the the U.S. Supreme Court cases of *District of Columbia v. Heller* and *McDonald v. Chicago* as well as his earlier Amici Curiae Brief in *Heller* on behalf of 55 members of the Senate, the Senate President, and 250 members of the House of Representatives. Dr. Halbrook is also the author of the book, [*That Every Man Be Armed: The Evolution of a Constitutional Right*](#) (Independent Institute).



"The two enemies of the people are criminals and the government, so let us tie the

second down with the chains of the Constitution so the second will not become the legalized version of the first." - Thomas Jefferson

"The truth is that the State is a conspiracy designed not only to exploit, but above all to corrupt its citizens." — Leo Tolstoy



More than a saw shop - We work on all brands of small engines
Alaska owned and operated

THE WOODSHED PAGE 3

(907) 452-6318

1-800-478-7318

Fax (907) 452-6883

127 Minnie Street

Fairbanks Alaska

The Boneta Bill in Virginia to Protect the Right to Farm

Dr. Ileana Johnson Paugh ([Bio and Archives](#)) Saturday, January 26, 2013

<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/52684>

Martha Boneta never dreamed that she would be at the center of a battle in Virginia that will have implications for every small farmer in America. I met her last year and [wrote two articles](#) about her battle with the board of supervisors in Fauquier County. I have featured Martha in my book, "[U.N. Agenda 21: Environmental Piracy](#)."

Delegate Scott Lingamfelter (R-Woodbridge) introduced HB 1430, the Boneta Bill, an amendment to the Right to Farm Act of July 1, 1981. HB 1430 will expand the definition of agricultural operations to include commerce of farm-to-business and farm-to-consumer sales, including art, literature, artifacts, furniture, food, beverage, and other items incidental to agricultural operations. Items which "constitute less than a majority amount of production or sales, or less than a majority of annual revenues from such sales, are defined as part of the agricultural operation.

"The bill gives persons engaged in agricultural operations a cause of action against the county or any official or employee of the county for violations of the Right to Farm Act." Two provisions of HB 1430 are retroactive to the Right to Farm Act of 1981:

expansion of the definition of agricultural operation

any ordinance directed at persons, property, or activity on land that is zoned agricultural or silvicultural that seeks to restrict free speech or the right to assembly, among other rights, is null and void

The Boneta Bill will be heard on Monday, January 28, 2013 at 5 p.m. by the Virginia House Agricultural Committee at the Virginia State Capitol – "[The Pitchfork Protest Comes to Richmond](#)."

The original pitchfork protest took place in August 2012 in Warrenton in response to a Fauquier County supervisor threatening Martha Boneta, the owner of Liberty Farms in the village of Paris in northern Virginia, with \$5,000 fines for selling produce and crafts and hosting unlicensed events such as a pumpkin carving and a birthday party for her best friend's daughter and eight ten-year old girls.

Boneta was told that "she did not have the proper event permits for the party and other events, including wine tastings, craft workshops, and pumpkin carving." Fines were also threatened for produce and products not grown or made on her 70-acre farm although she had a special "retail farm shop" license issued to her in 2011. Martha planned to sell handspun yarns, birdhouses, fresh vegetables, eggs, and herbs. But Fauquier County Board of Supervisors changed "farm sales" classification in 2011 to require a special permit for activities that were previously included under her license.

Martha paid \$500 to appeal the unjust administrative charges and threats. The country zoning administrator told Martha at the hearing that she was "out of line" for appealing these charges.

Martha's farm store that was opened just seven hours a week is now closed. She fears the "uncertain, unlawful, unscrupulous actions of the county."

When citizens fear their local governments, there is no freedom. The ruling attitude of the elected boards is that the "King can do no wrong." When elected officials claim "sovereign immunity" and no longer serve the citizens' interests but their own, there is tyranny and oppression.

According to Delegate Scott Lingamfelter, in November 2012, 74 percent of Virginians voted to amend the Constitution of Virginia in order to strengthen property rights. "Let's make sure that Fauquier County officials and all government employees remember that they work for us. Virginians will not tolerate overreaching and overregulating by any layer of government."

The Virginia Association of Counties opposes the Boneta Bill, developing talking points against HB 1430. Some of the counties support the mandates of U.N. Agenda 21 and prefer "penny-loafer farming," preserving thousands of acres of green grass with a few riding horses, no real agriculture to spoil the well-manicured "wilderness."

The Virginia Association of Counties' [talking points are](#):

- HB 1430 weakens the authority of counties to plan and regulate land use (this is false; the bill protects traditional, centuries-old forms of farming commerce and constitutional rights on farm lands)
- HB 1430 creates a more permissive zoning scheme in agricultural areas that may lead to land use conflicts with neighboring properties (false; protecting rights does not obstruct agricultural zoning; counties are still free to prohibit trespasses by farmers on their neighbors' rights of enjoyment)
- HB 1430 threatens "sovereign immunity" of county officials; they won't be able to perform their duties for fear of penalties (false; HB 1430 is only limited to violations of the Virginia Right to Farm Act; counties carry litigation insurance against frivolous lawsuits when their officials make mistakes in good faith; if officials are fearful of losing their "sovereign immunity," they should ask Martha what their overreaching ordinance did to her family's life and livelihood)

Counties and officials who support the Boneta Bill respect and follow the law and do not overreach in their duties as elected representatives of the people. The HB 1430 "will ensure that government at all levels respects the heritage and traditions of farming – and the rights of property owners to enjoy their land in the way that they see fit." (Del. Scott Lingamfelter's letter to constituents, January 8, 2013)

Unfortunately, there are those who developed and passed onerous regulations by "consensus," without the knowledge or approval of a local majority. These are "visioning committee" officials who were hand-picked to promote and pass U.N. Agenda 21 goals without the people's knowledge that the boards' green growth, smart growth, sustainable, and save the planet plans were limiting the use and ownership of private property, and, in some cases, leading to confiscation of property and return to wilderness.

Sevil Kalayci wrote an impassionate letter to her representative. "Sunday morning the local news was talking about local farms in Maryland and how much [urbanites] enjoyed getting produce from their local farms. I guess they have no idea small farms will be disappearing because of the goals of U.N. Agenda 21. The ultimate goal is to completely eliminate all small farms around the country. A few huge companies like Monsanto will direct all the farms in the country. Eventually all backyard gardens will be illegal."

Alice Butler Short was listening to John Kerry deliver a speech on the Hill and heard him make the analogy that "foreign policy is economic policy." He said, "A fruit vendor in Tunisia who ignited the Arab Awakening wanted dignity and respect. He wanted to sell his fruit without corruption and abuse. That is what led him to self-immolate."

Don't Martha and millions of small farmers like her deserve the same right to sell the fruits of her agricultural labor without corruption and abuse in the Land of the Free and Home of the Brave?



SERVING ALASKANS FOR OVER 30 YEARS

BUY & SELL
gold and silver bullion
ALASKA RARE COINS

(907) 452-6461

M - F 8:30 - 5:30 - SAT 10:00 - 5:00

551 2nd AVE, SUITE B, FAIRBANKS 99701



Dr. Ileana Johnson Paugh, ([Romanian Conservative](#)) is a freelance writer (Canada Free Press, Romanian Conservative, [usactionnews.com](#)), author, radio commentator (Silvio Canto Jr. Blogtalk Radio, Butler on Business WAFS 1190, and Republic Broadcasting Network), and speaker. Her book, "Echoes of Communism, is available at Amazon in paperback and Kindle. Short essays describe health care, education, poverty, religion, social engineering, and confiscation of property. A second book, "[Liberty on Life Support](#)," is also available at Amazon in paperback and Kindle. A third book, "U.N. Agenda 21: Environmental Piracy," is a best seller at Amazon.com under Globalism, Politics, and Environmental Policy.

Her commentaries reflect American Exceptionalism, the economy, immigration, and education. Visit her website, [ileanajohnson.com](#). Dr. Johnson can be reached at: ileana@canadafreepress.com

Discovery of Freedom

Excerpt on property by Rose Wilder Lane

5. THE RIGHTS OF PROPERTY

WHEN Madison wrote, "the rights of property," everyone knew what he meant. The right of property was the essence- of the Revolution; it was a right that Americans were fighting to establish.

The fantastic notion that property rights can be opposed to human rights had never entered anyone's head. That notion today is part of the confusion of American vocabulary and American thinking.

Of course, property can not possibly have any rights. Property is a legal human right.

An undiscovered island is not property. It is land and timber and metals, but it is not property. It becomes property only when someone owns it. That is, when someone has a legal ownership of it.

When Eric the Red landed on this continent, not an acre of it was property. The American Indians were communists; they owned no property.

When Spaniards were exploring this continent, every acre of it and all its resources were the property of the Spanish Crown, by legal right which the Pope conferred.

Later, by legal right of conquest and by legal transfer, the Kings of France and Spain and England owned this continent. In 1776, George the Third owned every tree that grew in British property here. **The Pine Tree flag meant that Americans asserted a right to own private property.**

This right had never existed.

THE WOODSHED PAGE 6

No individual owns property in communism. No one owned property under the ancient absolute monarchs. No one owned

property in Athenian democracy, where everyone's property and life were at the mercy of the majority's whim.

The Church maintained the theory of private property as Church doctrine, as it maintained the equality of souls; for a right to own property is essential to individual freedom, and

The Church recognized the freedom (the self-controlling responsibility) of souls, in abstract theory.

But no one owned actual property in the feudal system. Serfs were tied to the land, they did not own it. Peasants held land as communists. Barons held castles and land and villages in fief from the King, who could take the property from them if they failed in feudal duty. The King's holdings in property were controlled by the Barons who used it. The Church held property in *family* ownership; Churchmen used Church property but no individual Churchman owned the property.

The Divine Right Kings owned all property in their realms. Actually they could not take property away from any noble who commanded men enough to fight for it, but in theory the Kings owned the property. They controlled the property of the lower classes, as Louis XIV "controlled" the weavers' use of* their looms. The King could take anyone's property (if he had the strength) and he could always forbid anyone's possession of any *kind* of property. For instance, in 1776, no Frenchman who was not a noble could own a pigeon.

Americans were fighting for a right to own property.

Individual ownership of property was a daring aim of the Revolution. American Tories vigorously opposed it. Jefferson fought them for years, to get individual ownership of land recognized legally in Virginia.

The Revolution for the individual's right to own property has hardly begun on this earth. This right does not exist in Asia or in Africa, nor in continental Europe at this moment.

The right to own property is not an inalienable natural right, as life and liberty are. It is a legal right, absolutely essential to an individual's exercise of his natural rights.

Nothing can take his natural rights from any living person. But without legal protection of those rights, no one can exercise them. Europeans today have no legal protection from seizure, torture, or execution. Helpless in the hands of torturers, a man still controls his thoughts and speech; but he can not act or speak freely.

Legal rights, when they exist, protect the individual's *exercise* of natural rights. The Revolution protected every American's exercise of his natural freedom, by the revolutionary method, new in history, of forbidding American Government to seize or search an American's person without due process of law; to imprison him without trial; to try him in secret or without letting him call witness in his defence; to try him twice on the same charge; to punish him for a crime that someone else committed; to refuse him a jury trial or to deny his right of appeal; to torture him; or to deny his right of assembly, or his right to petition the Government, or his right to bear arms, or his right to own property.

Every one of these legal rights is necessary to protect any individual's use of his natural liberty. Let anyone who doubts this, look at Germany.

The right to own property is the newest of these rights. American revolutionists were the first to see the simple fact that no man can use his natural freedom, if he has no right to stand upon this earth. No one can act freely, if by merely living he is a trespasser upon property that Government—the King, the Squire, or the Commune—owns.

This is the reason why the counter-revolutionists who are attacking man's inalienable right to freedom, first attack his legal right to own property. Private property is the first individual right that Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler abolish. Today the world is full of innumerable new kinds of property. In one century, this Revolution has released



**Like to write?
Have something to say?
Ready to raise your pen for freedom?
Send your submissions to:
woodshcdonc@gmail.com**

such terrific human energy that it has created an entirely new world.

Americans using human rights protected by Constitutional law, Englishmen protected by their defence of feudal human rights, and a few Europeans getting a little leeway for free action, in fifty years have created unforeseen and totally new forms of ownership of all kinds of property that never before existed.

No one yet understands these. There has not been time. There are no historical precedents. Nor even any historical parallels. Nothing of this *kind* has ever been known before. This is a completely new world. Human energy is creating so many new methods of producing such tremendous quantities of goods, and of attacking poverty and disease and space and time, that no one knows what is happening.

So it is easy to confuse the thinking about property. It is possible to attack the Revolution at its newest, and therefore weakest, point: the individual's right to own property. Therefore we have this preposterous suggestion that "property rights" are the enemy of human rights.

This new world is not yet fifty years old. Strangely enough, it is not perfect. Unjust men, believe it or not, still act unjustly. Stupid men still act stupidly. And Diogenes himself, with the wisdom of Socrates, can not know in advance how all these unprecedented forms of individual ownership of totally new kinds of property are going to work. Not all of them can be expected to work perfectly.

The right to a jury trial does not work perfectly, either. I have known juries to convict innocent men, and acquit guilty ones. I knew a man who was sentenced to imprisonment for life, convicted of accepting, as a bribe, from the hands of another man, a certain box containing \$100,000 in bills. The man who (according to this verdict) handed him the box, was tried for the bribery, and on the identical evidence, a jury decided that he had not handed the other man this box, and acquitted him. Fifteen years later the prisoner, dying of tuberculosis, applied for parole and appeared before the Parole Board. The chairman of the Board was the man who had been acquitted of bribing him.

All politicians, all journalists, almost all Americans, know many such instances. Then why do we hear no passionate voices declaring that "jury rights" must not be permitted to interfere with human rights?

I will tell you why. Such an attack upon every American's legal right to trial by jury would sound like the nonsense it is. The same nonsensical attack upon every American's right to own so much as his own house, sounds like an attack upon the rich. If this attack can confuse American minds, it can destroy an essential safeguard of every American's personal security and his exercise of his human rights.

And let no one imagine that tender sympathy for the poor inspires this attack. These men and women who weep for Americans who own so much less than the rich (and so much more than the poor ever owned in history before) are proposing to take away from them and their children the right ever to own any property.

When Madison wrote that "democracies have ever been found incompatible with personal security and the rights of property," all Americans knew that he was saying that majority-rule has always been the enemy of human rights, and that he was stating the reason why this Republic is not a democracy.



THE WOODSHED

PAGE 8

Germany Repatriates Its Gold

Mises Daily: Thursday, January 31, 2013 by [Mark Thornton](#)

On Wednesday, January 16 the German Central Bank (i.e., Bundesbank) announced that it was going to repatriate some of its gold reserves currently being held at the New York Fed and all of its gold reserves held by the Banque de France. It had previously repatriated 940 of the 1385 tons of its gold reserves held at the Bank of England, citing high storage fees as the reason (the New York Fed and the Banque of France charge no such fees). Three-hundred-and seventy-four metric tons will be trucked from Paris to Frankfurt, representing 11 percent of its reserves, and 300 metric tons will be shipped from New York. By 2020, the plan is to have 50 percent of its reserves held in Frankfurt. Germany has the second largest stock of gold next to the US and has not bought or sold gold since 1973.

As part of its Cold War strategy, Germany stored much of its gold reserves “as west as possible.” Bundesbank officials now claim that strategy is outdated. They also say that the movement of gold back to Germany is meant to build trust and confidence in case of a currency crisis in the Euro. The move, as reported by the *Wall Street Journal*, was in response to “pressure from Berlin and from a remarkable grass-roots campaign by the populist press, which played on fears that the euro crisis poses a risk to Germany’s financial well being.”

The subject of repatriating Germany’s gold was discussed on Mises.org back in [October](#) and [December](#) of 2012. Patrick Barron and Godfrey Bloom concluded that repatriating the gold is an important and necessary first step for monetary reform.

That view is not shared by mainstream economists. The *Journal* reports, “Economists had viewed the debate (over the location of Germany’s gold) with bewilderment, seeing it as entirely divorced from reality, given that gold has played no official role in international monetary policy since the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreement in 1973.” The *Journal* then quotes Holger Schmieding, chief economist for Berenberg Bank in London. “Last year’s debate was absolutely ludicrous ... driven completely by irrational fears.... I don't see any economic or financial rationale for the Bundesbank to be doing this.”

However, John P. Cochran, Dean Emeritus of the Business School at Metropolitan State University of Denver, counters that “not all economists see this as ludicrous, particularly Austrian economists. The move could be a partial step to restoring sound money; a step which would potentially protect ... Germans from risks to their financial well-being.

Cochran continues, “The move is perhaps reason for optimism that arguments for a return to sound money are beginning to have some minimal impact moving discussion in a positive direction, but the key to success of any eventual gold-backed currency is on the idea that delivery of gold upon demand (to the general public) is crucial.” He provides additional caveats in his article [“Fool's Gold’ Standards.”](#)

Professor Guido Hülsmann, a native German teaching at the University of Angers in France, questions the meaning of the press releases: “So why does the Bundesbank suddenly issue two press releases within four months? In order to rub it into the face of the world that it wants to have its gold back? I don't think this serves to calm down public opinion at home. Rather, this is one of the last levers they can pull before they become completely marginalized within the ECB's governing council. Now they are pulling it indeed, even though they try not to be too rash. In a world flooded by debt, gold is the ultimate safe haven. Central bankers know this better than most people, even if they have to pretend in their day job that such concerns are irrelevant. Does it mean the Eurozone is approaching its end game? I don't think so, but the protagonists are no longer playing softball.”

Peter Klein, from the University of Missouri, notes that “Gold is the ultimate long-term inflation hedge, and holding physical gold is more secure than holding legal title to gold stored elsewhere. We don’t know if the Bundesbank’s move is purely symbolic or reflects real concerns, but it’s an important signal nonetheless!” Klein also notes, “Equally interesting is why the US government is not returning the gold all at once, but in stages. Is the US holding fractional reserves?”



Professor Philipp Bagus, a native German teaching at the University of Rey Juan Carlos in Spain, and the author of *The Tragedy of the Euro*, was also curious: “It is startling that they (the shipments of gold) will last until 2020 in order to bring the gold back. This reinforces the suspicions that the Fed and other central banks have lent gold to bullion banks who have in turn sold the gold depressing its price. To unwind these contracts it will take some time without upsetting the gold market. The Fed needs time to get its gold back. For all we know, it may not be there physically. That is probably the reason it will take until 2020.

On a more fundamental point, Bagus noted, “Of course, this is great news since by repatriating German gold, the importance of gold for monetary purposes is stressed, and it becomes available for any possible monetary reform Germany may want to do during the Euro crisis.”

Mark Thornton is a senior resident fellow at the Ludwig von Mises Institute in Auburn, Alabama, and is the book review editor for the *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*. He is the author of [The Economics of Prohibition](#), coauthor of [Tariffs, Blockades, and Inflation: The Economics of the Civil War](#), and the editor of [The Quotable Mises](#), [The Bastiat Collection](#), and [An Essay on Economic Theory](#). Send him [mail](#). See Mark Thornton's [article archives](#).

Woodshed Editor: Why is this article of interest?

It has been suggested that the intervention in Libya was because they were going to go to a sound money system. Going to a sound money system could be seen as an attack on the US dollar as the reserve currency.

Recent petroleum for commodity trades between India, China and Iran is another example of moving away from US currency as the default reserve.

If this is one of the final steps by Germany to a sound money system this will be the death knell to the US dollar as the world reserve currency. If that occurs ALL of our inflation fears will come home to roost.



WHY IS EVERYONE TALKING ABOUT UN AGENDA 21?

UN Agenda 21/Sustainable Development is the action plan to inventory and control all land, all water, all minerals, all plants, all animals, all construction, all means of production, all information, all energy, and all human beings in the world. INVENTORY AND CONTROL

Have you wondered where these terms 'sustainability' and 'smart growth' and 'high density urban mixed-use development' came from? Doesn't it seem like about 10 years ago you'd never heard of them and now everything seems to include these concepts? Is that just a coincidence? That every town and county and state and nation in the world would be changing their land use/planning codes and government policies to align themselves with...what?

THE WOODSHED PAGE 10

Far from being a ‘conspiracy theory’ or a ‘tin-foil hat’ fantasy, this is an actual United Nations plan, signed onto in 1992 by President George HW Bush along with 178 other world leaders. The UN called it Agenda 21 because it is the Agenda for the 21st century. According to UN Secretary General Maurice Strong, the ‘affluent middle-class

American lifestyle is unsustainable.' That includes single family homes, private vehicles, appliances, air-conditioning, & meat-eating. They are a threat to the planet.

This might sound like a silly plan that doesn't affect you. But look around. This economic collapse is UN Agenda 21. You'll hear that this plan is non-binding, that it's a dusty old plan with no teeth. That is a lie. In fact over the last 20 years this plan has been implemented all over the United States. It's called Sustainable Development. The 3 E's: ecology, economy, equity.

After George Bush signed it in 1992, it was brought back to the US by President Clinton (1993) when he created the President's Council on Sustainable Development for the sole purpose of getting it into every city, county, and state in the US through federal rules, regulations, and grants. This is a global plan but is implemented locally. You'll see it as a regional plan. It might be called Vision 2035, or Your Town 2025, or One Bay Area, or Plan NY...all of these regional plans are the same. They call for stack and pack housing, restricted mobility, and regional government. Domestic surveillance, smart meters, GMO's, loss of freedom—all UN Agenda 21/Sustainable Development. You are losing your rights. You are being manipulated. You are being lied to. You are the Resistance.

PostSustainabilityInstitute.org DemocratsAgainstUNAgenda21.com
is a non-partisan worldwide grassroots movement.



You Can Pick Up The Woodshed from these Great Interior Alaskan Businesses

Chowder House 206 Eagle Ave	Six Robblees' Inc. 3060 S Cushman St.
Ajimi Japanese Restaurant 550 3rd St	Gene's Chrysler Dodge Jeep 3400 South Cushman
Mayflower Buffet 414 3rd St	Advanced Printing 612 30th Ave
Sentry Hardware & Sporting 250 3rd St. Ste. 6	Arctic Fire and Safety 702 30th Ave
Rod's Saw Shop 127 Minnie Street	Holm Town Nursery 1301 30th Ave.
The Diner 244 Illinois St.	Northern Power Sports 1980 Van Horn Rd.
Big I 122 N Turner St	ABS Alaskan Inc. 2130 Van Horn Rd.
Elegant Memories Antiques 514 2nd Ave	Compeau's 4122 Boat St
Alaska Rare Coins 551 2nd Ave. Suite B	Altrol 2295 A Van Horn Road
Soapy Smith's Restaurant 543 2nd Ave.	Alyeska Tire 3250 Peger Road
Custom Leather & Gifts 535 2nd Ave	RCTIC RV 3013 Peger Rd.
River City Cafe 523 2nd Ave	Base Camp Eatery 3226 Airport Way
Larson's Locksmith & Security 1249 Noble St.	Taco Azteca 3401 Airport Way
Dick Randolph Insurance Agency 12th and Cushman	The Woodway 1830 RJ Loop on College Rd. 35
Jim Bradbury State Farm Insurance 1401 Turner	Alaska Fun Center 1817 College Rd.
Big State Autosales 1805 S Cushman	S&W Radiator 1625 College Rd.
Mr Pawn and Loan 2117 S Cushman St.	Bulgogi Grill 400 College Rd
Ranch Motel 2223 S Cushman St.	Siam Square , 59 College Rd # 202
Just Haircuts 2319 S Cushman St.	Northland Hearing River Mall, 29 College Rd.
Auto Trim Design 2550 South Cushman St	Seekins Ford Lincoln Mercury 1625 Seekins Ford Drive
	McPeaks 771 Badger Rd. North Pole

You can now go online to read the latest and past issues of The Woodshed at

<http://www.aklg.org/the-woodshed/>

Online you can follow the imbedded links to more information.