

TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-12/0870.html>

From: John Turmel (*bc726_at_FreeNet.Carleton.CA*)

Date: 12/18/04

Date: 18 Dec 2004 04:39:55 GMT

>*DrGreenthumbwpg*

>*Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 08:49 AM*

DR: I was around when this happened. Nobody from the big clubs out west asked Alan to "fix" the MMAR program – both clubs and many on the CCC asked him to challenge it and he ignored all of them.

Actually David that is the problem he is pointing out. The CDSA was already declared unconstitutional as per Parker because there was no satisfactory exemption system for those that needed cannabis for medical reasons.

The regs lacked the law that they were exempting people from. It was like an exemption from a law that was already of no force and effect because it was unconstitutional.

The judge, Pitt confirmed that. That is when Alan helped the crown get Pitt's decision set aside and got the attack on the MMAR combined with John and Terry's attack on the CDSA.

It gave the opportunity to the judges to tinker with the regs and decide what would be constitutional. The challenge of the MMAR were totally unnecessary as the judge had already ruled they were inadequate and did not satisfy the Parker order and were not even enacted in time to save the CDSA if they had been adequate.

The judges also said that regs were not good enough because they could be changed on a whim as they only needed to be printed in the Canada Gazette. Parliament still hasn't enacted a law but Alan and his crew (Myrden included) are still pushing the idea that the law has been passed by judges.

Note: Even if it was possible for them to have resurrected

the law health canada has not complied with the things the judges said would make the law unconstitutional so the minute they re-instated the parts of the mmar that the judges said made it unconstitutional the cdsa is once more unconstitutional and of no force or effect.

as far as deleting posts and banning people from posting, that is the chickenshit's way of not answering the critics. maybe eco2man should be banned for calling DML a moron? Why would anyone even suggest such a prohibitionist tactic? Are you a chickenshit or do you have some more nefarious reason for not wanting forum members to see all sides of the issue? Just because someone is being a prick doesn't make the issues they raise illegitimate.

You call John a kook and say he should be banned for accusing Alison of colluding with the enemy. Unless there is some proof that she is not doing so then you are insulting him with no proof so you are no better.

JCT: Her involvement in the Hitzig resurrection and her opposition to me all the way was all the proof I needed.

DR: I have also heard that she has ties to cannasat. I did not hear that from john either. If she is going to publicly support Alan and the governments spin that Hitzig resurected prohibition that she should expect to be scrutinized.

JCT: And of course, the purpose of her national speaking tour is to explain to people how the law is back alive. Real useful to us "the law is dead" crowd.

DR: How hard is it to believe that an ex prison guard may still harbour some prohibitionist ideals?

JCT: When you hear the cheers from the prohibitionist benches for her Hitzig victory resurrecting the prohibition, you have to wonder.

DR: I won't pass judgment on her till I know more but i won't discount the possibility either. The forums are a place for us to discuss any current events and developments, and our suspicions should be discussed here to try and bring out the FACTS. Stifling the discussion only helps keep the facts hidden. Your suggestion of banning and censoring the posts makes me wonder just what you feel you need to hide.

People reading these posts are perfectly able to discern what is based in fact and what is speculation, or do you doubt the intelligence of all the forum members and not just DML?

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

>james101

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 09:31 AM

DML wrote: "it's not my first line of defense (I've got one in mind that is way more educational and principled - less "win by technicality")." David, would you be so kind as to share YOUR first line of defense then, so that we can all use it to defend ourselves and to defeat prohibition?

>davidmalmolevine

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 09:31 AM

DML: Sure. First I would summarize where we have gotten so far. The only gain out of my Supreme Court visit would be paragraph 100 of their decision in which they said basically the harms that come with cannabis abuse can be mitigated through proper use. Those aren't the words - the whole thing is located in the counter-counterspin forum under "Supreme BS".

JCT: The point is he's still at proving the law is bad. I dropped that the moment I realize the law was dead and getting it declared buried, not declared bad, was the new goal. I can't count how many times I've explained how everything changed once we had orders declaring the law is dead and we had to change strategies from "it's bad" to "it's dead." Too bad David never read my stuff.

DML: Next, I would put someone on the witness stand who knew what the legal term "Genocide" was and could define it for the court. (There IS a definition - the United Nations anti-genocide treaty is the one I use.)

JCT: I guess the one I use from the Canadian Criminal Code isn't good enough for Canadian courts?

DML: Then after that I would put an anthropologist on the stand and define "culture". Then I would go into the anti-Genocide treaty (1952? 1956?) and argue that international law forbids what is currently happening to our culture. Finally, I would use section 8(3) of the criminal code (Necessity) to defend whatever non-violent mode of protest led me into court in the first place. Howzat?

JCT: Compared to pointing at the corpses of 4 epileptics a day from the epilepsy.ca statistics like I did, not very good.

>Orchidman

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 03:21 PM

David, I find it interesting that you would use the argument of genocide. John Turmel has a very good genocide argument using the Canadian definition of genocide and shocking statistics of dead epileptics. You should take the time to read it, it's included in his supreme court paperwork I think. A lot of people called Turmel kooky for raising the genocide argument, so now I wonder if they will now call you because of it.

>davidmalmolevine [Re: DrGreenthumbwpg

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 08:28 PM

>DML: "I was around when this happened. Nobody from the big clubs out west asked Alan to "fix" the MMAR program - both clubs and many on the CCC asked him to challenge it and he ignored all of them."

DR: Actually David that is the problem he is pointing out. The CDSA was already declared unconstitutional as per Parker because there was no satisfactory exemption system for those

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

that needed cannabis for medical reasons. The regs lacked the law that they were exempting people from. It was like an exemption from a law that was already of no force and effect because it was unconstitutional. The judge, Pitt confirmed that. That is when alan helped the crown get pitt's decision set aside and got the attack on the mmar combined with john and terry's attack on the cdsa. It gave the opportunity to the judges to tinker with the regs and decide what would be constitutional."

DML: If you and him are stating that VICS and the BCCCS ASKED Alan to do that, that would be a lie.

DR: "The challenge of the mmar were totally unnecessary as the judge had already ruled they were inadequate and did not satisfy the parker order and were not even enacted in time to save the cdsa if they had been adequate."

DML: That was the CSA's argument as well - the MMAR was inadequate. Read their press releases and media coverage I provided.

JCT: So should you challenge the CDSA because the MMAR were inadequate like Turmel was doing or challenge the MMAR?

That's the issue here. David and group did not say they wanted to challenge the CDSA because the MMAR did not work. They said they wanted to challenge the MMAR to prove what?

DR: "The judges also said that regs were not good enough because they could be changed on a whim as they only needed to be printed in the canada gazette. Parliament still hasn't enacted a law but alan and his crew (myrden included) are still pushing the idea that the law has been passed by judges."

DML: JCT is talking as if ALL the clubs are part of Alan's "crew" - not so.

JCT: I'm talking as if what I read David say about the clubs urging Alan was true. Whether he suckered them or they knew did not enter the discussion. So far, I've made criticized David and them as dupes, not moles. But moles is always a greater possibility for the guys who were there to keep the media away from me.

DR: "Note: Even if it was possible for them to have resurrected the law health canada has not complied with the things the judges said would make the law unconstitutional so the minute they re-instated the parts of the mmar that the judges said made it unconstitutional the cdsa is once more unconstitutional and of no force or effect.

JCT: That's the Health Canada "gimme" when they knew we couldn't lose with Krieger. Wouldn't it be nice to have the CDSA declared dead because of the gimme to help Sumbitch David Frankel get off the hook for not telling the cops about losing Krieger.

DR: "as far as deleting posts and banning people from posting, that is the chickenshit's way of not answering the critics."

DML: Are you accusing me of doing either? I've done no such thing.

DR: "...maybe eco2man should be banned for calling DML a moron? Why would anyone even suggest such a prohibitionist tactic?"

DML: Where do I say "ban eco2man"?

DR: "Are you a chickenshit or do you have some more nefarious reason for not wanting forum members to see all sides of the issue?"

DML: Please. Quote me where I endorse censorship. This should take a while - I've NEVER endorsed the silencing of a

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

voice.

DR: "Just because someone is being a prick doesn't make the issues they raise illegitimate. You call John a kook"

DML: That I did. He accused the clubs of asking Alan to fix the MMAR when their dozen press releases on the subject (CSA) indicate that they believed it was "inadequate"

JCT: But they did not challenge the CDSA. So what did they want challenged if not the CDSA and not the MMAR?

DML: - Alan did what he did DESPITE what the western clubs told him to do - not because of it. Blaming all the clubs for what Alan did IS kooky.

JCT: I'm blaming them for not challenging the CDSA.

DR: "and say he should be banned for accusing Alyson of colluding with the enemy."

DML: Where do I say "ban"? You're putting words into me falking mouth, buddy.

JCT: It's the Ecoman, not the Dr.

DR: "Unless there is some proof that she is not doing so then you are insulting him with no proof so you are no better."

DML: Proof that who isn't doing what?

DR: "I have also heard that she has ties to cannasat."

DML: Who has ties to cannasat?

DR: "I did not hear that from John either. If she is going to publicly support Alan and the governments spin that Hitzig resurrected prohibition that she should expect to be scrutinized. How hard is it to believe that an ex prison guard may still harbour some prohibitionist ideals?"

DML: If you mean Alyson, she's not a monopolist. If Alan led her astray, she will be the first to quit his "crew" when she finds out the truth. Perhaps you Alan critics would reach more of his "crew" if you weren't so quick to call people "narcs" - that's usually reserved for drug war predators, not "sick folks who didn't know any better".

DR: "I won't pass judgment on her till I know more"

DML: You should have done that for me, too.

DR: "... but i won't discount the possibility either. The forums are a place for us to discuss any current events and developments, and our suspicions should be discussed here to try and bring out the FACTS. Stifling the discussion only helps keep the facts hidden."

DML: Where do I falking say "ban" anyone??????

JCT: I have no idea why David thinks he's the one who proposed Ecoman's censorship. Didn't he read previous posts?

DR: "Your suggestion of banning and censoring the posts makes me wonder just what you feel you need to hide."

DML: I'm missing that post completely. Quote me, straw-man builder.

JCT: Funny when they get their lines crossed.

DR: "People reading these posts are perfectly able to discern what is based in fact and what is speculation, or do you doubt the intelligence of all the forum members and not just DML?"

DML: You're obviously having a hard time discerning the concept of "lack of endorsement" with "censorship". Next time you accuse ANYONE of censorship - have the quote you are referring to at the top of the page so everyone will know what the fak yer talking about.

>eco2man

>Crapfest escalates. Crap-slinger shootout.

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 08:56 PM

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

ECO: Moderators and all. This interaction below between David and someone else illustrates the problem of allowing defamatory "crap-slinging" to show its ugly head at all. It ends in one big non-informative confusing crapfest that puts people off from these forums and these issues.

Quote: "I did not hear that from John either. If she is going to publicly support Alan and the governments spin that Hitzig resurrected prohibition that she should expect to be scrutinized. How hard is it to believe that an ex prison guard may still harbour some prohibitionist ideals?"

If you mean Alyson, she's not a monopolist. If Alan led her astray, she will be the first to quit his "crew" when she finds out the truth.

Perhaps you Alan critics would reach more of his "crew" if you weren't so quick to call people "narcs" - that's usually reserved for drug war predators, not "sick folks who didn't know any better".

ECO: Contrast this crap-slinger shootout thread with the non-defamatory thread called "Possession laws not legit, marijuana advocate says"

<http://www.cannabisculture.com/forums/showflat.php?Number=989668>

It is much more informative on the same issues.

It is one thing to state general opinions of people such as "kook" "idiot" "moron" and so on.

It is entirely different to call people narcs, monopolists, collaborators, racists, etc.. For those specific accusations proof is needed or those posts should be deleted. And people who insist on posting those type of posts more than once should be banned in my opinion.

I volunteer to be a moderator here.

JCT: Har har har har har har har har.

ECO: It is not difficult to tell what a defamatory type of accusation is.

JCT: They need Ecoman at CBC, maybe CNN.

ECO: It is one that could be taken to court if printed in a major media. This started out as an interesting thread. But the problems started when the compilation of Turmel stuff was posted.

I believe it is the responsibility of the person who posts Turmel's stuff to edit out the defamatory accusations-without-proof. If that person keeps posting unedited Turmel stuff, then that person should be banned in my opinion.

>davidmalmolevine

>Re: Crapfest escalates. Crap-slinger shootout.

"I volunteer to be a moderator here... If that person keeps posting unedited Turmel stuff, then that person should be banned in my opinion. "

Dm1: Moderators are here to encourage debate, not silence it. If you ban everyone who insults anyone else a) we won't know why people have a beef with others and b) we won't know what else they have to contribute and c) we won't be able to solve whatever problem is at issue.

Banning, in my opinion, should only be for people who spew nothing but vile hatred and bad language and contribute nothing to the furthering of knowledge, and who all attempts at reasoning with has failed.

The way you talk, people are going to be banned for "insult by disagreement" - you're too quick to silence others. You don't have my vote for moderator status. Turmel may not be a "team player" but he doesn't fall into the "ban him instantly" category.

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

>eco2man

>Re: Crapfest escalates. Crap-slinger shootout.

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 09:41 PM

Quote: Turmel may not be a "team player" but he doesn't fall into the "ban him instantly" category.

ECO: As usual you distort what I say, David. Scroll up a few inches to what I said and see what I mean. It is constantly amazing to me that you will reply to me and have what I said right in front of you, and then you distort it. When you reply to someone what they said is on the same page as the box for typing in your reply. I didn't say "ban him instantly" I said that when people post his remarks they should edit out the defamatory accusations-without-proof, you dumbass kook.

>davidmalmolevine

>Date: Dec 16 2004 09:52 PM

"I said that when people post his remarks they should edit out the defamatory accusations-without-proof, you dumbass kook."

DML: I would rather know what lies people are saying than try and determine ahead of time what is the lie and what is the truth. Censoring selectively and banning are more similar than different.

>DrGreenThumb

>Re: BC Court Case wins on "Law too muddled" argument!!

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 10:09 PM

DML: "If you and him are stating that VICS and the BCCCS ASKED Alan to do that, that would be a lie."

DR: I am certainly not stating that and i don't think he is either but i can't speak for turmel. I think the compassion club model would have had the perfect opportunity to succeed in a legal market. I suspect that Alan convinced some people to go along with it, after all he is a lawyer so he needs a "defendant" to challenge the regulations right?

Why challenge the regulations when the law had been declared unconstitutional anyway? There was no law to be exempted from, hence the 4000 judicial stays.

I honestly think the compassion club people were just looking to protect themselves and get screwed the hardest if the cannasat monopoly goes thru. They have the experience and the clientell already, that would have been tough for any private company to compete with in a legal market. I think they were tricked into thinking he was looking out for their best interests when he was looking after his own best interests.

DML: "JCT is talking as if ALL the clubs are part of Alan's "crew" - not so."

DR: I didn't know he was suggesting that the clubs wanted alan to do this, i may have missed something in that respect but i believe john supports compassion clubs or anyone else being able to sell legal cannabis for any reason.

DML: "as far as deleting posts and banning people from posting, that is the chickenshit's way of not answering the critics."

"Are you accusing me of doing either? I've done no such thing"

DR: No, lol I was directing that comment to eco2man for calling you a moron and then calling on the moderators to delete posts he didn't like or kill the thread or something

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

like that because he said we were crap spewing and crapping on good activists for even having this discussion on the possible monopolization of the sacred herb.

DML: "Where do I say "ban eco2man"?"

DR: You didn't, I was suggesting that if he thought others should be banned for discussions he considered insulting then by his own standard he should have been banned for insulting you. He certainly didn't have facts to back up that you were in fact an actual moron but he said it in a public forum. (It was supposed to be sacrasm) I think by now you understand that it was eco2man not DML that i was acusing of endorsing censorship. Either I misrepresented what i meant to say or you just misunderstood but it was not you the second half of that post i made was about.

>davidmalmolevine

>Date: Thu Dec 16 2004 10:32 PM

Marc Emery and I have been arguing "cultural genocide" since at least 1996 if not before.

JCT: It's a lot easier to prove "genocide of epileptics" with corpses than "genocide of cultural" with what? I wasn't aware that there was as law against the genocide of culture. I always thought it was genocide of people.

DML: I did two shows on the subject for PTV and they seem to have been appreciated:

<http://www.pot-tv.net/archive/shows/pottvshowse-3096.html>

<http://www.pot-tv.net/archive/shows/pottvshowse-2119.html>

JCT: And he never knew the definition from the Criminal Code of Canada?

>elagabalus

>Date: Fri Dec 17 2004 12:02 AM

E: David, A half a dozen people are trying to have a reasonable discussion here, and you keep falling into the exterminator's (the moderator wannabee) trap. You even took the last half of DrGreenthumb's post personally - although he was clearly speaking to "he-who-wants-us-all-to-stop-talking-about-this"

You started a thread about the law being too muddled.

Eco2man keeps changing the title, so now you're arguing about "shit". That's what he keeps changing the title to.

Never mind his pr tactics - let's get back to your original thread. Even though the story was a year old, it IS Current News and the Events ARE unfolding.

You and Turmel have both raised the "genocide" argument, and I certainly support it. It's not just epileptics who have died because of the conspiracy between politicians, press, police and the judiciary.

You seem to agree with Turmel about the law too, although you haven't really mentioned Krieger, one of his aces.

DML: "It's not fair to say I don't feel his argument has substance. I've never said that."

E: Okay. Let's say you didn't address the main point - his arguments concerning Kreiger and Parker, which certainly relates to the topic of this thread.

Anyway, you seem to be in agreement with us. Why do you want to help eco2man to change the focus. He's talking about crap.

>eco2man

>Defamation versus general insults.

>Date: Fri Dec 17 2004 02:12 AM

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

ECO: Moderators. Please read the suggestions here.

Eco man: "I said that when people post his remarks they should edit out the defamatory accusations-without-proof, you dumbass kook."

David: I would rather know what lies people are saying than try and determine ahead of time what is the lie and what is the truth.

ECO: Censoring selectively and banning are more similar than different.

Of course you think that. Having succeeded (by your accusations-without-proof) recently in having 2 threads on Cannasat locked and/or moved by the moderators. One has been moved by the moderators to the Pot Politics forum.

You, and others, are again smearing Alan Young of Cannasat. Without proof. Others are smearing Alison Myrden, Marc Emery, etc.. Others are quoting Turmel in smearing Alison, Marc, and many others.

Therefore I think that this thread should also be moved. Or the offending posts deleted. Since you started this thread, maybe you should be given the choice.

But I don't think you and some others in this thread are capable of having a discussion without smearing people without proof.

JCT: I have always provided evidence of the dirty deeds before calling people names. That's calling them names hurts so much, because they fit so right on. Remember how my saying Emery confessed and pleaded guilty was considered a smear until it was pointed out that that is what he did? When the truth is taken as a smear, what can be inferred?

ECO: And I doubt moderators want to constantly have to delete the smearing posts, then I suggest to the moderators that this thread be moved. That is not censorship.

All forums have topics, and moderators set the rules of each forum. I suggest that this "current news and events" forum meet stricter standards since it is the forum most outsiders see first, and it is one of the busier CannabisCulture.com forums.

>Orchidman

>Date: Fri Dec 17 2004 03:42 AM

O: Here is a recent re-print from Turmel. As you can see there is no mud slinging. Noreen Evers is using the Turmel paperwork in her own defence in a BC court. She knows the stuff backwards now and has even dug up a couple of good additions to the information that Turmel has included in his work.

It's not that Turmel isn't a team player. He has Noreen Evers handing out the kits in BC and other people handing out the "Quash Kits". A lot of people believe in his work and support him, so he has a team. There is a press clipping below which John and Noreen discuss.

This is contemporary and in process. Her case was put off till March and they have figured out a way to speed it up. Nobody needs to deal with John Turmel if they are afraid of his reputation. I'm sure Noreen Evers would be glad to help anyone who asked.

>Press of Noreen's day in B.C. court.

>rtav

>Date: Fri Dec 17 2004 05:37 PM

DML: "I think Turmel is right."

R: OK. If you think he's right, why isn't a simple motion to

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

quash the recommended first line of defense? It can be easily served without an attorney. If it's not accepted, well, you're no worse off for having done it, are you?
JCT: Don't forget the Notice of Prohibition next, then the constitutional motion like Parker and Krieger next, then on to the trial with the lawyer.

R: Aside from that, though, if it was accepted, doesn't it make you a bit uneasy that the police and crown are harassing people over DEAD LAWS?

JCT: We've got them on the defensive. I guess it's not a mode of action that these marijuana reformers are used to, offence. Sure, I've been called very offensive, maybe the most offensive person in the world. Maybe.

R: I have no idea how you think that is a "technicality".

JCT: Parker and Krieger both presented major cases to prove that the law was bad. Why is it called a technicality to now force them to conclude it's dead?

R: Have I misunderstood?

JCT: Depends on whose side he's on but probably not.

>Whirlwind

>Date: Fri Dec 17 2004 07:44 PM

"I have no idea how you think that is a "technicality".

W: Speaking only for myself - but in the belief that others share this view - I work to end not just the legal prohibition, but also the cultural prohibition of pot. If we win a court case that proves the law dead, we only win our freedom until the feds pass a new law. The faster the law is shown to be dead, the faster the new law will be drawn up and the poorer it will be.

JCT: So his point is "why try, they'll just beat us anyway?"

W: And what will the public have learned? Only that it's amazin' what them there dope smokers kin do when they put their minds to it!

JCT: It wasn't dope-smokers. It was gutsy dope-smokers armed by a dope-smoking combat engineer.

W: Its the court cases like Carol Gwilt's and the defenses of DML that lead to a future of cultural tolerance, even understanding, because they seek to elucidate the public.

JCT: So you're saying we should prove the law is bad all over again. Parker's and Krieger's cases weren't enough. When do we get to have the funeral if funerals call forth new laws?

W: A man is accused of molesting a child. In court, the man proves that molestation is a crime not currently "known to law" because the law agaisnt it was struck down due to a technicality. The crown dismisses the charges and the man goes free. Innocent or not, in the eyes of the community the man will always be a child molester.

JCT: Bad analogy to call the Parker and Krieger medical challenges "technicalities" because we then have to move to have the law declared dead because the Crown won't admit it and stop the busts.

W: If the pot laws are indeed dead, they only died because the laws failed to make pot accessible to patients. The laws were struck down due to a technicality.

JCT: The laws were struck down because they violated the rights to life of the sick. Call this a technicality but I can't understand your need to denigrate their efforts.

W: If the laws against pot were never to be resurrected, pot would be vilified potentially forever.

JCT: Not being a scientist, you don't have a scientist's understanding of the scientific principle. Do you think

sci.econ: TURMEL: #2C Prohibition law "too muddled" or "too dead?"

the lies about the best medicinal herb on the planet will escape the truth detectors of engineers just because they've continue to escape yours. Now that the truth has caught the attention of The Engineer, more will be done than can be done by the millions thrown off target by the sown lies.

W: But, to have a jury trial court case, a chance to vindicate the herb's reputation, to extol its virtues, to open the eyes and ears of the public in such a way as to make the lies finally end, that would be truly good.

JCT: That's exactly what Parker and Krieger both did and now you want to do it all again. The strategy changed when Parker and Krieger won, from proving the law is bad to proving the "technicality" that it's repealed.

W: So, I guess I watch the cases like Marko's and RAM's with interest,

JCT: Oh, are these using the Krieger and Parker Aces?

W: but my heart lies with a case that will win using truth:

JCT: Forgetting that two have already done just that.

W: Laws against pot should never have been written. The science bears this out for any health concerns and our cannabis culture is witness to its general wonder and benevolence.

JCT: And yet you would just pessimistically keep trying to prove it bad but never try to collect the pot by proving it's dead because once it's admitted dead, Parliament will just bring it back to life again anyway?

Whose side are you working on, anyway. You want us spinning our wheels in eternal proving the law is bad but never claiming it's dead?

--

Abolitionist Slave Leader John C. "The Banking Systems Engineer" Turmel for UNILETS interest-free time-based currency in U.N. resolution C6 to Governments in the <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration.htm> <http://www.cyberclass.net/turmel> 519-753-0645 USENET: can.politics