

Even twelve years ago, on this very day of April 19th, a deadly massacre was instigated by our own government. Dozens died in the fire at the wake of church. It was shameful, despicable. It was a egregious act of tyranny. We should remember that today, today, today, today, because today marks the anniversary of that wretched evil. An excellent book about the Branch Davidian ordeal is called *A Place Called Waco*, which I plan to reference throughout this discussion.

The government discovered the Branch Davidians were receiving shipments of weapons. What happened was one of the shipment trucks accidentally caused a package to open up. A grenade came out which alarmed the authorities. The authorities put the Branch Davidians under surveillance and ultimately the ATF decided to raid the Branch Davidians. A warrant was secured. The ATF entered the compound and this is when it drew up and started shooting.

In that book, *A Place Called Waco*, he describes how, “due to the projectile of the bullet, it was clear the ATF was the first one to shoot.” He said later, unfortunately, the evidence was destroyed. The Branch Davidians did what any self-expecting,

sensible people would do in such a circumstance, defend themselves [like others noted].

There was bloodshed on both sides. The government retreated, but what resulted was a stand-up. Eventually the government's patience wore thin, so the government decided to throw tear gas in the building to get the ranch civilians out [many observers support this view]. The building burst into fire, which killed most of the Branch Davidians inside. Few survived. Most of these were sent into prison.

The author of that book was not sentenced to prison. Jonah's book said at best "Branch Davidians were erring not because the weapons were illegal, but because the proper permits were not secured. Even if the Branch Davidians were having improper rapids, it surely doesn't justify what happened. The permit is so minor, it's ludicrous the government would do what it did."

The author said one of the reasons he believed the ATF stooped to this low level was "because of the political climate of the time." He said, "At that point in time there was a lot of talk about doing away with some of the budget of the ATF since many believed the ATF's functions were done by other government

agencies better, thus at best ATF was redundant.” The author believed “The ATF needed a dramatic event in order for the public to believe the APF was justified in existing.” It's sad what people would do to avoid budget cuts.

David Koresh was a name the leader of the group gave to himself. It had biblical significance. He was born Vernon Howell. [“Vernon had difficulties growing up. The other kids didn't like him. He was constantly mocked, scoffed, ridiculed, and made the butt of jokes because he wasn't as academically advanced or intellectually bright as some of the others. Vernon did find solace in the Bible and in music. Later, his music would be a major part of his Outreach. In fact, the Autodesk book said he met Steve Schneider, the second-in-command behind David Koresh, through music.][common knowledge]

There's an excellent song about the Waco Massacre by Carl Klang called “Seventeen Little Children”. In the song, he says, “17 little children, all so helpless and so small, died a senseless death of gas and flames. How many names can you recall?” He also asks, “why did they have to die?” It's a rhetorical question because there really is no good answer. You can't justify the death of these children. The song is

very emotional and powerful is very convincing in its artistic message.

Jello Biafra, former lead singer of the band Dead Kennedys and now a lecturer made the excellent point that “David Koresh could have been arrested much easier by the government if it wanted to.” He said, “David Koresh could have been arrested while jogging.” Great point! The author of that book mentioned “how frequently the elder male members of the group would go out into the town to play music, to drink, especially when you could do something without killing people How can you justify the killing of people if you could at all?” It is inexcusable when you have a way without bloodshed to use a bloodshed method. The author of the book mentioned how “his group was, in his view, demonized by the press and the government.”

He viewed his ordeal as a form of religious persecution, a very violent form, which we would think our government wouldn't be that crude and blunt these days, but sometimes it is. Mumia Abu-Jamal, a journalist, ties the Waco ordeal to a similar point of a group he admires, MOVE, which suffered bombing by our own government. He believes groups like MOVE and the Branch Davidians are likely to experience, because they have religions that

are outside the norm, despite what all this rhetoric says about religious freedom.

This ordeal centered around firearms. Firearms present difficulty. The authorities get very threatened by firearms. Thus, if you are going to use firearms, you have to be very careful. You have to ask yourself, Does the risk justify the cost?

Many people [say they] use firearms in order to make themselves feel more secure and less vulnerable. Ironically, when the government actually responds the way it does, the opposite is true. You are less secure and more vulnerable. When I was at one protest, one of the pro-gun people there admitted that “strategically having guns would have been a bad idea since, we would be outnumbered.” “It just wouldn't be wise”, she suggested. She believed “morally people had the right to but she didn't believe such was a good idea.”

The government, in its paramilitary operation, murdered the Branch Davidians. One of my acquaintances, when I was at graduate school, made the point, he said, “there's no way you're going to take over the government with a few of your grandfather's hunting rifles.” Very true. It would be difficult to meet any government with something like

that, especially the most powerful military in the world, perhaps ever.

Unfortunately, the Branch Davidians were victims of this paramilitary force. The government, instead of opposing forces its own size, chooses to focus on a church. The church was what some people say religious groups are under a “siege mentality.” What happens when someone under a siege mentality is actually seized?

The author of that book said “the group had a proselytic vision. Thus, it perceived the assault on it as the beginning of Armageddon.”

One occurrence in my life demonstrates how harshly the government responds to firearms and other weapons. When I was at my mother's stand there a few months ago, One day the FBI comes to the door. He said, “He wanted to talk to me, I wasn't in trouble, about SHAC.” I didn't really want to deal with them, especially not wanting to deal with government officials when you're not prepared. So I told him, “I didn't want to talk now”, I took his card and shut the door. Unfortunately, that wasn't the end of that.

I soon researched what SHAC was. I had no clue what he was talking about. He just threw the acronym out like I knew what it was. I found out it was *Stop Huntington Animal Cruelty*. Then it dawned on me I had a publication in the mail from the group a few times. Great.

After I moved to Oakdale, the FBI came to talk to my mom. Telling me my mom “Stop Huntington Animal Cruelty led turnover SUVs and make them start fire and similar experiences.”

One agent from the ATF came to me when I was in Oakdale and asked me these questions. Fortunately, I didn't know much, anything about SHAC. All I could really know is what was in the publication I got, which the FBI could easily have gotten a hold of. I told the agent, Calvin Myers, And I didn't really give it, “I didn't give it the publication much thought. I read it, I just put it aside. It wasn't really distinctive.”

He asked me “How long ago it was?” I told him. He asked me, “Have I ever been out east? Did I ever know, did I ever head out east with SHAC? Did I know these names he gave me?” He even asked me to infiltrate. He said, “SHAC resorted to some militant tactics.” I've read many radical publications,

radical books, newsletters, newspapers, over the years. But only one time so far did I get the answer. I didn't get the answer coming after me. I wasn't involved in the group at all. I just received a publication from the group. I believe it was because the government feels so threatened by firearms. You can talk about radical ideas a lot. The government might not like it, but you might be left alone. You must be very careful in how you use your firearms.

Opponents of the government had prized what happened at Ruby Ridge to wake up. Ruby Ridge was a similar tragedy. A 14-year-old was shot in the back. A woman was shot holding a baby in her arms just because. A man sold two size shotguns. In that book, the author said, "His group was very alert and aware of what was happening at Ruby Ridge." He said, "He didn't admire, the group didn't admire Randy Ware because of his racist beliefs, but the group felt such could happen to it, and indeed it did."

After Ruby Ridge's trial, the Waco event happened, the judge said, "You can't hold this against the government." [in *A Place Called Waco?*] But as courtroom observers have noticed, "People can't just simply forget about something they witnessed." So many times similar events have happened. It's actually ironic that for once it happened to a

government that does something wrong. Sarah Weaver was a survivor of Ruby Ridge, watched the events of Waco on television, made her very emotionally upset as she experienced the trauma not too much earlier. She cried, "Those bastards did it again!" [Book title forgotten]

I find it interesting how these events happen in rapid succession. This was in 1992 and Waco was in 1993. Opponents of our government believe these events are wake up calls which galvanize people in action. These people believe these are two of the biggest acts of terror in the history of our nation, which should serve as means to galvanize us. Some even say "militias emerged in response to the invasion of Waco." Often militias, I feel, but I believe militias have some great virtue. I don't agree with that. We know militias do. The fire lines, as I mentioned earlier, are a question for militias to contend with. Militias have it right. Militias have perspective. Militias see tyranny, recognize tyranny when they see it. They also respond and react to tyranny, because they have good hearts. They have good sense. That inspires their faith just more. There's a lot of good in militias. Thus, we should heed the warnings of religion.

It is shameful how most people reacted to events of Waco and Ruby Ridge, but that matters. Most people reacted poorly. Thus, seeing it demonstrates that sometimes ideology really doesn't determine how much sense, perspective, morality, and heart people have. The centrist defended the government's actions at Waco because that's what centrists do. Don't want to get too far in one direction, therefore, we have to side with Clinton because those Branch Davidians were so bad. The author of that book describes a centrist type movie, which was on television, which none of the Branch Davidians looked really bad. I remember seeing that movie, too, back in the day. I got the impression that David Koresh was really horrible. But I believe the book was credible because the author, in addition, to tell any good about the bad things, also freely admitted the bad. Let's tell you the balance, the sign of credibility.

The moderate left doesn't think wake up a big deal. You don't hear about it much for the moderate left. If someone's welfare is cut, they will never hear the end of it. But Murdered children? No big deal. What's wrong with the left? In that book, the actor describes how after he survived the Waco, after he had spent the trial, he tried to spread his message. He said, "Leftists didn't want anything to do with him."

Because he didn't nicely fit in the stupidity of liberals. Probably. Liberals need to expand themselves, not just focus on the same issue.

Liberals are missing the forest for the tree. All these other issues aren't the same. Contains something as dramatic tyranny as the wake-up for death. The author of that book said, "When he was on lecture circuit, he felt, I don't know, because no one would listen to him." Those liberals would not listen to him, he said. Why, why? The liberals, they go freaking after their friends at work. Because that's what we live for. Stupid.

The moderate right also has left-wing actions. I just found out. So, another time when I talked about this, it was that the far right did criticize clues, which to me was probably more a partisan move than it was genuine concern about anyone's rights or lessons. Whatever criticism there was, to me it got short because the moderate right squandered an excellent opportunity. The latest moderate right would attempt to kick out a lot of office over the moderate right. I agree, Clinton should have been kicked out, but not in 1993. If not Clinton, there is no agent involved. Since Reno directly approved this operation, he should have been out. But we didn't endure her for much.

What was really interesting was in Rush Limbaugh's book, he described how "he was attacked by Charlie, and when he defended Janet", Let us take in what I just said. Rush Limbaugh defended Reno. In there, Rush Limbaugh is a Democrat. He hates Democrats, especially the Clinton administration [as everyone notices]. All these other tiny little issues, these new points, But when something extremely tragic, extremely tyrannical, he agrees. What an awful, awful individual.

Jello Biafra said that, when he said, "These two parties, they have so much disagreement on all these issues, but when they're down to They both destroy us behind our backs." Both Rush Limbaugh and Clinton thus meet to believe that sound government talks to murder children. All for its best permanent action. Less moderate right gets it. You have to remember, we'll be rich [like others note]. Under a Republican administration. George W. Bush's. George W. Bush's administration. Some parties are willing to be tyrannical. Some parties are willing to fight to take away your gun rights. There's no one on the internet who is white. I think people don't gung-ho about the Republican Party. I think it does no wrong. You think she's conservative. I think she's conservative and supports the Republican Party. I

don't know. Because the Republican Party, I think that is really not conservative. That waters down.

“I was talking about how awful Horvitz and Waco were. I think that Janet Reno should be Convicted for the murder of both places. I had a correction. Caterino was handed on to me by Richard Curtis in 1992, I said. But I'm not even elected yet. Should have blamed her for it.” Which she very well deserves to be. Republicans, you're not on this one. You've both got him. You've both are converts.

The far-right famously and very seriously denounce our government. Just read any newspaper, newsletters, pamphlets, leaflets, magazines, or websites on harsh language. condemning our government. You'll hear far-left people talk about revolution. Yet when there was a life opportunity to pounce upon our government to influence revolution, far-left, they impeached it. Shameful, shameful, shameful. There's some more to hear about the far-left. About the only good I found inappropriately was how right the far right viewed these stakeholders as extreme fascists. The far right said they should be left. The far right viewed us not to be witchcraft. To me, the far right expected heart, courage, morality, sense, and love. The fact is, it's so minty in these, I don't know if it's far, but it has a

space. It is so beautiful. Someone out there actually said, unfortunately it's not enough. I'm glad the guy is willing to call it full space. The far right may be right in all matters, but it doesn't get down to what's truly important. It's ever so correct. The far right becomes so abstracted.

Thibodeau said about “how he grew up was the far left.” He said, “fortunately, the far right had a different interpretation of the event than the far left.” He said, “to him, it was spiritual.” For Thibodeau, “the far right had a political view. Moral interpretation is different.” He said, “all right, Mrs. Bob, the only thing was to get out of here. So he went out and talked to the bar writer.”

Twelve years ago. Thirty days. Why don't we work at a hearing? It will have to occur. Certainly. One of the worst in recent history. Let us not forget, let us try to remember this from happening April 19, 2005, March 12, of this atrocity.