


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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

July 2000

Victimless Crime?

Sam Aurelius Milam III

It's well known to statisticians, and apparently unknown to most other people, that statistical predictions apply to populations, but not to individuals. That is, it's impossible to calculate a prediction that applies to a population of one, an individual. Only populations greater than one are subject to statistical predictions. The failure to understand this principle is of great significance. Consider drivers for example. It's possible to predict, using statistical methods, that within a certain population of drivers, there will be some percentage of accidents that involve drunk drivers. The larger the population of drivers, the more confidence we can have in the prediction. The smaller the population, the less confidence we will have in the prediction. However, for a population of one, the prediction is impossible. That is, it isn't possible to predict, statistically, that a specific drunk driver will ever have an accident. He might drive drunk for his entire life and never do so. It's impossible to prove that he's more likely to have an accident than a sober driver, because it's impossible to calculate the probability for either of them. While statistical calculations that predict a certain probability of an occurrence within a population might justify some government policy toward that population, it's utterly impossible to use a statistical consideration to justify the imposition of any requirement whatsoever upon an individual. Thus, to treat a drunk driver differently under the law than a sober driver, based only upon a probability that the drunk driver is more likely to cause an accident, is unjustifiable. Furthermore, a drunk driver, by the simple fact of driving drunk, doesn't harm anyone. Harm doesn't occur until someone is injured. If someone is injured, then they are just as injured, whether or not one of the drivers involved is

drunk. Indeed, people are injured just as seriously in accidents that don't involve drunk drivers at all. The fact of being drunk is irrelevant to the extent of injury caused by accidents.

Obviously, if probability is the only argument to the contrary, then we ought to leave drunk drivers alone to go about their business. If a driver causes an accident, then he should be equally guilty, whether or not he was drunk at the time. Although a presumption of innocence for drunk drivers contradicts the brainwashing to which we've all been exposed, even the establishment media have reported results that support it. On the NBC Nightly News With Tom Brokaw, Tuesday, January 7, 1997, NBC's Robert Hager reported the results of a study by the Centers For Disease Control which reported that there are about 1 1/2 million alcohol-related arrests each year in the USA, but a mere 17,000 alcohol-related deaths per year. There are over 123 million **undetected** incidents per year of drunk driving which **do not** result in deaths, accidents, or even arrests. Mr. Hager conceded that the number of undetected incidents of drunk driving is "a huge number compared to those arrested or causing an accident". Nobody seemed to notice the obvious conclusion. There are fewer than .014% as many alcohol-related deaths as there are drunk drivers. Fewer than 1.2% of drunk driving incidents even come to the notice of the cops. The obvious conclusion must be that drunk driving isn't really very likely to cause an accident. Yet, for this non-problem, we've given up (if we want to drive) our rights to be presumed innocent, to refuse to incriminate ourselves, to remain silent, to travel, and even to own a car. We've allowed the creation an arrogant and repressive police establishment staffed by strutting gestapo-style thugs. So, is drunk driving a victimless crime? Like all of the others, it was until we all became the victims. That happened when the arrogant reformers used it as yet another stupid excuse to expand the police state. ☛

Reprints

This Letter to the Editor, taken from a newspaper, was forwarded by Eric, of Calipatria, California. I'm not sure where he got it.

We see numerous letters and statements depicting values related to equality. Many if not most, espouse equality of conditions and results. An April 18 Letter to the Editor stated, "It's clear that the promulgation of inequality, rather than the augmentation of equality, is the principle guiding the wealthy parents of the upscale community that houses Menlo-Atherton High School." Though the article the writer was referring to, suggesting the presence of unequal treatment of students, was largely refuted by additional letters from present and past school teachers, the principal and one student, it is apparent that the writer sought equality of conditions.

Paradoxically, inequality is exactly what all people strive for: to be the best basketball or chess player, to get the top grades in physics, to jump higher, look prettier, buy the classiest car, become the most intelligent, the loudest, the sweetest, or sing better, make more money, live in the biggest house, have the most women, be the best dad, play the sweetest horn, seek the best school, classiest wife, run faster, spit further, whatever. Everything everyone does throughout their life assures inequalities of results, which become part of the conditions leading to the next set of unequal results.

We are born unequal in talents, parents and environment. Life will deal us a unique hand of experiences and challenges. We are exceedingly unequal in our desires, abilities, self-discipline, dedication, work habits and capacity to make

good life choices. We will take decidedly different and unequal paths than others. Inequality is the dominating truth of our lives — everyone's life, everywhere and at all times.

There are infinite numbers of conditions preceding an outcome or result, not the least of which are the attributes of the individual. Society can and should attempt equality for its citizens on those few controllable conditions, such as school equipment, which promote equality of opportunity. But results, which are also infinite, can never be equal, given differences in individuals and in uncontrollable conditions.

Given this powerful, inevitable and unchanging reality, what is the obligation of society? Some have expressed it as "to provide a level playing field." Properly understood, it means to try to build substantive equality of opportunity into our institutions, such as to treat everyone equally under the law. Mistakenly understood, "a level playing field" means to take from the more endowed, richer or luckier (by coercion, as this is the only way to do it) and give advantages disproportionately to those groups perceived as disadvantaged or victimized, a stereotype generalization — i.e. to achieve equality of result. Other than its inconsistency with our constitutional principles and the logical impossibility of classifying a group as though all its members possessed equality of disadvantage, and given the absolute differences between individuals, equality of results or conditions is impossible, even ludicrous.

On a level baseball field every player will achieve different results.

—Sam Clarke; Poulsbo, Washington

Millennium Forum to Create Global Parliament

From: khupdate@judah.khouse.org
Subject: KHouse eNews - June 13, 2000
Website: <http://www.khouse.org>

This September the United Nations will hold its Millennium Forum and People's Assembly, the purpose of which is to create a global parliament. To start with, the parliament will only be advisory in nature but the long-term goals are to make it into a world parliament in its own right.

Over the last decade, the United Nations has unabashedly been reinventing itself into a global government, striving to obtain the legal teeth

and financial resources to implement its policies. In 1995, the United Nations Commission on Global Governance published a report entitled, *Our Global Neighborhood*. The Commission made a number of recommendations for changes to the United Nations, including:

- A system of global taxation;
- A standing U.N. army;
- A Court of Criminal Justice;
- Expanded authority for the Secretary General;
- An Economic Security Council;
- U.N. authority over the global commons (especially the oceans and all areas of sovereign

territories that influence the oceans.);

--An end to the veto power of permanent Security Council members;

-- A new parliamentary body of "civil society" representatives (NGOs).

Since then the U.N. has been plugging ahead with these recommendations. Millennium Forum will be a fulfillment of the last item. Currently it is uncertain how members of the world body will be elected. Several proposals have been placed on the table:

--Establishing some kind of consultative assembly of parliamentarians to which parliaments all over the world would appoint representatives.

--Creating a consultative assembly consisting of unelected NGO organizations, which already provide input to the U.N. major conferences.

--An assembly directly elected by all the people of the world.

--Direct democracy by way of the Internet, so that any "world citizens" could vote on any items they could so choose at any time. This would probably be an electronic form of the ancient Greek "mob-ocracy."

Global government has been a long time in coming, supported by a wide panoply of luminaries over the years. Our Global Neighborhood said the surrender of sovereignty is "a principle that will yield only slowly and reluctantly to the imperatives of global environmental cooperation."

The foundation of global governance does not rest in the same set of core values and protections the American system contains. These values are not new. They have been tried, under different names, in other societies, often with devastating consequences. Legal safeguards against government abuse do not exist at the international level nor are there plans to create them. The rights enshrined in the U.S. Bill of Rights — property and financial rights, freedom of speech and religion, the right to bear arms against invaders and abusive government, protection against double jeopardy, trial by a jury of one's peers, right to petition for redress of grievances, et al. — do not exist in the same form at the U.N. level. Where the U.N. appears to guarantee rights, there are often "weasel words," which allow the so-called rights to be set aside at the will of government.

The entire push to globalism has tremendous significance for Christians for several reasons. First, we are witnessing the formation of what the Bible predicted 2,000 years ago: a (somewhat) unified universal political, financial and religious system. Christians note that the new global paradigm has a moral and religious component that will not tolerate opposition or dissent by religious factions that do not agree with it! To reiterate: the new globalism will not leave the Christian church alone. It will use legal and other pressures to co-opt, coerce, or eliminate religious groups to force them into conformity to the new ideals or go out of business. Unlike secular humanism, the new global pantheistic socialism will not leave the church alone! No clearer warning can be sounded as to the dangers to faith on the road ahead.

Thus our closing caveat: no matter how slow the implementation, given the current course, when the changes are all done, they will be binding on all by artifice of law, international treaty and internal regulation conforming to the dictates of the United Nations, against which citizens of the world will have little established methods of recourse or redress.

For more information on United Nations policies and how they will affect us, we recommend the following sites:

<<http://www.crossroad.to>>

<<http://www.freedom.org>>


<<http://www.sovereignty.org>>

<<http://www.un.org>>

Letter to the Editor


Sam, I agree with everything you say in [*Another Needless Prohibition*, June, page 1]. My one quibble is that you didn't go far enough in your conclusion. While we're dreaming about restoring common sense by repealing stupid laws and releasing victims from prison, why not also dream about taking the next logical step? Why not instill accountability in the legislators, cops, prosecutors and judges who enact and enforce the stupid laws in the first place by imposing personal costs on them for any frivolously improper action? If a government official faced a REAL risk of being docked a month's pay or losing his job for using his government position to impose personal opinions on the rest of us, he would be more likely to resist the temptation.

—Steve, Fremont, California



Nation in Distress

One man's defamation is
another man's Truth.
If the Freedom of
Speech doesn't include
both of them, then
(eventually) it won't
include either of them.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

Do you think I should get a cell phone?

—Unsure

Dear Unsure

Well, I've never needed one, but if you're in jail a lot it might be easier to make calls from your cell.

Acknowledgments

- 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 John the Generous <http://www.jwebster.com/>, Sir Donald the Elusive, Sir James the Bold, and Lady Helen the Gracious for their 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.

Men Can Be Proud Because...

Source Unknown — forwarded by Warren, of Pocatello, Idaho

- A few belches are expected and tolerated.
- Our bellies hide our big hips.
- One wallet, one pair of shoes, one color for all seasons.
- We can do our nails with a pocketknife.
- We have the freedom of choice concerning growing a mustache.
- Christmas shopping can be accomplished for 25 people on the day before Christmas — and in 45 minutes.

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