

Since I've been promoting survivalism I've been visited by dozens of TV crews, talked on dozens of radio shows and made several in-person TV talk and news programs. I've also given numerous newspaper and magazine interviews. All the others prominent in our field have likewise been interviewed by all segments of the media. Many journalists write us up with no contact except what they read about us.

A recurring theme runs through this media coverage. Fear. But the funny thing is that, according to the media, we survivalists are the ones who are afraid. We are portrayed as terrified, kill-crazy psychotics, unable to cope with city life. The hustle and bustle of urban life have somehow unhinged us. We've fled Heaven and each has sought his own rural Hell.

We are literally holed up in our primitive wildernesses. We are armed to the teeth against city people who would never leave paradise to threaten our poor homesteads. We all preach doom and threaten all those who would share our wretchedness.

Almost without exception, interviewers belabor the idea that we would shoot to defend ourselves. No media representative visits me without insisting on seeing my arsenal. Many of my non-survivalist neighbors have more weapons than I. But they are collectors and hunters and I'm just a murderous fiend.

One might ask; since most survivalists have left the cities and so are no danger to city folk, why the media blitz against urban dropouts? Also, if city folk are right in believing they live in the best of all possible worlds, why don't they just ignore us? Besides, it's unkind to make fun of us poor crazies afflicted with various forms of anxiety neuroses.

It simply makes no sense for the media to be obsessed with urban dropouts unless the mere fact that we have withdrawn is a threat to the cities. But, you see, we are a threat to the cities. Brain drain. White flight. Eroding urban tax bases. Plain, gut-level jealousy towards those able to leave their respective Disneylands for dummies for cleaner, safer areas. I could go on and on.

A big factor in painting us as vicious lunatics is to use us as an example of the kind of people who refuse to share the fate of those who stay behind. We are the rats leaving the sinking ship. We are the non-supportive. We can't stand the gaff. We lack compassion for the social dependents we abandon on the doorsteps of those with a stake in the cities. All this is simply because we refuse to be the victims of demanding parasites, muggers, burglars, etc. Every one who leaves makes city folk more heavily taxed and more likely to be criminally assaulted, due to the decrease in potential victims.

So the fear is not with us; it is with them. The hostility is not from us; it is from them. So it stands to reason that if they can convince others that we are degenerate goofs, less city folk will be inclined to imitate us.

The following is a reprint of an example of naked fear. Lynda Hurst is afraid and hostile. So terrified, in fact that she has lost control and so writes like an addled hysteric.

Although she had access to enough of my material to know that most of it is non-violent, she singled out that dealing with defense. This was expected. But to attack VICTORIA shows she is irrational. The most telling line is, "Women who find uses for stale bread and are able to recognize alfalfa should be the first ones Kurt and the boys blow away".

There's your key. A hatred of competence and independence

from the collective. We "boys" might well blow away those who would loot us, but Lynda and her ilk would rather those of her own sex who are thrifty and self-reliant be destroyed.

So let the Lynda Hursts rage against the competent on behalf of the parasitic. Let them soil themselves while calling us fear-crazed. Let them infer that survivalism is some sort of social treason. They are the collective against the individual. The have-nots against the haves. The doomed against the survivalists. So when they criticize your morality, your courage, your patriotism, just consider the source.