

"The rule is perfect: in all matters of opinion our adversaries are insane." - Mark Twain

New Taxes: Overlooked Sources Abound

LOTTERY TAX: In keeping with the spirit of the times, in which maximizing the amount of money you can soak out of poor fools and sinners seems to dominate, the lottery jackpot is again front page news.

Fact is, the odds of actually winning a lottery is so fractionally tiny that only a fool would waste his money on such outlandish odds. Here in Nevada we have constitutional protections in place to keep the simple from such gross exploitation. (The casino industry has a strong monopoly on such, and does not want competition from the government). Images of long lines at 7-Eleven stores, people who otherwise would plunk down the cash in slot machines, bingo games and card tables haunts casino executives.

Tax talk abounds here in the Silver State. Taxes, once based on concepts of equity and fairness, are now based on gettin' where the gettin's good. Lack of intelligence, immorality and economic punishment are the guides. I would like to share with you some pockets overlooked that fall within the new parameters.

EXCESS PAYCHECK TAX:

(Economic tax) This tax will target union members who artificially inflate their wages through restrictions on competition. For example a non-union plumber locally makes 15 to 20 bucks



Ira Hansen

an hour while his union counterpart rakes in 30-40 an hour. Union membership, causing higher costs to consumers, would be the tax base.

WHINY TEACHER TAX:

(Economic tax) This tax will be levied on all teachers who publicly talk only of their starting base salary. Fact is teachers average more than \$50,000 per year including benefits for about 9 months of work.

Contrary to what whiny teachers say, the job is very well compensated. Most teachers have literally spent their lives within the closely sheltered government school system and have no concept of how good they truly have it.

HOMO TAX: (Sin tax) trying to

apply "Affirmative Action" policies to homosexuals is difficult. How do you prove who is and who isn't? A tax would make coming out of the closet easier, and, by providing several years of receipts for a homo tax, you can qualify for programs for discriminated-against minorities.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TAX:

(Stupidity tax) This tax is for white liberal phonies who demand public quotas for minorities, but who fail to privately practice what they demand from others.

Democratic assembly candidate Jan Gilbert, a typical leftist, defeated a black man in the primary. In keeping with her alleged value system of promoting racial justice by having better-qualified white people forced aside, Gilbert should have voluntarily withdrawn her candidacy.

Tribune Columnist Andy Barbano, another champion of Affirmative Action (for others, that is) has yet to offer up his position here as a columnist to one of those poor, picked-on minorities he sheds so many crocodile tears for. Such deep and widespread hypocrisy is an untapped gold mine.

STREETWALKER TAX: (Sin

tax) Following Storey County's lead, Reno should capitalize on the sleazy side of human nature and share with their fellow pimps a cut of the money made through exploiting drug addicted and diseased hookers.

WHORE TAGS: (Sin tax) Similar

in application to deer tags. A whoremonger, rather than face prosecution, merely plops down a 100 bucks and buys a tag. Soliciting without a tag or failure to properly fill out the tag will be severely fined and punished.

EXCESS CHILDREN TAX:

(Economic tax) Schools are filling

rapidly with mainly illegal immigrant children whose parents pay at best a tiny sum of their costs. This tax helps offset the difference.

MASTURBATOR TAX: (Sin tax)

Levied on pornographic movie rentals, dirty books and entry into dirty bookstores.

EMPLOYER PROTECTION

BOND: (Economic tax) An insurance for employers, required for protection from being found guilty of hiring illegal aliens.

NOT ENOUGH PROPERTY

TAX: (Economic tax) Levied on numbers living in one house. Targeted at mainly Hispanics who cram 20 to 40 people into 900-square-foot houses, maximizing water, sewer and other services while paying the minimum for it.

IGNORANT VOTER TAX:

(Stupidity tax) Levied on voters who cannot give even a single issue-oriented reason for the candidates they vote for.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

BOND: (Economic and Stupidity tax) Required of all government school upper management personnel. Bond can be levied if school district gives a single kid a diploma who is functionally illiterate.

RAILROAD TRENCH TAX:

(Special use tax) Levied on all who are willing to actually pay for the trench they claim is so vital to Reno's

future. Mandatory for all union members.

LOBBYIST TAX: (Economic tax)

\$100,000 bond required, levied against when client they represent gives more than \$5,000 to any candidate or political party.

ILLITERACY TAX: (Stupidity

tax) People who can't read or write are a major drain on government treasuries. Like cigarette, booze and lottery taxes, make the poor fools pick up their own tab.

GRADE INFLATION TAX:

(Economic tax) In 1960, 20 percent of school kids were "A" students. Today, it is around 80 percent, yet at least 1 out of 4 graduates have not mastered basic skills. Tax based on number of pupils passed who fail to read or write at grade level.

FAT SLOB TAX: (Sin tax) Now

that being overweight is rapidly approaching criminal status, this tax will be assessed based on excess girth. After all, obesity, like smoking and drinking, is a major cause of expensive taxpayer financed medical costs.

Yes, if we were a bit more open-minded and creative, tax opportunities are almost limitless.

Ira Hansen is a lifelong Sparks resident.

"The rule is perfect: in all matters of opinion our adversaries are insane." - Mark Twain

John Farahi and Ira Hansen Meet Face to Face

4-28-2002

John Farahi, owner of the Atlantis Casino, and I finally met. At Mr. Farahi's invitation, we had lunch at the Atlantis, and spent an interesting and productive hour-and-a-half together.

In September 2001 Farahi got me fired from my radio talk show by threatening to pull his very substantial advertising from all five Citadel Communication stations locally. He was upset because I had said he was an Iranian Jew on the air.

Fact is, Farahi is an Iranian Jew, and I felt very unjustly treated for stating a fact on the air and getting fired over it without so much as a phone call from my accuser. About six weeks ago, while I was a guest on KLINR 88.7 FM, John Farahi called in, and Guy Rocha, the host, got Farahi to commit to meeting with me.

In person, Farahi is a distinguished looking man of medium height and was very cordial when we met. I was somewhat apprehensive about the meeting, mentally running through all of the possibilities. I expected a rather brief and formal face-to-face confrontation, fulfilling his publicly given promise to meet with me. Thus, his demeanor towards me was somewhat disarming, and although I knew that at least some of it was merely good manners, it also showed a lot of class on his part.

In my mind I was a victim of his irrational and excessive race paranoia, while in his mind he was certain I was one of those dreaded and hated anti-Semites that have plagued Jews for centuries.

His perspective on the Middle East, the root cause of the conflict between him and me, was instructive and intriguing.



Ira Hansen

His family history in Iran was also remarkable to me, mainly for its immense span of time, dating back to when Nebuchadnezzar's Babylonians overran Judah, more than 600 years before Christ. His Jewish family had stayed behind when other Jews with Nehemiah returned, hence his Persian roots.

One point he strongly emphasized: he was not an Iranian or even Persian. He was a Jew with a Persian heritage. Historically in that land, Jews had been second-class citizens "knowing their place," and this had deeply affected his thinking.

Born in Iran, he experienced this firsthand, and now, living in America, he swore he would never tolerate this sort of negative distinction again. Hence, the interpretation told to him by others (he in fact had not heard it) of what I said triggered a strong and immediate emotional response.

After my firing, I had publicly challenged Farahi in any local Jewish leader to debate me in any forum of their choosing, and this was an irritation to him as well. In fact, he somewhat wanted our conversation to be a debate, but for me, sitting in a restaurant surrounded by others, the environment was not conducive to debate. Our conversation was never heated, although some veins of

thought we explored were hot-button issues for both of us.

Farahi had read all of my columns on the Israel-Palestine issue faithfully, and knew where I was coming from. He also told me he had run a full "background check" on me and knew my family and personal history — all of which showed his concern over the whole situation. Personally, I was glad to hear it; I have no skeletons to speak of, and it was clear that by the end of our conversation he sensed my sincerity and honesty.

Hatred of Jews in no way is the foundation for my views, and our face-to-face discussion I could tell removed any lingering doubts he had along those lines. He was troubled by my use of the word "Jew" when describing people in my column, such as "talk show host Mike Savage, who is Jewish," questioning me at length why I did that.

I explained that I felt most Jews have a strong bias in favor of Israel, and pointed out their ethnicity to help explain their motives and why they felt as they did. To me, it would be no different than if someone did a spirited defense of Utah or Brigham Young and a critic or detractor pointed out the author was a Mormon.

On the current Middle East situation, Farahi was unabashedly Pro-Israel, feeling a need existed for a homeland for the Jewish people, a place of refuge to help mitigate such occurrences as the Holocaust. He believes Jews have a historical claim to the land that outdated anyone else's right to the same land.

Although Pro-Israel, his position was moderated somewhat on the question of a state for the Palestinians. He felt the West Bank and other areas with Arab

majorities would prove in the long a threat to a Jewish state of Israel.

Demographically, incorporating them into Israel would destroy the concept of a Jewish state. The solution was a Palestinian state.

On the question of the refugees, he felt most of the modern Arab nations were somewhat artificial in their creation and that the Palestinian refugees could easily be absorbed by their Arab brethren, and that Arab nations rather than Israel should pay compensation for the refugee's land losses. He based that on the Arab attack in 1948 on Israel. Overall, his historical knowledge was deep, although, I felt, biased by his background.

As our luncheon ended, he invited me to bring my wife to his home to meet his wife and have a "genuine Persian dinner." He also acknowledged he acted hastily and said, "he had no objection" to getting my radio show back. Too late for me; I burned my bridges, and quite frankly would not want to go back to Citadel after seeing how they treat their employees.

My views on the Middle East, although now more in-depth on the Jewish perspective, are tempered entirely on two grounds: first and foremost, what is best for the United States, and second, humanitarian grounds. Arabs, Jews, Chinese, Negroes, Indians, whatever, are all children of God, and deserve equal treatment.

Ira Hansen is a lifelong Sparks resident.

Soapbox is dedicated to airing

as many views as possible. We support the right of our columnists and the public to voice their opinions, even when we disagree. To that end, we encourage readers to write, call or e-mail us.

All letters to the editor must include a typed or printed name and an address and telephone number. Only the city will be published. Short letters of 250 words or fewer have priority, and any letter may be cut. Unsigned letters will not run. Authors who have written letters within 30 days will run if space is available. Letters are published on Sundays.

Letters should be sent to:
Editor — Sparks Tribune
1002 "C" Street
Sparks, NV 89431

Letters can also be sent by e-mail to: editor@tribune.sparks.nv.us

Messages for **Sound Off!** can be left by calling 358-8061, ext. 425. All messages will be transcribed as accurately as possible. Messages of more than 50 words will be edited for length, and we do not guarantee that any message will be printed. Sound Off! will appear daily, whenever space is available.

SUNDAY, MAY 6, 2001 THE TRIBUNE 4A

Published by Tribune Publist

Sports betting and cock fighting; death penalty unfair

MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS:

Few things are more annoying than having the self-righteous wag their finger in your face. Case in point: Sports betting. National legislation may soon be passed to close down such practices, and Nevada's gambling industry is putting up a full-fledged fight, lead by our congressional delegation.

But, there is a slight twist to the story. U.S. Senator John Ensign has been receiving all kinds of praise for legislation he proposed to stop something most find morally repugnant — cock fighting. Yes, two roosters slugging it out is still legal in three states, and, riding his moral high horse to the rescue is Senator Ensign.

Of course, no one I've ever talked to supports cock fighting, and almost no one would think to criticize Ensign for such actions. But, in a hopefully rare case of excessive exuberance, Senator Ensign wants to do to others what he finds so repugnant when done to us, whether it be sports betting, feral horses or the nuclear dump.

It's really none of our business as Nevadans through our elected representatives to tell the people in, say, Oklahoma, where cock fighting is legal, to outlaw it — or else. The people of each state have the right to determine what the laws they live under should be, and if they want such things as cock fighting outlawed, their own elected officials can do the job.

The same principle applies for us as



**IRA
HANSEN**

well. If we determine sports betting is O.K. in Nevada, it's really none of anyone else's business. A feeble attempt to justify the proposed legislative ban on cockfighting under the guise of the "interstate commerce" clause of the Constitution has been advanced, but such claims are shaky at best. Hopefully such attempts to ignore the self-governance principles of state's rights under the U.S. Constitution, whether about sports betting or cockfighting, will be defeated.

I would expect such legislation from a liberal like Senator Reid, not from a conservative like Ensign. I think the world of Ensign, and this cockfighting bill will hopefully be a mere anomaly in an otherwise illustrious career. But principles are principles, and just as we recognize the injustice of a national attempt to change Nevada law, so we should also see the injustice when we attempt to do the same to others.

DEATH PENALTY: "You will not find the rich and powerful on death row. You'll find individuals without means and without power." Thus spoke state

Senator Joe Neal, a death penalty opponent. Overlooked by Neal is that the injustice is not against those on death row. In fact, they are getting exactly what they deserve. The injustice lies — assuming Neal's presumption is correct — in the failure to properly punish those with the means to thwart justice, as personified by O.J. Simpson.

Also intentionally overlooked in both the death penalty and "racial profiling" debates by Neal and his confederates are the disproportionate amounts of crime committed by minorities. The reason cops pick up so many minority types is because they make up the bulk of the criminals. In this age of cowardly political correctness, in which speaking the truth is socially suppressed, the facts are buried behind artificial walls of "race makes no difference" nonsense.

As usual with the left and their obsession with protecting criminals, the fact minorities also make up the bulk of the victims is overlooked as well. Cops are disproportionately in poorer neighborhoods where minorities live precisely because that's where the victims of crime tend to live. Cops do not ignore crimes in higher income — predominantly white neighborhoods.

There is simply a lot less of it there. They focus their efforts on where the bulk of crimes occur. To force them to somehow equalize their time between white areas and minority areas to stop the largely mythical "racial profiling" would simply create that many more

minority victims.

In this age of political correctness, "sexism" is pointed out whenever ratio differences occur between men and women. But no one on the left ever talks of the grossest example of all, sexism in the criminal justice system. Men make up more than 90 percent of our convicts, and men on death row are even more disproportionately represented. Why no outcry of this obvious breach of P.C.?

The answer is simple. Men commit most of the crimes, and hence, are more of our convicts as well. Same exact scenario for minorities in the system. Racial bias in the criminal justice system is rare to non-existent. Juries — the real judges — are today multicultural, and a single juror can "hang" a jury, a blessing handed down to us from the common law of England, a check on unfair prosecution or abusive application of the law. And today, with DNA testing, the likelihood of sending an innocent person to their death is nil.

The death penalty is completely just. In fact, its use should be extended to such crimes as forcible rape, child molestation, habitual criminals and other extreme or gruesome crimes. And remember, with the death penalty, the recidivism rate is an impressive 0 percent.

Ira Hansen is a life-long Sparks resident. He hosts "The Ira Hansen Show" Saturdays from 11 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. on KKO 780 AM.

The evolution dilemma — Piltown man strikes again

"The number of intermediate and transitional links, between all living and extinct species, must have been inconceivably great. But assuredly, if this theory [organic evolution] be true, such have lived upon the earth."

This quote comes from Charles Darwin in his famous work, "Origin of Species", and, as he correctly points out, there has to be an almost infinite number of "missing links," transitory steps between current living organisms and their supposedly original progenitors, for his theory to be valid.

When Darwin began his work, which today is treated as gospel, the fossil record was spotty at best. Darwin and his followers anticipated exonerations of their speculative theory as the geologic record was more thoroughly explored.

Unfortunately for the Darwinians, and in spite of an almost universal acceptance of evolution as fact, the fossil record, if anything, proves the opposite — there are no "missing links." As Harvard Professor Stephen J. Gould has written in his book "The Panda's Thumb," the complete absence of transitory fossils is "the trade secret of paleontology."

But why is this "secret" kept from the public? Why are supposedly objective scientists going on what amounts to a religious-like faith, ignoring the mountains of evidence to the contrary?

One cannot help but note a certain level of desperation amongst the evolutionists of today. The reason of course is the passage of time has not expanded the evidence as expected and it grows



IRA HANSEN

increasingly difficult to "prove" a theory without facts to back it up. Where are the "inconceivably great" numbers of transitory species that Darwin wrote about?

That's why, when a supposedly "missing link" fossil shows up, the evolutionists pounce on it with the same sensation experienced by a man dying of thirst in the desert who by random luck stumbles upon a cistern of water. But for the evolutionists, the water has often proved but a mirage.

Take for example the amusing case of the "Piltown Man," a supposed missing link. Piltown Man, "discovered" in 1912, was shown, up until the hoax was exposed in 1953, to be the missing link between man and the apes on those evolutionary charts all of us grew up with in our science classes. An estimated 700 doctrinal theses were written about "Piltown Man."

The entire fossil record of Piltown man consisted of a skull and a jawbone, yet the scientific literature was overflowing, describing everything from the food he ate to the climate he lived in to the tools he made.

In spite of the amazing level of confirmation of his existence, Piltown

man was a phony. In 1953, a stunned scientific community painfully admitted to the world the "bones and teeth had been artificially stained and the teeth artificially abraded." They had been fooled. Piltown man never existed.

You would think they had learned their lesson, but no. This year, the desperate evolutionists once again rushed forward with another "missing link", attempting to reestablish their credibility with an increasingly skeptical public.

An amazing fossil had been discovered in China, showing a dinosaur with feathers. The missing link between birds and reptiles had been found! Finally! Proof that Darwin was right!

The National Geographic Society, not missing a moment, published gushing reports in its November 1999 issue. And, like the prolific writers about Piltown Man, the National Geographic people were not bashful or reserved in their descriptions of their find.

"We can now say that birds are theropods [carnivorous dinosaurs] just as confidently as we say humans are mammals. Everything from lunch boxes to museum exhibits will change to reflect this revelation," and "It's a missing link between terrestrial dinosaurs and birds that could actually fly."

Even the most famous of all dinosaurs, Tyrannosaurus Rex, received a new makeover. "Because so many of his relatives had feathers, scientists now think T. Rex may have had them too at an early stage."

The whole article is full of such mush, including the claim that "scien-

tists funded by National Geographic studied the animal" under ultraviolet light and used CT scans to view parts of the fossil obscured by rock.

Wow. Sounds pretty thorough. Feathers, missing links, scientists, ages of 120-140 million years ago. CT scans, and so forth give it a strong believability factor, doesn't it?

Sadly, for the desperate evolutionists and their mad rush to prove all us doubters wrong, the whole "Archaeopteryx Liaoningensis" bird-dinosaur story was the Piltown Man story all over again — another phony. The supposedly carefully examined fossils had been pieced together from various parts and passed off as genuine, and the evolutionists gladly swallowed hook, line and sinker.

Modern Darwinians, unlike Darwin himself, do not have the luxury of hoping the future will prove them right. The dearth of fossil evidence shows them to be not scientific, but faith driven, like their much despised religious critics.

Piltown Man, and now the "flying dinosaur," show how easily they can fabricate elaborate fantasies and cloak their fabrications behind scientific sounding vernacular. But more and more people are beginning to see the obvious — Darwinian Evolution is a massive superstructure built on an imaginary foundation — one of histories greatest frauds.

Ira Hansen is a lifelong Sports resident. He hosts "The Ira Hansen Show" Saturdays from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. on KKOH 780 AM.

Free speech in America — not when defined as hate

"Everyone has the right... to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers."

So goes the much ballyhoosed "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," the Left's supposed guiding light illuminating our path into the "New World Order."

But, as less romantic and more cynical observers note, liberals believe in free speech, free expression and detest any form of "censorship," that is, as long as the speech and expressions and now even thoughts agree with theirs.

The Left's way of censoring unpopular speech is to give it a politically incorrect label, such as "hate" speech or "hate" thought, and have modern versions of George Orwell's "thought police" decide what form of thought or speech is allowed, and which merit punishment. And it's amusing to see how the new politically correct rules are applied.

For example, after Dennis Rodman, NBA star, was greeted with a less than enthusiastic welcome in Salt Lake City during the NBA championships a couple of years ago, he told the press, "F... the Mormons."

What was the NBA's reaction? Was Rodman ordered to undergo psychological testing? Was his career threatened?

No. Mormons and other Christians are not on the "chosen" list. But, what if Rodman had been white, and said something like "F... the Blacks," would the response have been different?

After baseball Pitcher John Recker made unflattering remarks about homosexuals, unwed mothers, immigrants and others, his career was and is in jeopardy, and to protect it he has been busy crawling on his belly and kissing



**IRA
HANSEN**

the behind of every "outraged" group in America.

Nor were the attacks limited to his views. His sanity was even called into question. He was ordered to undergo psychological counseling. Apparently unpopular opinions are not only to remain unspeakable, now, to even entertain such thoughts is considered a sign of mental instability. The implications are clear — if you dare to think in terms of the thought police find repulsive or offensive, you may find yourself unemployed, perhaps even in the looney bin.

But who determines what is allowed? What forms of hate are bad, and which are good? Louis Farrakhan has consistently and viciously attacked Jews, Asians, Whites and almost everyone else not of the chosen black lineage. Is he ostracized? By a token few, yes. But Jesse Jackson, hero of the Left, and the supposed mantle-wearer of the Martin Luther King legacy of color blindness and intolerance of bigotry, came and warmly embraced this hate-monger at the Million Man March. Would Jesse show the same toleration for say, David Duke? Why are some forms of hate acceptable?

And what about Marv Albert? If being a loon is something professional sports is against, why is this man, convicted of a bizarre molestation case

involving his wearing women's underwear and biting his erstwhile fellow fornicator, now once again a broadcaster for the big leagues?

In Reno, a "hate crimes" unit has been established in the Reno Police Department, whose job is to monitor "hate" groups. In other words, spy on people whose opinions are not in the mainstream.

When J. Edgar Hoover was doing similar things in his day, the leftists were coming unglued over his "intrusions," his "violations of privacy," his "stifling of thought and free speech," etc. (It is a bit ironic the RPD's chief's name is Hoover).

Yet another example of liberal hypocrisy run amuck, promoting something they once so loudly protested. What's next? Liberal "Loyalty Boards?" A new "un-American activities" Committee? And whom exactly will the Hate Crimes unit spy on? Who defines "hate?"

A recent guest columnist in a Reno newspaper, Howard Eisenberg, defined hate in an entirely new light: "When some people teach their children that they will go to heaven when they die but that others will not because they don't pray in the same manner, this is sowing the seeds of hatred. When they teach their children that they were chosen by God to be his people, when they say that marriage is only to be between a man and a woman or when they say that it is against God's word and an abomination for a man to love a man, or a woman to love a woman, all this is sowing seeds of hatred."

Wow. The Reno Police Department's new "hate" unit is going to be pretty busy, now that we find how the Leftists define hate. By his definition, the new

expanded hate group list would include all Jews, Catholics, Mormons, Evangelical Christians, people who believe that homosexuality is a perversion — and almost everyone else. He also blasted religions that proselytize as "hate spreaders."

I've always wondered how is it that such holier-than-thou types are so certain their moral views are the only ones that should be allowed?

Isn't his tirade, full of blanket statements and absurd and grandiose conclusions, a form of what he condemns? By his definition, is he not promoting hatred of religious people and others whose views on issues ranging from marriage to homosexuals in the military he disagrees with?

Is it acceptable to hate bigots? To be intolerant of intolerance? To hate those who hate? It would be fun to be able to listen to his private comments on those whose views are contrary to his own. I'll bet "love" and "toleration" and "acceptance" are in short supply.

So what's it all about? By making certain subjects taboo and intimidating the opposition with simplistic labels, the left wins the debate by default. The real fear of the Left is an in-depth examination of the facts. Hollow but attractive clichés are soon pierced and destroyed. It's not "hate" they despise, but freedom — freedom of expression, freedom of thought, freedom to speak your views, and freedom to act on your convictions.

Truth can stand on its own; only error needs the special protection of political correctness."

Ira Hansen is a lifelong Sparks resident. He hosts the "Ira Hansen Show" from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. Saturdays on KKOH 780 AM.

The confederated battle flag — Symbol of manly courage

"On, they come, with the old swing route step and swaying battle flags. In the van, the proud Confederate ensign. Before us in proud humiliation stood the embodiment of manhood; men whom neither the toils and sufferings, nor the fact of death could bend from their resolve; standing before us now, thin, worn, and furnished, but erect, and with eyes looking level into ours, waking memories that bound us together as no other bond; was not such manhood to be welcomed back into a Union so tested and assured?"

"On our part not a sound of trumpet more, nor roll of drum; not a cheer, nor word, nor whisper or vain-glorying, nor notion of man, but an awed stillness rather, and breath-holding, as if it were the passing of the dead!"

The above is a description of the formal surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia in 1865 as described by General Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain, wounded six times defending the Union. Leading the surrendering Confederates was General John B. Gordon, wounded five times, including being shot through the face, in the valiant but futile effort to create the Confederate States of America.

Today of course, all of the brave soldiers both North and South are long gone, but the symbols of their almost unbelievable devotion to duty live on in the flags of their causes. For the sons of the South, the "Stars and Bars", the Confederate battle flag, the "proud Confederate ensign" as described by Chamberlain, is their tie to their valiant



**IRA
HANSEN**

ancestors.

Like a lot of Americans, I have a healthy dose of both Yankee and Rebel blood in me, and an extremely proud of the "lost cause" and the attempts to preserve the original States Rights position of the U.S. Constitution. In spite of what most believe, the War Between the States was not about slavery per se, but about whether or not a State had the right to leave the Union. Eleven southern states attempted to leave, and were by force of arms, coerced back into the Union.

Slavery was a serious dispute between the two sides, as were tariffs, but not the major issue of the war as so many are taught today. Five of the northern states were slave states, and one of those, West Virginia, was created during the Civil War and allowed to enter the Union with slavery fully intact. Lincoln himself was afraid to issue his so-called "Emancipation Proclamation" for fear of losing a large portion of his armies to desertion. They were fighting to preserve the Union, not eliminate slavery.

In point of fact, Lincoln freed the slaves where he did not have the power to do so, while maintaining slavery in all

the territory — including sections of the Union-occupied South — where he could have freed them. As he at the time pointed out, the Emancipation Proclamation was aimed at harming the Southern economy much more than at striking a moral blow against slavery.

The issue today, that the Confederate battle flag is a symbol of slavery, etc., is a classic example of how ignorant most Americans are about our nation's history. Anyone who has read the Confederate Constitution, studied the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, read Calhoun's arguments on nullification, and delved into the ideology behind the attempts at seceding from the Union know the Confederate battle flag represents the original thinking of the majority of our founding fathers. The death of the Confederacy was in fact the death of Federalism, the division of power between equal States with a common, internationally weak central government handling primarily the foreign affairs and general needs of this union of states, known as the United States of America. By way of contrast, today, as Nevadans know oh so well, the central, "Federal" government is an almost unbridled and an increasingly dangerous power, while States have become practically impotent.

But the Confederate Flag is to me not so much about ideology, but about manly courage, bravery, struggle against great odds, heroic battlefield actions. It represents many of my heroes: Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Nathan Bedford Forrest,

Jefferson Davis, and yes, my Rebel ancestors. To dishonor this flag, their symbol, is to dishonor their memory and the great cause for which they gave their all. I would rather die a thousand deaths than do something so disgraceful. Sacrifice their honor to the cowardly political correctness of today? The thought makes me ashamed.

The Confederate flag also represents a way of life now gone but still strongly influential in our thinking. The greatest statesmen in America history have been Southern; in fact, all our great documents, including the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution and the Monroe Doctrine were written by Southerners. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Patrick Henry, James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, John Randolph, and George Mason were all Southerners. Their brilliant minds and powerful pens created the blueprints from which our nation was built, and their warrior hearts and actions won us our liberty from England.

Above my desk where I write this column every week, tacked on the wall, is a Confederate battle flag. I fly it proudly in honor and in memory of a great cause and my brave ancestors who fought for that cause. Give it up? Take it down?

Never.

Ira Hansen is a lifelong Spauls resident. He hosts the Ira Hansen Show Saturdays on KKOI 780 AM from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

ing
supp
some
Env
recy
copy
tion.
R
shee
engi
tion
imp
by U
cove
incl
ence
kids
abst
but
7
sho
5
and
thir
the
acci
recu
and
call
the
] call
RLK
ers
zoo
me
dev
infi
Sau
stu
the

Reno cops deserve praise for a job well done

As is so often the case, the bad guys in the recent riots in Reno are not the rioters themselves, but the cops, according to the boiler-plate A.C.L.U. and the leftist Reno Gazette Journal.

A hundred or so cops had the responsibility to control and contain thousands of people during the riot. Even with that awesome task, the cops on the front line are expected to always have 100 percent control over themselves in every way. The fact they may possibly be facing bodily harm or even death to protect law abiding citizens from the animals we politely call "gang members" or "drunken youth" is ignored or minimized.

Some may object to my referring to the rioters as "animals". They may be right. Animals would never block a street and drag drivers from their cars, while molesting the women inside. Animals would not throw bottles at cars, and tear down barricades and use them to hit people over the head. Animals would not gather in drunken groups and demand from females to "Show us your [breasts]". Animals would not overturn cars and destroy property maliciously. Only humans are capable of such depraved behavior, and only cops or vigilantism can restore order when dealing with such human debris. Yet, judging from the press, the only bad guys in the riots were the cops.

Riot by definition is a state of chaos, where all self-control is tossed aside and mob behavior takes over. Just as a good cure for a biting dog is a hard kick in the



**IRA
HANSEN**

chops, so is a certain degree of brute force and law enforcement aggressiveness necessary when dealing with human animals. For most of us, a simple appeal to behave or else is enough to keep us within the law's boundaries; this works because we have a certain level of both respect and fear of the law's power.

But for some, the criminal justice system creates no fear or respect, and the deterrent value is nonexistent. The only thing such animals fear is sheer brute force. Because physical punishment has been largely eliminated, and the remaining punishments create little dread, cops and jails and courts are regarded with contempt, and recidivism is extremely high.

On the other hand, cops are always and without exception expected to perfectly follow every jot and tittle of the law, and the slightest move that even hints of impropriety is jumped on with both feet by the liberals. They see the cops not as defenders and protectors but as America's version of Nazi brown-shirts, defending the evil while capitalist

establishment against the poor and helpless minorities of the world.

When you have a hundred or so cops confronted with the task of trying to re-establish order in a crowd of 15,000 people with who knows how many in the crowd out of control, it is not surprising that cops sometimes overreact. Unlike the rest of us, who can turn and run when things get ugly, a cop's job is to stand tough and restore order. Force and aggression are their only tools; a simple method, shooting a few of the rioters, is not allowed. Instead the cops themselves are forced to physically confront the thugs. I can only imagine the kind of high emotional intensity these cops must experience in such situations.

As Monday morning quarterback, it's easy to say what should or should not have been done. But for the cop in the trenches, split second decisions and immediate reactions are required. Act too timidly, and the situation worsens; act too aggressively, and the ACLU and its ivory tower friends are screaming for your head.

Did the cops make mistakes? Maybe. But we must remember the circumstances and cut them some slack before we make our sweeping assertions about "police brutality".

Considering the potential, the riots ended with minimal property damage and no loss of life. The cops got things under control in a reasonable amount of time, and overall, what could have developed into a truly horrendous situation was short lived.

Remember how the cops stood around and did nothing when the animals went on a rampage after the Rodney King verdict in L.A.? After dozens of murders and millions in property damage, many were wondering "Where are the cops?" When the cops become intimidated, or for political reasons they're restrained, we are reminded of the tremendous asset they are in keeping law and order.

When dealing with rioting animals, a cop understands much better than the sideline critics the value of a strong and immediate show of force. Had the Reno cops failed in this, the riot would have undoubtedly continued and spread. If some of them got a little too aggressive, so be it. It is much better to nip the problem in the bud than to allow its spread through timid police work.

Another thing to consider: Continue to harp on how bad the cops behaved, and next year, if I were a cop, I certainly would not place my life on the line for a bunch of ungrateful (but safe) citizens—who were so far back in the rear echelon that they do not have even the remotest idea of what it's like to confront a mob of rioters.

In conclusion, I'm certain I speak for the vast majority when I extend a most sincere thank you to the local police for a job well done.

Ira Hansen is a lifelong Sparks resident. He hosts the Ira Hansen Show from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. on 780 KKOH, A.M.