


Notice:

This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date. For current contact information, [click here](#).



Frontiersman

September 1995

Exposé of The Big Lie

by John Webster

This is THE BIG LIE: that LAWS are sacred; that since they were created by a representative government they represent the "Will of the People" and therefore the government has the moral right to enforce the laws at the point of a gun, the right to initiate violence against even peaceful people who would choose to ignore those laws.

The truth is that even our government must be held to basic moral principals. It cannot be allowed to violate the natural rights of an individual simply because it used "Due Process". Only when an individual has violated the natural rights of another does he give up his own rights to life, liberty, and property, thereby giving government the right to have its way with him. In all other cases where our government and its law enforcement agencies have incarcerated or killed people or confiscated their property it is our government that is the evil villain, and those of us that have stood silently on the sidelines are accessories to that evil action.

The forefathers of our government set up a system of checks and balances with three competitive branches: a legislative, executive (law enforcement), and judicial; to slow down the process by which that government would infringe on the rights of the individual. Unfortunately, these branches of government, while quarreling between themselves about who gets the biggest piece of the power pie, have reached an agreement on all wanting a bigger pie.

In addition, both the legislative and judicial branches of government have come to realize that it is only through the real power of law enforcement agencies that their own edicts get any real teeth. So over time the legislature and courts have established a supposedly "benevolent" police state. They have given the police more and more power, to give them the ability to enforce the latest laws that are more and more an invasion of individual rights.

This process has proceeded to the point where our Bill of Rights is now little more than a historical artifact. The po-

PIGS

Here's how I understand the pre-sent system: when someone is killed and someone else is suspected of having done it, then the suspect is indicted and given a trial. There are some things wrong with that system, but that's the way it's presently supposed to work. In that system, extenuating circumstances don't prevent the trial. They're presented at the trial, where they're considered. Based on these and other circumstances, a judge or a jury rules on the case.

I watched the news coverage of the recent Congressional Waco Hearings. I heard with my own ears and saw with my own eyes when Attorney General Janet Reno accepted responsibility for the conclusion of the Branch Davidian siege. People were killed during that confrontation. Janet Reno accepted responsibility.

Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman is currently being tried in connection with the World Trade Center bombing. He

lice now are free to use active entrapment to enforce victimless crime laws where their would be no victim to make a complaint. Gun laws have gotten tighter and tighter and the police get looser and looser restrictions on being able to search for and confiscate those weapons by which the people could fight back. Laws requiring the carrying of an identity card have gotten stronger where lack of identification is now enough to detain a person. The cards themselves are carrying magnet strips that allow police to easily locate an individual's records within a government data base. Law enforcement agencies are now even rewarded for enforcing the laws with their cut of the loot from asset forfeiture.

The assault at Waco Texas was simply a test enforcement to see whether or not the propaganda had succeeded in convincing the general public that "Laws are sacred". The government was testing as to whether or not the people will stand by and allow the continued escalation of government power even when it involves the killing of children. To add insult to injury, the survivors at Waco were charged with murdering their attackers for having shot back.

The biggest proof that laws are not sacred is that the law enforcement agencies themselves blatantly disregard the law. In my own experience, I have seen the courts look the other way when police altered evidence. The courts even sealed documents to hide police illegal activity. There just is no incentive for the system to bring charges against a police officer that is seen (by the system) as doing his job — that of enforcing government control. The police see the laws not as something that applies to them but only as tools of their trade to be used and misused against socially undesirable people and against people that threaten or ignore the power base of the established legislative, judicial, and law enforcement branches of government.

Our government now has only a thin facade of legitimacy. We must strip away that facade and expose the corrupt center — the lust for power. Then we must systematically strip away all of its unconstitutional, immoral, and unjust power so that it once again is the servant of the people not their master; so that it again protects the rights of the individual instead of violating those rights. ∞

didn't take part in the action, but merely (allegedly) directed it. This is much like Janet Reno's position with regard to the Branch Davidian siege. If Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman must be tried for the World Trade Center bombing, then Janet Reno should be tried for the Branch Davidian siege. Her position as Attorney General, just like any other extenuating circumstance, can be considered by a jury. The sad fact is that, unlike the rest of us, People In Government Service can do whatever they want, regardless of the law. The worst punishment they're likely to receive is suspension from duty and a letter of censure in a personnel file.

I believe it's now appropriate for a militia unit to arrest Janet Reno and hold her in custody until she can be tried before a court of appropriate jurisdiction. If the militia units are not yet capable of this, then we need to strengthen them. Decimus Junius Juvenalis (50 - 130 A.D.) wondered who will guard the guards. The answer is: we will. 🗡️

Live and Let Live

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

We're being submerged in a pervasive ocean of puritan repression. Its focus is largely the repression of sexual behavior and relationships, but the attitudes and methods are not limited to sexual matters. Evangelistic puritans of every stripe are intent upon aggressive programs of repression. Some want to prevent us from "desecrating" the flag. Some won't let us smoke. Some are taking our fireworks away from us. Some are medicating us without our consent through our drinking water. Some won't let us drive without seat belts, crash helmets, or car-seats for our children. The list seems endless. The common thread is involuntary compliance with somebody else's beliefs.

The repression of human sexuality is probably the most persistent program of such forced compliance ever attempted by puritans. They have long been determined to impose their narrow beliefs upon others, and they have long been brutal in their response to non-compliance. Whether or not an "unapproved" activity is inherently harmful, puritans insure by their powers of disapproval that harm will result. In general, the harm isn't caused by the activity, but by the puritans when they demonize and punish the participants.

Today, to even voice an unauthorized attitude is dangerous. I challenge you, for example, to get on the internet and profess a sexual interest in children. Yet, what difference does it make if such views are "lewd"? If the freedom of speech extends only to approved ideas, then it isn't freedom. We must be able to advocate unpopular or even disgusting beliefs. Otherwise, freedom doesn't exist. It's easy for puritans to tolerate the advocacy and practice of their own doctrine, but the more they dislike our beliefs and the more they dislike us for those beliefs, then the more important it is that we insist upon our freedom. They don't have to share our beliefs or practice them, but they must not prevent us from practicing them ourselves.

There isn't necessarily anything wrong with a sexual relationship between people of different races. Prohibition of miscegenation is a puritan accomplishment. There isn't necessarily anything wrong with paying money for sex. Prohibition of prostitution is a puritan accomplishment. There isn't necessarily anything wrong with a sexual relationship involving a girl who's old enough to perform sexually, to be interested

in sex, and to attract men, regardless of her age. Prohibition of sexual relationships with minors is a puritan accomplishment. There isn't necessarily anything wrong with a sexual relationship between consenting siblings. Prohibition of incest is a puritan accomplishment. Most people regard each of these practices as a bad idea, and that's O.K. Whether I'm right or wrong is irrelevant. It's even irrelevant that the practices may involve a risk. Many people have been killed while on vacation, but that doesn't mean vacations ought to be banned. The point is that so long as the participants are not forcing others to participate, no one has any cause to enforce a prohibition. We each have a right to hold and advocate our beliefs, to practice them in concert with other like-minded people, and to do so without interference.

Society can be based upon concern for liberty or it can be based upon concern for sin. The results are vastly

different. If people respect one another's diverse beliefs, no matter how unpopular some of those beliefs may be, it tends to promote a peaceful world. On the other hand, if people try to punish others for practicing their beliefs, it promotes hostility. The results of such repressive behavior are there for all to see: Hutu v s Tutsi; Catholic vs Protestant; Christian vs Moslem; Serb vs Croatian; Jew vs Arab; etc. Throughout history, repression in the name of some belief system has been the greatest source of hatred the world has ever known.

Orwell Now — In the past, puritans have been most successful at repressing actions and behavior. Today, that is changing. Much as George Orwell described the Inner Party in his chilling novel *1984*, puritans today are attempting to prohibit words and even thoughts (cf. Newspeak and Doublethink-Orwell). The "political correctness" movement has prohibited many words, and people who use them are punished (cf. Thought Police-Orwell). The writing of Mark Twain was recently banned (cf. Ministry of Truth, Records Department-Orwell) in some schools not because of what he wrote, but because he used the word *nigger* when he wrote it. The latest and most notorious example of word prohibition is the effort to restrict the publication, particularly on the internet, of words with any unapproved sexual meanings (cf. Junior Anti-Sex League-Orwell). A current example of attempted thought control is the diversity and sensitivity training (cf. Two Minutes Hate-Orwell) imposed upon employees who fail to have certain arbitrary sexual attitudes (cf. Thoughtcrime-Orwell). Orwell's writing seems more frightening with every passing year. Newspeak, Thoughtcrime, rewriting history for political correctness, sexual prohibitions, and more are developing as Orwell depicted them in his novel. As Orwell foresaw, war is peace, freedom is slavery, and ignorance is strength. Sadly, America is being transformed into Orwell's Oceania. —Sam

Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thought-crime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it.

—from *1984*, Chapter One, Section V, By George Orwell

He could not help feeling a twinge of panic... Whether he wrote DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER, or whether he refrained from writing it, made no difference. Whether he went on with the diary, or whether he did not go on with it, made no difference. The Thought Police would get him just the same. He had committed — would still have committed, even if he had never set pen to paper — the essential crime that contained all others in itself. Thoughtcrime, they called it.

—from *1984*, Chapter One, Section I, by George Orwell

Religious freedom in a cultural complex is inversely proportional to the strength of the strongest religion.

—from *Glory Road*[1963], by Robert A. Heinlein

Give Them an Inch and They Become Rulers

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

The *Bicycle Trader* is a subscription newspaper consisting largely of classified ads. One regular section is called "Women Specific". It advertises events for women only. In the May 1995 issue, the following ad appeared in "Women Specific":

"Women-Only Tour on the North Rim of the Grand Canyon, Aug. 15-19, 1995. Women mountain bike riders of all abilities will enjoy this tour for the amazing singletrack riding through alpine forests and meadows, the intimate group size, and unexpected luxuries along the way. This tour is fully supported and accompanied by three professional female guides...."

The paper doesn't publish a "Men Specific" section.

Meanwhile, Shannon Faulkner forced her admission to the Citadel, a (previously) all-male military academy in Charleston, South Carolina. She could have obtained training elsewhere. Choosing the Citadel enabled her to challenge an all-male institution. Her failure to succeed after admission is delightful, but in no way detracts from the outrage of her unwelcome intrusion.

There are thus two opposite strategies pursued simultaneously by different groups of

women. The combination of preserving exclusively female activities while destroying exclusively male activities reduces men to a state of servitude and raises women to a state of supremacy.

The manipulation of men has long been a way for women to seek security. Within the home and family it

Female Taxonomy — I'm sometimes accused of putting all women in the same group. Actually, there are probably four groups.

- Women like the ones in the bicycle tour ad are doing everything possible to promote exclusive rights for women.
- Women like Shannon Faulkner are doing everything possible to deprive men any exclusive rights at all.
- Members of the third group claim that they don't like the feminists, yet they're entirely happy to benefit from feminist "gains". They voluntarily attend classes at schools which are required by feminist legislation to accept female students, and which otherwise would not do so. They voluntarily invoke legislation established by the feminists to oppose so-called sexual harassment. They expect to reap the fruit of feminist ideals in their marriages. They don't actively promote feminist doctrine, but their eagerness to benefit from it constitutes a tacit and hypocritical approval of the feminists.
- I'm not sure the fourth group exists. However, I can think of a few women who don't seem to fit the other groups. I'm not sure, but maybe there's a group of women who really do oppose the feminists, and who try not to benefit from feminist "gains". If the group exists, it's quite small and not politically effective. —Sam

was O.K. Today, however, manipulation of men for the benefit of women has become a matter of public policy, enforced by feminist courts and legislation. This really shouldn't be a surprise. Over 2000 years ago, Aristotle said, "What difference does it make whether women rule, or the rulers are ruled by women? The result is the same." In 2000 years, they haven't changed. Give them political authority and in a few decades you're living in a maternalistic welfare state. Twenty years ago, I supported feminism. Today, after twenty additional years of dealing with women, I'm convinced that letting them vote was one of the biggest mistakes ever made in the United States. Since women have reaffirmed their old compulsion to control men, I won't rest until feminism is a thing of the past, women are no longer political masters, and men are no longer the political pawns of women ♂

From *The Law*

by Frederic Bastiat

"...The claims of these organizers of humanity raise another question which I have often asked them and which, so far as I know, they have never answered: If the natural tendencies of mankind are so bad that it is not safe to permit people to be free, how is it that the tendencies of these organizers are always good? Do not the legislators and their appointed agents also belong to the human race? Or do they believe that they themselves are made of a finer clay than the rest of mankind? The organizers maintain that society, when left undirected, rushes headlong to its inevitable destruction because the instincts of the people are so perverse. The legislators claim to stop this suicidal course and to give it a saner direction. Apparently, then, the legislators and the organizers have received from Heaven an intelligence and virtue that place them beyond and above mankind...."

"Please understand that I do not dispute their right to invent social combinations, to advertise them, to advocate them, and to try them upon themselves, at their own expense and risk. But I do dispute their right to

impose these plans upon us by law—by force—and to compel us to pay for them with our taxes.

"I do not insist that the supporters of these various social schools of thought...renounce their various ideas. I insist only that they renounce this one idea that they have in common: They need only to give up the idea of *forcing* us to acquiesce to their groups and series, their socialized projects, their free-credit banks, their Graeco-Roman concept of morality, and their commercial regulations. I ask only that we be permitted to decide upon these plans for ourselves; that we not be forced to accept them, directly or indirectly, if we find them to be contrary to our best interests or repugnant to our consciences.


"But these organizers desire access to the tax funds and to the power of the law in order to carry out their plans. In addition to being oppressive and unjust, this desire also implies the fatal supposition that the organizer is infallible and mankind is incompetent. But, again, if persons are incompetent to judge for themselves, then why all this talk about universal suffrage?"

—first published as a pamphlet in June, 1850



Nation in Distress

Feminist advocates Family Values Next, on Unsolved Mysteries!



Please Hurt Me I have a female friend who delights
by Steve Strayer in sniping at males. Some time ago,
while I was troubleshooting a problem in her car's electrical
system to save her from having to pay for the service, she
entertained me with the following story.

A talk show host was interviewing two people, one of each
variety, who had undergone sex change operations. The
ex-male commented that the most painful part of becoming
a woman was having the penis amputated. The ex-female
responded that the worst part of becoming a man was hav-
ing half of the brain removed.

My friend, of course, got quite a haw-haw out of her story
and my reaction to it. A few minutes later, as I confirmed
proper multimeter readings at various points in her car's
electrical system, she asked how men seem to know about
such things intuitively. I explained that it's because we
don't have all those brains in the way.

After I finished gloating over my timely come-back and
her momentary loss for words, I asked myself why so many
of us men are so eager to provide freebie help to women,
frequently with nothing in return except individual or collec-
tive abuse. Is it due to our feeble intelligence or do we
simply enjoy being abused? ∞

If you don't want to keep receiving this newsletter, print RETURN TO SENDER above your name and address, cross out your name and address, and return the newsletter. When I receive it, I'll terminate your subscription.

Back issues or extra copies of this newsletter are available upon request.

Permission is hereby granted to reproduce this newsletter in its entirety or to reproduce material from it, provided that the reproduction is accurate and that proper credit is given. Please note that I do not have the authority to give permission to reprint material that I have reprinted from other publications. For that permission, you must go to the original source. I would appreciate receiving a courtesy copy of any document or publication in which you reprint my material.

I solicit letters, articles, and cartoons for the newsletter, but I don't pay for them. Short items are more likely to be printed. I suggest that letters and articles be shorter than 500 words, but that's flexible depending on space available and the content of the piece. I give credit for all items printed unless the author specifies otherwise.

This newsletter isn't for sale. If you care to make a voluntary contribution, you may do so. The continued existence of the newsletter will depend, in part, on such contributions. I accept cash and postage stamps. I don't accept checks, money orders, anything that will smell bad by the time it arrives, or anything that requires me to provide ID or a signature to receive it. In case anybody's curious, I also accept gold, silver, platinum, etc. I'm sure you get the idea.

Laboratory Procedures from [Another Compendium of Wit and Wisdom](#)

1. When you don't know what you are doing, do it neatly.
2. Experiments must be reproducible. They should all fail the same way.
3. First draw your curves, then plot the data.
4. A record of data is essential. It indicates you've been working.
5. To study a subject best, understand it thoroughly before you start.
6. In case of doubt, make it sound convincing. Talk loudly and authorita-
tively.
7. Do not merely believe in miracles. Rely on them.
8. Teamwork is essential in the laboratory. It allows you to blame someone
else.

Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck
What's a pariah? —Student

Dear Student
A carnivorous fish.

Sesame Suite

Bernie: Hey, Burt!

Burt: Yah, what!

Bernie: Did you hear that the feminists are gonna start their
own space program?

Burt: Why?

Bernie: They wanna be the first to land a woman on the
sun!

Burt: But Bernie, what are they gonna do about all that
heat?

Bernie: No problem, Burt! They're gonna land her at night!

Burt: Aaaaaaahh, Bernieeee!

*Sesame Suite has been brought to you by the National
Association of Sexual Agitators (NASA), by the letter F, and
by the number 0.*

WANTED

Someone to remove copy-protection from
discontinued software

SmoothTalker, Version 2, Serial # 212125, dated 1984, runs on
old Macintosh

A product of: First Byte Inc, 2845 Temple Avenue,
Long Beach, CA 90806
(apparently out of business)

Contact: **Free Association**, 435 South
White Road, San Jose, California 95127