

Open LETTER

June 1994

Prescription for Disaster

To Senator Carl Levin:

I have a specific question that I need answered about the Clinton health care plan, or any other plans being considered by the Congress. Are there penalties in these plans for refusing to accept government controlled medical coverage? Fines or imprisonment? I need to know because I have made the decision that if this folly goes through I will not accept the government coverage. The day I receive that "Health Security Card" the President waves around, I'm going to cut it up and send it back to the White House.

You see, Senator, I live my life as an individual totally responsible for my own needs. I pay for my own food, shelter, clothing, transportation, and for all the products and services I consume. I have never in my life accepted any money or any benefits supplied by the government or paid for by tax dollars. No loans, no subsidies, no handouts, no welfare or food stamps, etc. The only service I receive is the proper benefit of government-- protection locally in the form of police, protection nationally by the armed forces, and the reassurance that a judicial system is in place should I ever need it. Those are the only services a government should supply, and they are the only ones I use.

I would get evicted before I would accept a welfare check to pay my rent, I would starve before I ate food bought with food stamps, I will void and return each "Social Security" check sent to me after retirement-- I will never accept government money. Similarly, I will never accept Medicare or Medicaid or any government usurpation of my responsibility to provide for my own health care. I will not allow the government to pay my doc-

tors for the care I receive, and if government payment becomes the only way that care will be delivered, I will refuse to accept the care.

Now, I realize the consequences of this. If I got sick I will not be able to seek care. If I got in a car wreck, I would not get treatment. Terminating all possibility of health care will most certainly shorten my life span. I know that, but I accept it as a reality of the principles I believe in.

So please tell me, if I cut up my smart card will I be arrested? If I am in an accident but conscious, can I tell the doctors not to help me? Will they obey my wishes? Are there provisions for a "living will" in the Congressional plans? Just as some religious groups refuse medical treatment on spiritual grounds, can I refuse it on the basis of conscience? Will I be fined for doing so?

Please take these questions as seriously as I am meaning them. Please send me an answer, and if there is no answer yet, please consider these ideas when voting on plans. This is a matter of great importance to many people.

:Michael Emhart, 0394.

"I will never fail to live up to my responsibility to peacefully provide for all of my own needs."

■ Lansing State Journal
■ Wednesday, April 20, 1994

YOUR OPINIONS

Council frustrating

There seems to be some miscommunication between the residents of Lansing and the City Council.

When the council members were elected to help fix the problems plaguing the streets of Lansing, residents meant things like the shooting of cab drivers, the robbing of people at ATMs, and government abuse of power such as the early-out retirement fiasco.

It is obvious now that what the council thinks is the biggest concern about the streets of Lansing is what they are named. When will they stop wasting time on such folly, and do what they were elected to do?

"Lansing burned while the City Council fiddled around with street names."

MICHAEL EMHART,
Lansing

■ Lansing State Journal
■ Sunday, May 1, 1994

Laws should expire

I think it's great that Pepsi is putting expiration dates on their pop cans now. Wouldn't it make sense if our legislators would start doing the same thing on the laws they pass?

I would like to see a "good until" date put on all new laws, no further than 10 years in the future. Then every law would be subject to periodic review and renewal, and any that became outdated would be dropped when they came due. Expiration dates are handy on milk, and I think they would be just the cure to keep our laws from going sour!

MICHAEL EMHART,
Lansing

"It's time to talk about getting back the rights we've lost. That's what I want to go to Washington to do."

:Jon Coon

Jon Coon Is Absolutely Right!

The May 1994 LAMM meeting consisted of the watching of portions of two excellent video presentations, and an invigorating discussion of what we saw and what it means to the cause of liberty and politics.

A large portion of the evening was spent watching the previous days edition of "Absolutely Right." This Lansing-produced conservative talk show is hosted by Robert Glenn, who was the guest speaker at the March 1994 LAMM meeting. On the TV program, Glenn interviewed Jon Coon, who is the 1994 Libertarian Party candidate for the United States Senate seat being vacated by Don Riegel, and who was the guest speaker at the September 1993 LAMM meeting.

Glenn, who describes himself as "the Christian right," found much in common to talk about with Coon. Examples of this were evident in their conversations on gun control legislation, taxation, property rights and the minimum wage.

On the subject of gun control, Jon Coon defined the issue by saying, "it's not about guns, it's about freedom. If we really wanted to solve the problem we would start insisting on personal responsibility, which is what's missing in this government of ours." Coon warned gun owners that "anybody who thinks it's going to stop here had better wake up. It's not going to stop here. What they want to do is disarm this country. That's what they're trying to do."

Jon Coon promised that as a Senator he will "work for a balanced budget without raising taxes. I don't care how

many (current Senators) say it's not possible to do it, that's baloney, it is possible to do it."

When the topic turned to education, Coon declared "we should privatize the education system because anything else is socialism, it's un-American, and it's not right." He also displayed his support for home schooling, calling it "the best thing that has happened to education in this state in a long time."

A caller questioned Jon about what effect one Libertarian can possibly have on the Washington bureaucracy, to which he replied, "I can do a whole lot more than any freshman Democrat or freshman Republican can do. What's a freshman Republican or freshman Democrat going to do to change the direction" of the government? "No freshman Senator is going to do it. What will do it is an outside threat. What will do it is one Senator up there who is free to act, who is free to vote his principles, who doesn't have the heel of either of those 2 parties on his throat."

Another caller asked about foreign policy, particularly the situation in Bosnia. Coon said he believes in "defending the United States of America," and asked, "If we send troops to Bosnia, will we be defending the US? No. Is what's going on in Bosnia an unfortunate situation? Yes. But they've been at war for thousands of years, and we're not going to fix it." He warned that "if you're going to have troops around the world, you'd better have a philosophy backing you," and observed that "right now we don't."

After the video, those in attendance praised the job done by both Glenn and Coon, and much discussion went on about the most effective way to "sell" the freedom philosophy and candidates like Jon Coon to the public.

"Absolutely Right" with host **Robert Glenn** can be seen every Tuesday at 7pm on cable channel 37 in Lansing, Wednesday at 9pm on cable channel 56 in East Lansing.

For more information on the campaign, or to pledge your support for **Jon Coon**, call him toll-free at **1-800-JON-COON**.

The LAMM meets the second Thursday of each month. The next meeting will be:

Thursday, May 9, 1994 at **Sneakers Restaurant** in the **Frantor Shopping Plaza**, off US-127, Lansing. People begin showing up at 6:00 pm, dinner is served beginning at 6:30, and the meeting begins at 7:00.

The meeting will feature several people who will be running for public office on the Libertarian ticket in the November election. This is an excellent chance to meet the people you can vote for, to discuss the issues with them, and for them to get a chance to practice their public speaking skills.

The Libertarian Alliance of Mid-Michigan was founded in 1981 to promote ideas that support and enhance personal freedom, free market economics, and political liberty. The LAMM is not responsible to any other group that calls itself "libertarian." The LAMM is run without officers for the benefit of those who attend its meetings. For information about the LAMM, call Jon Addiss at 517/394-0122.

Liberty Coin Service

Foremost in the sale, purchase and liquidation of:

- Rare Coins • Precious Metals •
- GIA Certified Diamonds • Rare Stamps •

Established 1971 Patrick A. Heller, CPA, President

Confidential inquiries welcome

Call 351-4720

Monday through Saturday

Elsewhere in Michigan, call toll-free 1-800-933-4720

In the Michigan Nat'l Bank Bldg, Frantor, Lansing

JON W. ADDISS
Broker

ADDISS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

INVESTMENTS - CONSULTING
BUYER - BROKERAGE

913 WEST HOLMES, SUITE 240
LANSING, MI 48910

(517)394-0122

The Obligation to Preserve and Protect

To President Clinton:

Please allow me to relate a story to you that I believe is timely. Earlier today I withdrew a couple hundred dollars from my bank and bought a gun. It is a semiautomatic SKS rifle, the kind you are labeling as an "assault rifle." The gun was purchased used (but barely used), bought from a nice older gentleman who is an avid sportsman and as a hobby refinishes all types of hunting guns.

Now let me make it clear that I am not a hunter. Even though I live in a wooded state, I have never been hunting before, and I do not intend to begin now. So, why did I take such a big step, and spend so much money?

From all I have been reading in the paper and hearing on the news, I can see that the situation in America is deteriorating so quickly that I am no longer protected, and I must get serious about protecting myself. And the situation I am talking about is not the fear that I may be attacked by those who break the law, but the reality that I am being attacked by those who make the laws-- the legislators and president who were elected to preserve and protect my Constitutional rights.

I never bought a rifle in the past because I never felt I needed one, and I knew that if I ever did need one for my own protection that I would be able to get whatever type of gun I felt I needed at a minimal cost with a minimum of hassle. Today I still don't feel as if I need one for protection from crime-- I live in a quiet small town where there is no looming safety threat. But with all the uninformed, emotionally charged gun control rhetoric flying now, with the citizens and legislators whipped up into a frenzy in this city over a publicity stunt token gun buyback, I have gotten scared that my ability to obtain an affordable gun was waning.

And it is no coincidence that I purchased this particular type of firearm, or that I did so in early May, shortly after the Congress passed a ban on the manufacture or sale of these guns. Since after this

ban goes into effect I will ~~not~~ be able to get a good rifle quickly if I were to need one for protection, I made the logical choice and purchased one before the bill becomes law. I'm sure the law will pass, and I'm sure it will withstand any challenges of "infringing" on a citizens "right to keep and bear arms," but that still does not make the law correct in my eyes.

I am a self-supporting individual who believes it is his duty to provide for all of the things he and his family need, including food, shelter, education, and-- yes-- security. I believe that a government military force is needed for collective defense should our borders ever be attacked, I believe a local police force is necessary should any citizen ever be attacked by domes-

"The way to succeed is to 'manage to the rule and deal with the exceptions' and that is where the current gun control logic misses it's target."

tic foes in a way that one could not reasonably be expected to defend oneself against. But I believe that responsibility for ones own security rests with the individual, that every person should take reasonable steps to ensure they are not victims of crime and to defend themselves when they are, without relying on the state as their primary means of security.

This is the way I have always lived my life, but suddenly this year the lawmakers in the Capitol have decided that it is not my responsibility to provide for my own security and, in fact, that I do not even have the right to defend my home in the way I determine is best! They have declared that they know more about my security than I do, that they will be the sole providers of it, and now they are in the process of making it illegal to obtain some defensive weapons that I would use to keep

myself safe. What makes them think they know better than I do, Mr President? What makes you think that an on-call police force can protect my home better than the occupants can?

President Clinton, the gun shops all around the area are saying they can't keep guns in their cases right now, that the demand is far surpassing the supply. And I do not wonder why. I can not believe my story is unique. I think all across America there are good, honest citizens who have never done any harm but who are seeing the tide rise against personal protection and are arming themselves while they still can. Speaking from experience, it is not necessarily that people want to keep and bear arms, it is that they feel they must do so, and now must do so quickly.

A wise person once told me the way to succeed was to "manage to the rule, and deal with the exceptions," and I think that's where the current gun control logic misses its target. The rule, as police statistics show, is that America is full of honest, decent people who purchase firearms for their sporting use and for home security. The exception is the criminal who uses the gun to steal, or the psychopath who goes on a shooting spree. But despite these realities, the current trend is to "manage to the exception, and sorry that we're interfering with all you in the rule." Such a policy is backwards, and can only fail.

Americans can not be broken down and all expected to act according to the lowest common denominator. Forcing multitudes of good citizens to live on the lower level because of a comparatively few law breakers can only have a negative effect-- teaching people that they are irresponsible children that need to be protected from themselves, instead of allowing them to be the self regulating adults that they really are. This reducing of all people to the base level will not do anything to solve the problem, and will, in fact, only serve to make it worse.

:Michael Emhart, 0594.

An Open INVITATION...

You are invited to send in your thoughts, comments, and Open LETTERS on any topic pertaining to public policy, individual liberty, personal responsibility, or free market economics. Your ideas will be printed with little or no editing, and shared with hundreds of people in the mid-Michigan area. If you are a member of a group working towards increasing liberty or shaping political policy, send in updates about what you are doing... there are many others who may like to join you.

Open LETTER is edited and laid out in the Freedom Reading Room by Michael Emhart. Printing is paid for by Liberty Coins. Postage is paid for by Jon Addiss. The views printed here are not necessarily the opinions of the editor or sponsors, although most Interested Parties probably do agree!

Copyright © 1994 By Emhart. All Rights Are Reserved.

THOUGHT FOR THE DAY:

"If ten percent of our income is good enough for God, why does the IRS think they deserve more?"

Discuss the campaign issues with the local candidates-- at the Thursday, June 9 LAMM meeting.
(Details inside...)

Michael Emhart/Open LETTER
Post Office Box 80985
Lansing Michigan 48908-0985

Emily Salvette
1026 Greenhills
Ann Arbor Michigan
48105

