

THE STORMRIDER ISSUE 20



Freedom, Country Living and Prepping

THE STORMRIDER ISSUE 20

After taking a brief look at how you can prepare for earthquakes, we will discuss freedom of speech. Freedom of speech is a basic human right, as



fundamental as any, within a democratic society. Freedom of speech allows for the free flow of ideas and the expression of both affirmation and dissent. In our country of Canada an on-going battle is being fought as the boundaries of freedom of speech are hotly debated.

Shawn Stevens

Visit our website: <https://hobbyhomesteadingprepper.ca/>

I want to express in the clearest language possible that all statements made in this magazine are meant to be taken not in malice towards any identifiable people group but rather as discussion on issues of public interest, for public benefit, in good faith. I believe that my views on the issues contained here are also consistent with our faith beliefs which are contained in our statement of faith which can be viewed on our websites. Whether you agree or disagree with what I have stated here, we bless you. My articles are meant to be read with an open mind. By reading these articles you may find material that you find objectionable. By viewing the material, or any part of the material, printed in this magazine, and any part of the magazine and its pages, you agree to waive any legal or equitable rights or remedies you have or may have against Shawn Stevens or Ramona Stevens in respect to material that you find offensive or objectionable contained in this magazine. I and we at freedomandsocialorder.com accept no responsibility or liability for any harms or losses that may occur as result of following any information found on this site. Do not consider information found here to be legal advice from ourselves to yourself. Do not use information found here if you don't agree to these terms. I am not a legal authority and do not propose to be viewed as such. By reading the material of this magazine or any part of this magazine, you agree to indemnify and hold harmless Shawn Stevens and Ramona Stevens and you specifically acknowledge and agree that Shawn Stevens and Ramona Stevens will not be liable for comments deemed defamatory, offensive or damaging and agree to dismiss any legal claims that you may have against Shawn Stevens or Ramona Stevens relating to the contents of this magazine. Shawn Stevens

EARTHQUAKES AND HOW YOU CAN PREPARE

Earthquake Threat. An earthquake is the shaking of the Earth's surface resulting from a sudden release of energy in the Earth's lithosphere. This creates seismic waves. These seismic waves are recorded and measured and a Richter scale value is given to them. This tells us the magnitude of an earthquake. Estimates are that around 500,000 earthquakes happen yearly. Of these, people only feel about 100,000. We are told that earthquakes are becoming more frequent. Every once in a while a monster one comes along. In 2010, an 8.8 quake hit Chile. Some NASA scientists think that this monster quake may have actually shifted the axis of the earth about 3 inches.

What can you do to your home to prepare yourself and your family for an earthquake? Here are some tips:

- Securely fasten large appliances, especially gas appliances and water heaters.
- Check your shelves and make sure that the heaviest items are on the bottom and the lightest

on the top and any bottles or glass should also go on the bottom.

- Locate spots throughout the house where you can plan to take refuge.
- Fix defective electrical wiring and gas leaks.
- Consider purchasing earthquake insurance.
- Secure overhead lighting.
- Know how to shut of the electrical and other utilities.

What should you do when an earthquake hits?

- If you are outside of your house, move away from buildings, utility wires and trees.
- If you are inside your house take cover under solid furniture.
- If you are in a high-rise get away from the windows.

- If you are in your car, pull over as safely as possible and park away from any possible falling structures or trees.

What should you do when the quake ends?

- If there is no electricity, use your flashlight.
- Try to gather together anyone else in the house and see that everyone is okay.
- If there are signs of electrical damage, sparking, etc, turn off the power at the electrical panel.
- If you hear a gas seeping sound, open a window and leave the building.

Shawn Stevens

REFERENCES

Tim Macwellch. Prepare For Anything Survival Manual. Weldonowen San Francisco 2014.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earthquake>

<https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=three+earthquakes+in+the+twentieth+century+changed+the+tilt+of+the+earth>

FREEDOM OF SPEECH



FREEDOM OF SPEECH

When most people think of human rights, they commonly think of concepts such as the right to pursuing sustenance, happiness and, perhaps, the right to education. Another freedom which is high on the list of human rights is the freedom of speech.

Freedom of speech is something that we often hear professors and activists demanding. However, if freedom of speech is a basic human right, then all people in society have a right to use it, including Christians.

True freedom of speech allows for the free flow of ideas, including the expression of contrary ideas. This is often useful in determining courses of action in many different arenas. Even though freedom of speech is useful and constructive in many ways, freedom of speech is under attack in our postmodern world, as well as in postmodern Canada.

A major idea which is set in opposition to freedom of speech is “inclusivism.” Inclusivism, or inclusive speech, is simply perceived “political correctness.” It is the refusal to speak things that would be divisive or offensive. It has the motive of including as many people

as possible in something, without saying something that would push some person away. Inclusivism has been applied to not only the refusal to speak divisively but, in many areas, the refusal to let others speak what they sincerely believe.

While in many contexts it is a positive thing to be inclusive, it is unrealistic and impossible to be inclusive in all things. We live in a real world. We live in a world with real issues that hotly divide society. We live in a society with contrary and conflicting values. Once we require one segment of society to be silent on the values that it holds, we are violating the principle of freedom of speech.

Today, there are possibly no greater examples in of the stifling of free speech as the prohibition in many workplaces, institutions and public forums on critical objections being raised to the homosexual lifestyle and towards the abortion-on-demand movement. Those who come to these issues with heart-felt concerns, and convictions which do not support these movements, are often called “bigoted” or “homophobic” and are sometimes subjected to prosecution or disciplinary action.

Inclusiveness, many times, is just a code word for “group-think” (either coined by or used by Irving Janis).¹ It is the pressuring of individuals to adopt the views of a group, without any expression of opposition or dissent being allowed. The dynamics of group-life are

such that pressure is placed on individuals to abandon their personal views, or values, for the perceived good of the group.

In some contexts, inclusiveness and group-think may be constructive as teams work towards a common goal. However, when well-meaning, conscientious objections towards issues are being interpreted as hate towards people, and banned as such, then inclusiveness has gone too far and is being abused. In such cases, freedom of speech is being violated.

What is “hate” and should people be allowed to speak it? Hatred must be carefully qualified when evaluated in relation to free speech. I think that people should not direct hatred at individuals or groups of people. However, hatred may, quite rightly, be directed at issues or lifestyles. For example, few would argue against hating the practice of slavery or against hating the vice of racism. It is right, and good, to directly speak out against these evils. If someone participating in the practice of slavery, or racism, was offended by such remarks, they have no real right to be prosecuting such speech. In a similar way, practices, such as the homosexual lifestyle and abortion, should be spoken against. To do so, is not the same as hating individual people, or people-groups, involved in these practices.

Christians make a careful distinction between hating the sin while loving the sinner. This distinction must be recognized when

addressing the issue of hatred and free speech. Christians are called to love and show Christ-like compassion towards others. Christians are also called to stand for what the Bible teaches on moral issues. On the topic of same-sex lifestyle, the Bible says; “Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.” (Leviticus 18:22). Christians, and people in general, have a moral obligation to hate what is evil and to love what is good.

Historically, other regions in our 21st-century world have forbidden freedom of speech and freedom of dissent. Communist parties and totalitarian regimes crush and punish dissent and deny freedom of speech. By doing so, in many cases, regimes have streamlined their political operations, but at what cost? They have done so at the sacrifice of human rights and this is horribly wrong. Sadly, Canadian society has taken some steps down this same road of banning public dissent.

Restricting freedom of speech and banning dissent may, in some ways, streamline Canadian politics and make society more inclusive but it ignores the larger issue of personal freedom. Instead of valuing its citizens as free people, who have a right to their own opinions, society and governments sometimes view them as problems and obstacles to progress, as they define it. More seriously, they regard people's human rights and freedoms as problems and obstacles to their course of perceived progress.

What is fair play in the field of freedom of speech? Fair play allows for objections. Fair play also responds to objections to issues with

responses to issues. That is to say, that when someone speaks out in objection to an issue, then that person's position should be heard and response should be made to the position, not necessarily to the person.

However, all too often, when someone speaks out against the homosexual lifestyle or abortion, the response to their objection, instead of being directed at the issue in contention or at conservatism in general, is directed at the individual. The person raising the objection is often called a bigot or homophobic, instead of response being made to the issue objected to. In such cases, it is the name-caller who is guilty of hatred, not the one objecting to the issue of the homosexual lifestyle or abortion. We need full freedom of speech to expose and respond to the weak arguments put forward in defense of the gay lifestyle and abortion-on-demand.

This distinction, of separating the issue from the person, must be made if we are ever to regain freedom of speech in Canada. It is wrong for governments, or institutions, to crush dissent or force conformity on conscientious objectors regarding controversial activities. Many would allow for freedom of thought in private life but would ban it in public life. However, thought in private becomes speech in public. It is a form of mind-control to take away a person's freedom of speech when in public life.

To take away freedom of speech is to shut the door on reform. Human societies, institutions and countries cannot grow and progress without reform. Canada needs reform. Canada needs freedom of speech.

To deny a people freedom of speech is to deny them their very identity. It is to demand a surrender of their identity and to insist that they conform to something foreign to their very beliefs and values. Freedom of speech, even in democratic nations, is a precious freedom that is becoming fragile. When governments take steps to limit the freedom of speech of their citizens, it shows that those governments view their citizens as anomalies and even obstacles to their national plans. Without the freedom to express dissent, there is no possibility for reforming our world. This is too important a freedom to let go of. 2

Freedom of speech is directly connected to freedom of conscience. In the early days of settlement in North America, Puritans left England in search of freedom to practice their faith and speak its truths. They found this freedom on the shores of North America. This is one of the great virtues of colonial America. Modern-day America and Canada must decide if they will again be known for this essential freedom.

Freedom of speech allows freedom of belief and the profession of it. A Christian's profession of faith is the most important profession he or she will ever make in their lifetime. Freedom of belief is a fundamental human right and the freedom to profess that belief is every bit as fundamental and foundational to a person's humanity. To disallow a believer the right to profess his or her faith is to reject that person's humanity. How? It is rejecting a person's humanity because a Christian's faith is the foundational thing by which he or she defines themselves; it is their very identity.

Canada is a country which has a long history of extending freedom to its citizens. However, in recent history, for a time, activists and special-interest groups had been successful in establishing “hate speech” legislation in Canada. Hate speech laws were set up in the 1970's and were codified in section 13 of the human rights act. Since that time over 100 Canadians have come under fire from this legislation. Conservative reforms led to revisions being made. Canadian hate speech legislation, after being revised, did make some provision for religious doctrine and did allow critical speech directed toward an identifiable group on religious grounds. The first revision established that free speech was not to be prosecuted “if, in good faith, the person expressed or attempted to establish by an argument an opinion on a religious subject or an opinion based on a belief in a religious text.”³ Many activists were upset by this provision and would like to have seen it changed. For a season, freedom of religion and freedom of speech in this country depended on this provision. The situation changed again when Conservative

MP Brian Storseth put forward Bill C-304, which having passed, has repealed the section 13 hate speech clause from the Human Rights Act. This is the single greatest victory for freedom of speech that our nation has ever seen. This does not mean that the battle over freedom of speech is completely over. This does not mean that speech cannot be prosecuted in Canada. There are also federal restrictions on certain content allowed on public broadcasting.

Freedom of speech in Canada is still tenuous. Liberals have long favoured hate speech laws. Canadian parliament also passed an Islamaphobia motion that calls for government to condemn anti-Islamic rhetoric.

Sometimes people can't express in print all that they would like to because of copyright laws. This is regarding quoted material I think that this is a form of denying freedom of speech. I would like to see reforms come to copyright law which would expand the boundaries of "Fair Use" and the Public Domain. I also think that publishers should not be allowed to hold rights over works that they allow to go out of print.

Freedom of speech is a basic human right, as fundamental as any, within a democratic society. Freedom of speech allows for the free flow of ideas and the expression of both affirmation and dissent. In

our country of Canada an on-going battle is being fought as the boundaries of freedom of speech are hotly debated. May God keep our land glorious and free.

Shawn Stevens

ENDNOTES:

1. Tammy Bruce, *The New Thought Police – Inside the Left's Assault on Free Speech and Free Minds* (Roseville: Prima Publishing, FORUM, 2001).
2. Thomas R. Berger, *Fragile Freedoms* (Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 1982).
3. Section 319 of Canadian Criminal Code. info@cipme.org

REFERENCES :

- Berger, Thomas R. *Fragile Freedoms*. Toronto: Irwin Publishing, 1982.
- Brasch, Walter M. *Social Foundations Of The Mass Media*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2001.
- Bruce, Tammy. *The New Thought Police*. Roseville: Prima Publishing, 2001.
- Canadian Criminal Code, Section 319. info@cipme.org
- Cookson, Catharine. Ed. *Encyclopedia of Religious Freedom*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Levant, Ezra. *Shakedown*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2009.
- <https://nationalpost.com/news/politics/liberals-reviewing-option-to-revive-controversial-hate-speech-law-repealed-in-2013>
- [“Hate Speech Laws in Canada” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hate_speech_laws_in_Canada](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hate_speech_laws_in_Canada)

I am a researcher and writer. I want to express in the clearest language possible that all statements made in this booklet are meant to be taken not in malice towards any identifiable people group but rather as discussion on issues of public interest, for public benefit, in good faith. I believe that my views on the issues contained here are also consistent with our faith beliefs which are contained in our statement of faith which can be viewed on our website(freedomandsocialorder.com). Whether you agree or disagree with what I have stated here we bless you. My articles are meant to be read with an open mind. By reading these articles you may find material that you find objectionable. By viewing the material, or any part of the material, printed in this booklet, you agree to wave any legal or equitable rights or remedies you have or may have against Shawn Stevens in respect to material that you find offensive or objectionable contained in this article. Do not consider information found here to be legal advice from ourselves to yourself. Do not use information found here if you don't agree to these terms. I am not a legal authority and do not propose to be viewed as such. We therefore disclaim all liability for false or inaccurate information from these media sources. We disclaim all liability for the third-party information that may be accessed through the material printed here. By viewing the material of this booklet, you agree to indemnify and hold harmless Shawn Stevens and Ramona Stevens and you specifically acknowledge and agree that Shawn Stevens and Ramona Stevens will not be liable for comments deemed defamatory, offensive or damaging and agree to dismiss any legal claims that you may have against Shawn Stevens or Ramona Stevens relating to the contents of this booklet.

Shawn Stevens

DEPOPULATION

If you were to travel to Elbert County, Georgia, you would see erected on the top of one of its hilltops a strange and ominous granite monument. It is comprised of four giant stones that support a common capstone. It resembles the famous Stonehenge Monument in England. The Elbert County monument has aroused a lot of curiosity and it is often referred to as the American Stonehenge or The Georgia Guidestones. Inscribed on the monument stone are what can be considered the ten commandments of the New World Order. The first of these commandments, written in eight different languages, states “Maintain humanity under 500,000,000 in perpetual balance with nature.” The second commandment is “Guide reproduction wisely – improving fitness and diversity.” There is a lot

of mystery surrounding the origin of this monument. It is not public knowledge who commissioned its construction. What is known is that in 1979 a well-dressed man, identifying himself as R. C. Christian, inquired of Elberton Granite Finishing Company for their assistance in building an edifice to announce a message to mankind. Beyond this little else is known about the origin of this monument.

Regardless that little is known of the origin of the monument, any man or woman can understand its message by simply reading it and its message is population and reproduction control. Our world is populated by over seven billion human beings. To reduce that number to 500,000,000 would require a program of very dramatic depopulation.

The idea of population control can be observed around the world, most notably in China where up until recently the government strictly enforced a one-child family policy. According to government officials, this policy has prevented four hundred million births. However, the idea of population control is not confined only to Asia. It is alive in western civilization as well. An early proponent was the British economist Thomas Malthus who warned of the dangers of increased population and spoke of “positive checks”¹ and “preventative checks.”² “Positive checks” referred to natural causes of human depopulation such as natural disasters, diseases, famines, etc. “Preventative checks” referred to man-made initiatives to control population growth.

Man-made initiatives at controlling populations has become a popular idea with many social theorists within western civilization. Paul R. Ehrlich, an American biologist and environmentalist, in 1968, produced a book, “The Population Bomb.” In it, he called for mandatory regulation of births and the addition of fertility sterilants into the food or water supply. Sterility could then be reversed by taking a government rationed and government controlled antidote.³

The idea of adding sterilants to a public water and food supply was not unique to Ehrlich but was advocated by other early eugenicists such as Margaret Sanger. (For information of the eugenics movement, read my booklets “Charles Darwin and the Races of Man” and “The Truth About Planned Parenthood”). I strongly disagree with Ehrlich's and the eugenicists call for compulsory birth regulation on the grounds that it is a violation of human rights. I am sure that many others would agree with me and, yet, many prominent personalities in western history have advocated for population control. They would include Bertrand Russell, John D. Rockefeller, Margaret Sanger, Isaac Asimov, Frederick Osborn, Arne Naess and Jacques Cousteau. Modern-day advocates of population control would include David Attenborough, Crispin Tickell, Michael E. Arth, Sara Parkin, Ted Turner and Jonathon Porritt (the UK Sustainable Development Commissioner).

As population management is becoming a more and more popular idea in western civilization, more and more organizations are beginning to promote it. The late Jacques Cousteau said in “The Unesco Courier”:

“It's terrible to have to say this. World population must be stabilized and to do that we must eliminate 350,000 people per day. This is so horrible to contemplate that we shouldn't even say it. But the general situation in which we are involved is lamentable.”⁴

The magazine “Balanced View,” in their August 2007 issue, ran an article entitled “Reducing Human Numbers by 80%”. The author of the article, J. Kenneth Smail, said “My position is simply stated. Within the next half-century, it will be essential for the human species to have fully operational a flexibly designed, broadly equitable and internationally coordinated set of initiatives focused on reducing the then-current world population by at least 80%.”⁵ I strongly disagree with Jaques Cousteau and J. Kenneth Smail because it is not ethical to eliminate people simply to control population.

For many years population control has been a goal of many United Nations initiatives. The United Nations refers to population control as population stabilization. The U. N. organization, *POPIN*

(United Nations Population Information Network) says; “We believe that the time has come now to recognize the world-wide necessity to achieve population stabilization and for each country to adopt the necessary policies and programs to do so, consistent with its own culture and aspirations.”⁶ If you go to the United Nations website and type *Population Stabilization* in their search box, you will see that they have much to say about this topic. In their 2008 press conference on Revision of The World Population Prospects, the apparent message of Hania Zlotnik, the director of the population division, is summarized on the U.N. website to say; “To control overpopulation, governments must be prepared to admit to a problem and to act quickly to stem the tide, such as in Bangladesh, which now enjoyed a fertility rate of 2.4 children per woman.”⁷ The United Nations is enormously influential on the world scene. What is the extent of their plan for population stabilization? What does acting quickly to stem the tide of the problem of overpopulation look like? What are the necessary policies and programs that the U.N. would like to see implemented? I am opposed to such policies, programs and quick action because they are not spelled out.

If the world population is to be reduced, how is this to be achieved? The most common answer given by population stabilization activists to that question is that to achieve this will require birth control and in the definition of many birth control includes abortion. Human life is of immeasurable value. It is sacred. I am opposed to abortion. There

are enough resources in this world to sustain it if people are given access to those resources. We need to return to valuing people again.

Shawn Stevens

ENDNOTES :

1. Thomas Malthus, quoted in *Human Population Control* http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_population_control
2. Ibid.
3. Paul R. Ehrlich, quoted in *Human Population Control*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_population_control
4. Jacques Cousteau, quoted in *The Unesco Courier*, November 1991, Pg. 13.
5. *Balanced View*, August 2007, Page 3.
6. 94-09-06: *Statement on Population Stabilization by World Leaders*, United Nations Population Information Network. U.N. Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs with Support from the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA), <http://un.org>
7. *Press Conference on 2008 Revision of the World Population Prospects*, http://www.un.org/News/briefings/docs/2009/090311_DESA.doc.

REFERENCES:

“Confronting the Twenty-First Century’s Hidden Crisis : Reducing Human Numbers by 80%”.
Balanced View, August 2007.

Cousteau, Jacques. Quoted in *The Unesco Courier*, November 1991.

Ehrlich, Paul R. Quoted in *Human Population Control*.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_population_control

“Human Population Control.” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_population_control

Malthus, Thomas. Quoted in *Human Population Control*.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_population_control

Press Conference on 2008 Revision of the World Population Prospects,
http://www.un.org/News/briefings/docs/2009/090311_DESA.doc.

94-09-06: Statement on Population Stabilization by World Leaders, United Nations Population Information Network. U.N. Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs with Support from the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA). <http://un.org>

“The Georgia Guidestones – Illuminati Ten Commandments?” <http://www.rense.com>

United Nations. [Http://www.un.org](http://www.un.org)

“Video : Ted Turner, Reduce population by five billion people.” <http://www.lifesitenews.com>