

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

November 2000



News Speak

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Martha Raddatz, a correspondent for ABC News, might say what she wants in private, but as a journalist she should know better than to distort the meanings of words in a news report. Nevertheless, on Washington Week in Review on October 13, 2000, she did exactly that. Near the beginning of her report, she lamented that the people killed during the attack on the USS Cole, during the October 12 bombing, were just “kids”. Maybe she was just speaking rhetorically, but it didn’t sound like it to me, and the fact is that those weren’t kids. They were adults, above the “legal” age, responsible for their own decisions, and (presumably) voluntary members of the Navy. Regret for their deaths is to be expected, but to lament those deaths as the deaths of “kids” doesn’t do them, their colleagues, or the U.S. Navy any good. It just twists the meaning of the word into a parody of itself. After all the weeping and wailing about tobacco companies selling to “kids”, gun companies arming “kids”, and movie companies marketing to “kids”, a journalist ought to be more careful than that.

Actually, the misuse of the word *kids* by a journalist is mild next to a far worse case of distortion of the language that has become evident during the reporting of the same bombing incident. That is, the bombing of the USS Cole has been routinely characterized as an act of terrorism. It seems that the U.S. government has redefined terrorism as being any successful act of aggression committed against U.S. “interests”. Substantially similar behavior by U.S. forces has been redefined as counterterrorism, peacekeeping, retaliatory or preemptive strikes, law enforcement, and so forth. In other words, the government’s definition isn’t based on the nature of the act, but on the source and target of the act. I would expect such disingenuous rub-

bish from the likes of President Clinton or Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen. However, I would expect far better than that from Gwen Ifill, Jim Lehrer, Martha Raddatz, or Peter Jennings. It’s disappointing that they and all of their media colleagues have meekly fallen in line with the government’s jargon of deception.

Now, let’s get this straight. Terrorism is an armed attack on unarmed, noncombatant civilians — theirs or ours. The same attack against a military target isn’t terrorism. It’s combat. It’s part and parcel of military life and activities, especially regarding armed vessels at sea. Military people don’t get the luxury of claiming to be victims of terrorism. All military facilities are, by definition, potential targets. People manning them are expected to be prepared and alert. The fundamental job of the military includes the use or threat of death and destruction, and the risk of receiving the same goes with the territory. People who won’t accept that risk shouldn’t be in the military. To call the attack upon the USS Cole terrorism distorts the meaning of the word into a mockery of itself, and can only indicate an intention to mislead and brainwash the American People.

In fact, the U.S. government has been committing acts of terrorism since its inception. Examples abound. One recent instance of terrorism by the U.S. government occurred on August 20, 1998, when the U.S. military launched an unannounced cruise missile attack against the Shifa pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum, Sudan. The facility was an unarmed, civilian facility. It’s as if China had launched cruise missiles at Wal-Mart. It was an act of terrorism. It is entirely consistent with other acts of terrorism that have, for years, routinely been committed by the U.S. government. For that government to call any successful attack upon its own interests an act of terrorism is an indication its incredible hypocrisy. The U.S. government is the most powerful terrorist organization in the known history of the world. ☛

Reprint — Important Civil Rights Issues to be Heard by Top Court

K-House eNews for October 10, 2000, From: "K-House eNews" <enews@khhouse.org>

In its upcoming session the Supreme Court is scheduled to hear five cases which involve challenges to police power to stop, search, and arrest citizens for drug or seat belt violations.

In the case of *Indianapolis vs. Edmond*, the court will decide whether police can set up random drug roadblocks on public streets for the purpose of questioning motorists to see if they are using drugs. This includes the use of drug-sniffing dogs.

Ferguson vs. Charleston involves the question of whether or not hospitals can secretly test pregnant women for cocaine use, and turn the results over to police.

In *Atwater vs. Lago Vista*, the question is whether people can be handcuffed and hauled off to jail for not wearing a seat belt.

In *Kyllo vs. United States*, the court will have to determine whether police, without the owners' knowledge, can scan homes with a thermal imaging gun to search for heat patterns that could indicate a marijuana-growing operation.

All of these cases involve what are called "victimless crimes." Where previously the purpose of law enforcement was apprehending criminals in obvious crimes such as robbery, rape, murder, and assault, the emphasis now is on preventing crime, especially a rapidly growing category of victimless crimes.

According to Steve Dasbach, National Director of the Libertarian Party, "There's a reason why police aren't setting up random roadblocks to find people who have been the victims of robbery or a violent crime," he said. "In those kinds of cases, people go to the police to seek justice. But with drug and seat belt laws, there is no victim to complain."

To combat victimless crimes, police must use sting operations, paid informants, anonymous tips, snitch phone lines, warrantless searches, and high-tech surveillance. The bottom line is that in order to prevent victimless crimes, government needs to know what everyone is doing in every aspect of their lives to see if the potential citizen-criminals are behaving themselves.

The only governments that did this in the past were Communist or Fascist. Neverthe-

less, the war against privacy and the Bill of Rights is underway and can be expected to intensify in the name of preventing crimes. Given the increasing push for hate crimes, this will ultimately have ramifications for freedom of speech and religion.

Agencies from the IRS to Child Protective Services make abundant use of snitch lines. Health and Human Services wanted senior citizens last year to spy on their doctors by offering a reward of up to \$1,000 for reporting fraud. But what distinguishes fraud from honest error in the labyrinthine maze of Medicare paperwork? The potential for harassment is enormous! This becomes more serious when one realizes civil forfeiture could be used against medical practices. Given the current direction of such laws, one false snitch and a doctor could face losing his entire practice, without prosecution — just through an accusation.

Government educrats continue data-basing school children and their families. The hunt for "at-risk" children continues with many school children being forced to fill out oftentimes illegal and invasive questionnaires soliciting non-academic information about attitudes, behavior, health, religious values, and family privacy, which is then entered on databases and transmitted to the Departments of Education or Labor and maintained on other government computers — which then becomes available to the private sector.

The most frightening aspect of all this data-basing is that the databases are being linked. By means of Executive Order 13011, President Clinton created a massive new bureaucracy in 1998 to manage "Federal Information Technology." This order links the data gathered by the Health, Education, and Labor departments to the data accessible to the FBI, CIA, EPA, and other federal agencies. ∞

Selections from Milam's Notes

Most people don't get interested in politics until the Gestapo kicks down their door.

—February 20, 1991

Preventive medicine is acceptable. Preventive legislation is intolerable. —July 27, 1995

You know you're living in a police state when you realize that you're more likely to be arrested than to be mugged. —July 27, 1996

Letters to the Editor

To: Sam Aurelius Milam III

<frontiersman@ida.net>

Subject: Re: October 2000 Frontiersman

Vintage Whine [page 2] — The least we can do is repatriate those that would claim reparations. Their ancestors were kidnapped from Africa so they should at least be entitled to a one way trip back to Africa. Let them choose the country. One condition should be the renunciation of their USA citizenship. It would be cheaper in the long run than keeping them on the welfare rolls or in prison.

Spinning Gold into Straw [page 2] — Too true. I have always said that the only reason that recreational drugs were illegal was because the government profited more than if recreational drugs were legal and taxed. The major benefit, other than the money they get from reselling confiscated drugs, bribes, skimming profits, and other confiscations, is the ability to increase their armed forces and train them in urban warfare without risking a public outcry. Match that with the benefits of legalizing drugs and the government's decision is a "no brainer".

Aristocracy, Democracy, Hypocrisy [page 3] — There are many other examples. Just about every time you turn around you hear about the USA interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. Just think of how the One World Government will act when the government does not need to restrain itself as the USA needs to restrain itself.

Reply to Jonathan; San Jose, California [page 3] — If you wish to see the extent to which the FDA will pervert its intended function of protecting the public in favor of moneyed interests, use any search engine and look up "monosodium glutamate" (including quotes).

Banner headline [page 4] — "If you have to register before you are permitted to vote, then voting isn't a right. It's a privilege." How else would you prevent fraud yet still allow those that choose to vote access to the polls? Registering allows those at the polls to quickly verify the identity of those eligible to vote. Citizenship and residency requirements have all been veri-

fied in advance.

A good issue. A bit late, but worth the wait. Perhaps you should reply to Jonathan regarding his suggestion of charging for back issues. Do you get many requests for back issues? I presume that the Metro is supported by advertisers that pay for the production and delivery costs, but not the costs associated with back issues, hence the charge for back issues.

—Sir James the Bold

Regarding voter fraud, I suggest that you examine your assumptions. Some people will be honest and others will be dishonest, but you must regard the electorate, the citizens en masse, as either trustworthy or not trustworthy. If they can be trusted, on average, then voter fraud won't be a problem. If they can't, then it's foolhardy to have a democracy.

Requiring voter registration reveals an assumption that the electorate is sufficiently dishonest, on average, that the people cannot be trusted to govern themselves. It is the political equivalent of the judicial presumption of guilt, and it makes a mockery of the idea of democracy. It also converts the right to vote into a privilege and creates a bureaucracy empowered to regulate that privilege. The bureaucracy has the power to impose any prerequisite on voting. The bureaucracy, being a part of the government, enables the government to regulate (control) the voters and the elections.

If people insist on trying to have a democracy in spite of the assumption that the electorate is dishonest, then there are better ways to handle it than voter registration. For example, all voting could take place at exactly the same time in auditoriums, theaters, stadiums, etc., throughout the land. Anybody who shows up can vote. Anybody who doesn't show up doesn't vote. Since everybody votes at the same time, nobody can vote twice.

I've said it before and I'll say it again, any government that is too big for all of its citizens to gather into one place and vote by a show of hands is too big to be a democracy. Any such government should be a federation of voluntarily participating small democracies.

—editor



Nation in Distress

Don't be a terrorist.
U.S. federal agents don't
like the competition.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What do you think about Bill Gates?

—Industry Analyst

Dear Industry Analyst

I suppose that if you keep 'em closed, they'll keep tha cows in as good as any other kind.

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 sources. 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.

Does Anybody Know?

Source Unknown — forwarded by Lady Nancy the Enchanting

- Why is bra singular and panties plural?
- If a mute swears, does his mother wash his hands with soap?
- If a person with multiple personalities threatens to kill himself is it considered a hostage situation?
- Is there another word for synonym?
- Isn't it a bit unnerving that doctors call what they do "practice"? [That's why you have to be a "patient". —editor]
- When you open a bag of cotton balls, is the top one meant to be thrown away?
- Why isn't there mouse flavored cat food?
- Where do forest rangers go to get away from it all?

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