

Written Testimony of Ronald F. Avery

Senate Select Committee on Mass Violence Prevention & Community Safety (Chair Senator Joan Huffman)
Public Hearing: October 30, 2019, 10:00 AM, Capitol of Texas Room E1.036 (Finance Room)

Dear Committee,

You have asked for public input on some terms that appear to be loaded with prejudice and bias and fail to identify the most obvious cause of Mass Violence in America.

Instead of questioning the "digital media" and "dark web," what about the impact of the Federal State Department program called "Freedom From War"¹ that calls for the complete and total disarmament of the American people? Would the State Department benefit from the demand for infringement and abolition of the 2nd Amendment predicated on mass shootings?

Instead of questioning what might contribute to the "radicalization of individuals and incitement of racism, white supremacy and domestic terrorism," why not consider the discovery of a "FEMA Manual for Sandy Hook Mass Casualty Drill Involving Children"² scheduled for two days, beginning one day before the alleged murder of 25 people at that elementary school? Do you think the State Department could obtain their goal by argument on the floor of any federal or state congress? There is no good argument for the disarmament of the American people. Is it at all conceivable that this goal could be achieved by creating a demand in the public to disarm themselves by the use of "random mass shootings of small children?"

And while contemplating the prohibition of "wearing masks to intimidate others, incite violence, or engage in criminal activity," why not consider the state and federal practice of redaction of all information that would prove the mass media cartel version of what happens at mass shootings? If the media and government officials would not use these shootings as an excuse to violate another more important law, the proof of the crime would not need to go further than those directly impacted. But when disarmament of the whole society is being demanded as a result of a particular shooting, would it not be fair to demand proof of the crime in detail and photographically? If the government does not like the people to wear masks, then the government should not mask their evidence of crimes used to disarm the people of America!

While examining the "impact of the overall fraying culture on mass shootings, including increased violence, tolerance for violence, and extremist views," Would it be so unfair to conclude that a State Department plan to violate the law of the land be an extremist view? Why do we tolerate the disarmament of the American people over the murder of people? We don't tolerate folks who advocate the murder of people, so why do we tolerate the disarmament of people? Both are against the law of the land and the later more serious!

The prevention of one crime cannot be the commission of another crime! The only reason to disarm the American public would be to harm them in their life, liberty and possessions with impunity. The fact that those in government are considering it is just cause for alarm in the people. It is a far greater crime to disarm the American people than to endure "random mass shootings." And once it is made known to all that disarmament cannot be achieved with mass shootings they will no longer be of any use and we would be assured that any such crime was truly the act of some mentally disturbed person and not some group of tyrants.

*** turn page over ***

¹ Freedom from War State Department Publication 7277
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/GunControl/Law/freedom-from-war-state-dept-pub-7277.pdf>

² FEMA Manual for Sandy Hook, published 10/08/12 Exercise date: 12/14/12
<http://www.postwtc.com/pvf-fema-manual-exh-a.pdf>

While considering the "cultural issues" that promote "domestic terrorism" let us define *Conspiracy to Commit Disarmament Terrorism*. Terrorism is the use of violence (real, threatened, or pretended) to alter the law of the land. A conspiracy is any two or more people that agree to do something unlawful or to do something lawful by an unlawful means. These people do not need to know one another, and their jobs can be different. And each individual conspirator assumes the liability of the whole conspiracy. A conspiracy to commit disarmament terrorism would be an agreement to use violence (real, threatened, or pretended) to alter or abolish the Second Amendment. All it takes to become a conspirator is the agreement to use violence (real, threatened or pretended) as pretext for the alteration or abolition of the 2nd Amendment. As stated, those who do the violence (real, threatened or pretended) do not need to be the same ones that do the advocacy and visa versa. This means there are most likely disarmament terrorists in this room today.

We would not allow someone to alter the 2nd Amendment directly with violence (real, threatened or pretended) so why do we tolerate its advocacy by others who did not do the violence? It is violence none the less used to alter the law of the land and it is disarmament terrorism. So the only way terrorists can use violence (real, threatened or pretended) to alter the law is to have others do the advocacy indirectly as victims or their sympathizers. But harm to a handful of people, as sad as that is, is not cause to disarm the entire population. Let us put an end to disarmament terrorism and we will see a diminishing of mass shootings.

Finally, let us consider the use of deceptive terminology by the mass media cartel as also advocating the disarmament of the American people. Terms like "gun violence" and "assault weapon" and "gun control" are all deceptive tools to disarm the American people. No tool is an assault weapon or a defense weapon all the time. An object is an assault weapon when used to assault people. It is a defense weapon when used to repel an assault. The naming of an effective weapon an assault weapon to take it from the people is unlawful disarmament of the people.

The Second Amendment covers fire arms that would be effective against a military the size of the United States Army because that is what it was designed to protect against. The 2nd Amendment is defense to federal and state tyranny. It is not for hunting, sport or home protection but protection against a government army harming the life, liberty and possessions of the people. The Preamble³ to the First Ten Amendments or Bill of Rights proves that. Also Federalist Letter #29⁴ goes into detail as the purpose of the 2nd Amendment and the right of the people to militia and keep and bear arms for their own protection and that of their community against all comers including their own state and federal government which are very well equipped. Proving a weapon is effective at killing a lot of people fast makes it more protected by the 2nd Amendment.

Thank you

³ Preamble to Bill of Rights, <https://drexel.edu/ogcr/resources/constitution/amendments/preamble/>

⁴ Federalist Letter #29, <https://www.constitution.org/fed/federa29.htm>