

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

March 2000



Cyber Attack on Liberty

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Recently, I've seen several news interviews with people who claim to be well acquainted with the workings of the internet. They claim that everything that I do on the internet is traceable back to me. If that's true, then the cyber attacks launched against Yahoo, eBay, and the likes, during the second week of February pose a puzzling question. Why can't the FBI locate the perpetrators? There might be several reasons, but there's one possibility that I haven't heard suggested on the news. Maybe the FBI doesn't want to locate the perpetrators. Maybe the attacks were launched from sources within the U.S. government.

Why would the U.S. government do such a thing? Isn't that exactly the question that everybody's been asking about the unknown perpetrators anyway? However, in the case of the U.S. government, the question almost answers itself. For years, people have been required to get licenses to drive a car, own a business, get a job, get married, own a dog. The government, at one level or another, requires licenses for everybody from airline pilots to contractors. The government licenses broadcasters and publishers. For years, individuals have been required to get a license to participate in amateur radio. There's even a license for the so-called Citizen's Band. By now, the motive of the hypothetical government perpetrators of the attacks should be obvious. You don't need a license to use the internet. I expect that there are people who would like to change that.

Why hasn't the government enacted a licensing requirement before now? So far, people haven't been ready to sacrifice their liberty in favor of security in the use of the internet, as they've done in everything else. In that regard, the U.S. government has promoted a constant stream of propaganda concerning the threat of

cyber terrorism to "national security", the threats to your privacy, the threats to your children, the threats of illegal and "substandard" prescription drugs, the treats of unregulated overseas purchases, all posed by unscrupulous users of the unregulated internet. The recent cyber attacks sure look to me like another piece of a well orchestrated campaign, and it seems to be working. The people are getting "ready". Even the "industry" is wavering. It takes me right back to the 60's and the stupid airline hijackings to Cuba. Incredible as they seemed even then, they nevertheless resulted in an airport surveillance gestapo that continues even today to increase its power and intrusiveness. See *Watching Big Brother Watch You*, on page 2.

Whether or not the government actually launched the attacks is probably irrelevant. The result is likely to be the same in either case — a new licensing requirement. Imagine, if you can, that you don't have a right to use the internet any more. Suppose that instead you have to go downtown first, and get a license. Remember, a license is permission. If you need permission to use the internet, then it isn't a right. It's a privilege. It might seem unlikely now, but I can remember a time when seat belts and auto insurance were voluntary. If the logistics appear daunting, just consider the number of people that are licensed as drivers. Licensing internet users is well within the abilities of government and, given the international nature of the internet, it's an ideal opportunity to create an international licensing agency. All the pieces are being carefully put in place, one by one. Even the new built-in location capability that will soon be required for cell phones fits the scenario. That is, if the enforcers can find your phone, anywhere in the world, then you won't be able to illegally sneak into the internet with a cell phone. Some kind of internet licensing requirement seems at least possible. The excuse is being provided and the people might be just stupid enough to go for it.

A Worse Bigotry

Sam Aurelius Milam III

The opposition to discrimination that began with what were probably good intentions has become a monster. The original intention, as I understand it, was to secure equal treatment before the law for everyone, regardless of race, religion, etc. While a government, as governments are presently understood,¹ should treat everyone equally, there isn't any reason at all to expect that a person should do so. Indeed, there's every reason to expect otherwise. Everyone has different attitudes and opinions. Everyone should be entitled to have and to express those attitudes and opinions, whether or not they're agreeable to everyone else. If some of those attitudes and opinions happen to be racist, sexist, or any other "ist", then so be it. Any attempt to coercively prohibit such thinking, however despicable that thinking may appear to be, is in fact nothing more than another form of bigotry, directed not at a specific group, but at anyone who's opinion differs from the mandated standard.

So, if someone doesn't like negroes, homosexuals, Jews, or whatever, then c'est la vie. Those attitudes already create sufficient conflict, without the intrusive evangelism of insensitive reformers who demand sensitivity in everyone but themselves. If the hateful ideas that drive the atrocities in the world cannot be eradicated by persuasion and education, then they simply will not be eradicated at all. Experience has shown, and continues to show, that attempts to coercively prohibit prejudice will fail. In their failure, such attempts result in resentment and hostility. They reinforce prejudice, bigotry, and atrocities rather than reducing them. The hope of achieving courtesy and respect in the world may indeed live within many of us, but it dies an ugly death as regulation or legislation.

A Native American elder once described his own inner struggles in this manner: "Inside of me there are two dogs. One of the dogs is mean and evil. The other dog is good. The mean dog fights the good dog all the time." When asked which dog wins, he reflected for a moment and replied, "The one I feed the most."
—Source Unknown

¹ See my essay [The Long and Winding Doctrine, Social Contract](#). It's available upon request.

Notice

Sam Aurelius Milam III

John Webster expects to go on trial in the near future. You can review his situation at <http://www.jwebster.com/> and contact him at jwebster@ix.netcom.com or 408 972-2963.

Mr. Webster needs \$25,000 "up front" for his lawyer. Contributions or loans would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Webster has promised that, in the event that he receives over half a million dollars in compensation for the violation of his rights, money loaned to his legal fund at this time will be paid back at twice the amount and money donated will be paid back at three times the amount. If he doesn't receive compensation he will still make every attempt to pay back loans at face value.

Watching Big Brother Watch You

This is reprinted from Khouse eNews, January 25, 2000 For The Week Of 1/25/2000.

Contact khupdate@judah.khouse.org.

Security checks at airports may be spicier in the near future, at least for the security guards who perform them. A new X-ray-type machine, called BodySearch, employs the latest technology to reveal everything one has on under their clothes...and then some. Currently BodySearch machines are used in customs operations at New York's JFK Airport as well as five other major airports around the country. They will be installed in every major USA airport by June.

According to the Libertarian Party's web site, the devices have "voyeuristic" quality and although not yielding photographic-quality images, they do display intimate body parts as well as weapons and other items the person may be carrying strapped to their person. Even using them in customs work is causing concern. "In 1998, U.S. Customs employees ordered 2,797 international airline passengers to strip off their clothes at gunpoint, intimately groped them, and conducted humiliating body cavity searches."² Most of these searches were unnecessary. Now will airport security attempt to force this on the general public as a routine security procedure? ∞

² "Airport's new X-rated X-rays expose your naked body through your clothes," www.lp.org, January 11, 2000

Letter to the Editor

Dear Sam:

...In regard to the privacy issue [[The War on Muffshots](#), December 1999, and subsequent letters], I think there is a grey area involved... situations where something might technically be public, or in public view, but where the privacy invader might almost have to be aggressive to “get the goods” as it were. Still, I think it’s funny how we all get stuck on debating these unusual, borderline cases. I mean, how many men are going around with low angle cameras anyway?

In regard to the former Yugoslavia: If blame is being allocated for the mess, then, beyond the various ethnic politicians, blame must be placed on the German government. At the very beginning of the crisis, the US basically decided to follow German ideas on what to do, on the theory that this was more a German problem than an American problem. It was Germany that rushed to recognize break-away Croatia, without even consulting the US, (or against US advice, I’m not sure which). In retrospect, the western powers were just too eager to fish in troubled waters.

—Donald; Santa Clara, California

There are two issues here — peeking up women’s skirts and protectionist legislation. From the letters that I’m receiving, it seems that I haven’t clearly distinguished between the two issues. I’ll try harder to make the distinction.

The peeking issue results from normal male sexual response to the presence of women. I believe that the time is long past for women to recognize the existence of such normal male behavior. Granted, women don’t presently have a clue but, as the courts like to say, “ignorance is no excuse”. Women are going to be the targets of sexual attention by men, including peeking, whether they intend to attract such attention or not. If they can’t deal with it, then they should avoid the presence of men instead of trying so hard to force themselves into our workplaces, clubs, military institutions, and so forth.

Whether or not you believe that men ought to be peeking up women’s skirts, the protectionist legislation issue is a separate issue. Anti-peeking legislation is merely the latest example. For decades, feminist activists of every stripe have

been promoting legislation intended to secure special privileges and protection for women by regulating the behavior of men, all under the phony banner of alleged equality.³ As usual, this particular round of protectionist legislation will be more harmful to both men and women than the peeking would have been. Men have always peeked and always will. Protectionist legislation prohibiting such peeking won’t change male behavior. It will merely punish men for that behavior, fueling hostility and resentment. Also, as I’ve said repeatedly, women don’t need protectionist legislation to protect themselves from this kind of covert videotaping. Each woman can decide for herself which part of her body should be private and achieve that privacy by the way she dresses. However, and exactly as I would expect, feminists are refusing to act like adults. They could encourage women to protect themselves. Instead, they’re whining to their male-surrogate authority figure — government — for protection. As for how many men are taking such covert videos, the feminists don’t really care. They’ll happily use the behavior of a very few men as an excuse to impose protectionist legislation on all of us.

While I’m on the issue of sexual privacy, I can’t help mentioning the airport surveillance gestapo and their BodySearch intrusion technology, noted earlier in this issue. If the feminist activists really cared about the privacy of female sexual parts, you’d think they’d be complaining about that issue — a case where women really can’t protect themselves. I haven’t seen any indication of concern. Maybe they don’t care about peeking by agents of the male-surrogate authority figure. It’s only us ordinary guys who aren’t permitted to do it. I speculate that we’re witnessing the conversion of yet another natural human activity — voyeurism — into yet another special privilege that is reserved exclusively for government agents but denied for the rest of us.

—editor

When any government, or any church for that matter, undertakes to say to its subjects, “This you may not read, this you must not see, this you are forbidden to know,” the end result is tyranny and oppression, no matter how holy the motives.

—from *If this Goes On*
by Robert A. Heinlein

³ See the article [Penultimate Straw](#), in the April 1995 issue of this newsletter. It’s available upon request.



Nation in Distress

Zero tolerance teaches intolerance.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

How do you think Trump would work out in the Presidency? —Interested Voter

Dear Interested Voter

I'm not familiar with the game you mentioned, but I know a Trump works OK in Bridge.

Acknowledgments

• My thanks to Sir John the Generous <http://www.jwebster.com/>, and Sir Donald the Elusive for their contributions.

• My thanks to *The Affiliate*, <http://www.the-grand-barn.com/>, of Vankleek Hill, Ontario for regularly printing reviews of the *Frontiersman*.

—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.

US Air Force Communications Difficulties

Source Unknown — forwarded by Sir John the Generous

• Problem — Number three engine missing. Solution — Engine found on right wing after brief search.

• Problem — Aircraft handles funny. Solution — Aircraft warned to straighten up, "fly right," and be serious.

• Problem — Target Radar hums. Solution — Reprogrammed Target Radar with the words.

Does Anybody Know?

Source Unknown — forwarded by Lady Nancy the Enchanting

• Why doesn't glue stick to the inside of the bottle?

• Can fat people go skinny-dipping?

• Can you be a closet claustrophobe?

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