

Notice:

This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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



Frontiersman

The Truth Is Within You
October 1999

Danforth's Folly

Sam Aurelius Milam III

On the very day of his appointment, Special Counsel John Danforth revealed that his investigation of the Branch Davidian Massacre will probably be a failure. First, he professed a high-sounding concern with fundamental principles of government, such as those expressed in the Declaration of Independence. Government operates by the consent of the governed and its purpose is to secure the "rights" to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then, he refused to address much of the behavior of the government that might be a violation of those principles. Instead, he limited his investigation to a few selected questions. Was there a cover-up? Did government agents kill anybody? Who started the fire? He solemnly calls these the "dark questions". I call them symptoms of the bigger problem, which he refuses to address.

There are prior and fundamental questions that should be asked. Do unproven allegations of "child" or "gun" violations justify a potentially lethal confrontation, and its execution as a para-military invasion? Where did the government get the authority to pursue a potentially lethal confrontation against Americans who had not been convicted of a capital offense? The accused individuals hadn't even been to court.

Reminder

Sam Aurelius Milam III

We've been reminded again, this time by the people of East Timor, of a fundamental truth of government. While the vote of an armed electorate can be an enforceable demand upon its government, the vote of an unarmed electorate might be an exercise in futility. In East Timor, 98% of the voters voted and 75% expressed the same opinion.¹ Yet, their vote was of no effect because they lacked the means to enforce it.

¹ Madeleine Albright, September 14, 1999, *NewsHour*

Were they presumed innocent until proven guilty? Does refusal of a citizen to cooperate justify lethal response by government? Is "failure to appear" a capital offense? If equal treatment under the law exists, then why weren't the Branch Davidians treated the same as Presbyterians? Were the Branch Davidians members of the governed? Did they consent? Did the government secure their "rights" to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Why did the government believe that it could get away with such a siege? Do government agents believe that they aren't accountable for their actions? Once it was in position, why couldn't the U.S. government, the most powerful government in the world, afford to simply back up a few yards, out of range of alleged (defensive) gunfire from the besieged Americans in the compound, and continue to negotiate? The occupants of the compound weren't going anywhere. Wasn't time on the side of the government? Why was there such a sense of urgency to end the confrontation? What did the government fear, that caused the sense of urgency? After Janet Reno accepted responsibility for the murders, why wasn't she hauled into court? I surely would have been. The surviving Branch Davidians were.

Unless John Danforth has the courage to address such questions, then his investigation will be of little value.

Again, light is shed upon why the U.S. government is trying so hard to disarm the voters.

The only things that stand between Americans and the tyranny of the U.S. government are the willingness and ability of Americans to defend themselves against that government, which has changed from government **by** the people to government **of** the people. It was **never** government **for** the people.

Seek justice from tyrannical governments not with your hat in your hands but with a rifle in your fist.
—Emiliano Zapata

Important Police Information

This item was credited to the Associated Press, July 18, 1999, and was forwarded by Mark Evans, mark-evans88@hotmail.com, and Sir John the Generous, <http://www.jwebster.com>

Washington — Local police can now take a single fingerprint from a suspect at a roadside arrest and find out in minutes from a new FBI computerized national crime database whether the person is wanted, rather than waiting hours, days or longer, that the old FBI system took. The FBI just launched its new National Crime Information Center 2000. The new system now has the ability to automatically process fingerprints and mugshots. It also contains the information about wanted people, criminal histories, missing and deported people, stolen guns, vehicle license plates, stocks, boats, and “other” articles. Now a police officer in a station or squad car in the field can put a suspect’s index finger into a small reader that transmits the print by radio to the FBI NCIC 2000 computers in Clarksburg, W. Va. Within minutes, the NCIC computer — automatically without any action by FBI employees — checks the single fingerprint against 250,000 fingerprints in the FBI’s file of fugitives and wanted persons. The answer pops out in minutes. If the print identifies the suspect as someone who is wanted, the NCIC 2000 computer not only relays the result to local police but also sends a mugshot of the wanted person. ∞

Property Rights

Sam Aurelius Milam III

While I was studying with the Constitutional Patriots, I was exposed to the theory that the government owns us, that we are actually and literally property. There were probably various things to which advocates of this theory pointed in its defense, but I recall two items in particular.

The first item is our parents’ marriage license. It is, according to advocates of the theory, a grant of the authority to produce children. The marriage is equivalent to a licensed business or a chartered corporation. It’s created by government, empowered to do certain things, and prohibited from doing other things. It can be terminated only by the government. Children produced without the benefit of the license are “illegitimate”, equivalent to a counterfeit product produced by a company not authorized

to produce it.

The second item is our birth certificate. It is, according to advocates of the theory, exactly the equivalent of a title for a car or a deed for a piece of land. It’s issued by the government. It uniquely identifies the named individual and testifies to the individual’s origin and authenticity. The party that holds the certificate owns the property described on it. The government holds your birth certificate. Neither you nor any other person can legally obtain possession of it.

I still haven’t decided if this theory is entirely valid. However, it certainly explains a lot of the government’s behavior. If the government owns us, then it has a legitimate reason to act without our consent to protect, utilize, and dispose of us. There are many examples of such behavior.

The government does many things to protect us, either without our consent or against our will. As children, we’re compelled to receive vaccinations. We’re prevented from consuming substances or using products which the government believes might harm us. We’re required to use crash helmets, seat belts, safety glasses, and so forth. If the government doesn’t own us, then it isn’t justified in such behavior. If it does, then it can act to protect its property.

The government also acts as if it has the right to use us for its own profit. We’re both compelled and encouraged in school to study things which the government believes will make us more productive. Government agencies help us try to find jobs. When we’re paid, the government takes its share first. According to the advocates of this ownership theory, the government views us as production units.

The most significant behavior, however, is based on the fact that only the owner of property can dispose of it. Accordingly, only the government can dispose of us — kill us or have us killed. If a person kills another person, it’s a crime. This, more than any other behavior, suggests that the government owns us.

Are we property? I’m still not sure but I think the prudent answer is to presume that we are. Then, we should try to free ourselves from the condition of being owned. I also think that we should act quickly because if we don’t solve the problem soon — given the government’s growing technology of control — we and our descendants might be property forever. ¶

Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor

In November of 1963, I was one sick girl. The doctors told my mother that I needed an operation to make me better. They did a D & C in November of that year. The doctors said that instead of a D & C they should have done a hysterectomy but they wanted me to “grow up normal”. Please tell me what is normal about having to get shots of Demerol or Darvon in your behind every day for seven days during your period. Also, the laws stated that if I had 1 in 1,000,000 chances of getting pregnant I could not have the hysterectomy.

In November of 1969, I was again a sick woman. The doctors **finally** found the tumors that I could feel by pressing on my abdomen. They finally decided to do “exploratory surgery” and they found 7 lbs of tumors on the outside of my uterus. The tumors had almost shut off my tubes from my kidneys to my bladder. The tumor was wrapped around my back bone also. They took out the tumors, one tube and ovary. The doctors told me that I should have a complete hysterectomy then but the laws stated that if I had 1 in 1,000,000 chances of getting pregnant I could not have the hysterectomy.

Fast forward to December of 1972, after 6 months of doctors telling me “there is nothing wrong with you. Get a job or have a kid.”, I told them if they did not do anything I would do it myself. The doctors finally took me into the hospital and did, **again** exploratory surgery. When I was with it enough they were on my bed crying because they had been **WRONG** and I had cancer. They were really sorry etc. Because of the law Roe v Wade they were allowed (finally this time) to do the hysterectomy as well as remove the tumor. I had finally gotten what I needed in medical care.

Now, just because a man in eBay [September 2, 1999 — editor] wanted to sell his kidney to the highest bidder the great white bureaucrats in our nation’s capital say he cannot do this. This to me seems just like when I needed a hysterectomy in 1963 and 1969 and could not get it because it was illegal. This man may be selling his kidney, but he is also helping a person who might die otherwise. The slave masters in Washington D. C. say no to the slave. They don’t stop to think that the man has 2 (count them) 2 kidneys and can live just as well on one as on two. They don’t stop to think that the man is trying to help another person as well as

himself. They just want to control all of their slaves, and don’t you dare try to think for yourself.

What are we — citizens of the United States of America or Slaves of the United States of America? Only you can answer this question. And your answer defines what we give to our children.
—Jan; Firth, Idaho

If people owned themselves, they’d be able to dispose of their organs as a matter of choice. By what logic does the government have jurisdiction over these matters? The simplest answer is that the government owns the organs.
—editor

Dear Sam

Anarchists talk about a world without rulers. Communists say that, after a generation or two of Leninist dictatorship, comes withering away of the state. In practice, after two generations of Stalinist dictatorship, came the transfer of the state to the “democratic” gangsters. Today we are ruled by gangsters, & no one is happy about it but the gangsters, whose concept of happiness is suspect anyway. But is a world without LEADERS really possible? I’m disgusted, not because there are leaders, but because our “leaders” are gangsters. The CIA seems to be behind everything, from Kissinger to Yeltsin to the “libertarian” Ventura. Ventura showed that a former wrestler could be no more a clown than Democrats or Republicans. But by continuing in wrestling from the governor’s mansion, he manages to drag US politics even lower.

Robertson says that Clinton should obey his advisors. Empires from Rome to China to England to the US have been run by bureaucracies. But leaders, whether chosen by the army, primogenitor, or vote, are supposed to direct bureaucracies, not be directed by them. Bureaucrats are not supposed to tell leaders what to do. But of course the world today is run by the covert bureaucracies of the CIA, FBI, & other secret police. Louis Freeh, a typical shadow government bureaucrat, has consistently attacked the Clinton administration, in concert with the right wing conspirators like Robertson. I hope Clinton & Reno will take advantage of the re-emergent Waco scandal to sack Freeh & some of his subversive bureaucratic associates. It’s people like this who make real leadership impossible, opening the way for “libertarians” like Ventura, as well as Bradley, Beatty, & other such sports.

Sincerely,
—Elliot; N. Merrick, New York



Nation in Distress

Just because
something is a
good idea
doesn't necessarily
mean that it should be
mandated by
government.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What do you think about Janet Reno?

—Political Analyst

Dear Political Analyst

I suppose that if they named a town after her, then she can't be all bad.

Acknowledgments

- My thanks to Sir John the Generous, <http://www.jwebster.com/>, for his contributions.
- My thanks to *The Affiliate*, <http://www.the-grand-barn.com/>, of Vankleek Hill, Ontario for regularly printing reviews of the *Frontiersman*.
- My thanks to Sir Donald the Elusive for paying the production costs of this newsletter and for his additional contributions. —editor

Frontiersman

Cancellations — If you don't want to keep receiving this newsletter, print REFUSED, 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. You may also cancel by letter, e-mail, carrier pigeon, or any other method that gets the message to me.

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

Reprint Policy — 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.

Sightings

Source Unknown — forwarded by Sir John the Generous

I was at the airport, checking in at the gate, when the airport employee asked, "Has anyone put anything in your baggage without your knowledge?" I said, "If it was without my knowledge, how would I know?" He smiled and nodded knowingly, "That's why we ask."

The stoplight on the corner buzzes when it is safe to cross the street. I was crossing with an intellectually challenged co-worker of mine, when she asked if I knew what the buzzer was for. I explained that it signals to blind people when the light is red. She responded, appalled, "What on earth are blind people doing driving?"

Submissions — 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.

Payment — 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 U.S. postage stamps. I will accept checks or money orders only by prior arrangement. I don't accept 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 is curious, I also accept gold, silver, platinum, etc. I'm sure you get the idea.

—Sam Aurelius Milam III, editor