


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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

January 2001

Demockery:

The Will of the Ignorant

Sam Aurelius Milam III

The recently concluded presidential selection fiasco has brilliantly illuminated the difference between a federation and a democracy. So far as I can tell, the current incarnation of the United States of America wasn't originally intended to be a democracy at all. It was intended to be a federation. A review of the U.S. Constitution supports this claim.

The president was intended to be selected by the states, not elected by the people.

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall ... be elected, as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors....

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for two persons.... And they shall make a list of all the persons voted for, and of the number of votes for each; which list they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes shall be the President....

—Article II, Section 1, clauses 1, 2, and 3
U.S. Constitution

The quoted clauses provide other details, which I have not printed here, regarding the selection process. You can read the deleted material in your own copy of the constitution. It isn't relevant to the present article. What is relevant is the fact that there isn't any requirement whatsoever, anywhere in the provision, of a presidential election by popular vote.

Likewise, senators were intended to be se-

lected by the states, not elected by the people.

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof....

—Article I, Section 3, clause 1
U.S. Constitution

Only the members of the House of Representatives were to be elected by the people. Even that wasn't necessarily intended to invoke the will of the majority. It was intended to preserve the powers of large states as compared to the powers of small states. It was a result of the Great Compromise, which had more to do with states rights than with democracy.

Clearly, the government established by the U.S. Constitution wasn't intended to be a democracy, but a federation of states. The insidious encroachment of ill-considered democracy into the federal process has resulted in the usurpation of the federal principles, and their replacement by the unwieldy mechanisms of a bloated and unmanageable parody of democracy. It isn't even a true democracy, but government by an elected oligarchy. The misapplication of democratic principles and the misrepresentation of the result has reduced the people to ignorance and servitude, and the U.S. government to such spectacles as the one we witnessed this past November and December. The continuing encroachment of so-called democracy into the tattered vestiges of the federation will, no doubt, contribute to the eventual and inevitable destruction of that federation.

For some time now, I've been calling for the repeal of the U.S. Constitution, the termination of the present federal union, and the elevation of the American states to the status of politically independent nations. The present course, however, is in the opposite direction, toward ever increasing concentrations of power in fewer hands. Unchecked, the trend will result in a One-World government, under which the people won't have any power at all, and will be ruled by distant masters in foreign lands.

Reprint

Editor's Note: I have not verified the Related Links presented by K House eNews.
K-House eNews for December 12, 2000
<http://www.khouse.org/index.html>

Excerpts from eNews

For The Week Of December 12, 2000

Toward Global Governance

The term "global governance" began to replace former President George Bush's term "New World Order" in the mid-90s, once the latter term became a political liability as more and more people caught on to what it would mean. This follows the socialist pattern of constantly changing the names of programs, actions or laws to keep the opposition confused as to the actual intent of what is being promoted or passed.

The chief mechanism for achieving these goals is to incrementally transfer sovereignty and economic control bit by bit from nation-states to new supra-national globalist organizations, such as the United Nations. In some cases, such as the GATT accord, substantial control over countries' economies has been "deeded over" to unelected, unaccountable officials, who will make decisions affecting the lives of millions of those countries' citizens. All of this is usually done slowly with steps taken to ensure that public recognition of what is happening and a subsequent outcry of protest does not occur.

Bottom line on the new global governance: it does not have adequate protection of rights and the guarantee of freedoms built into it.

The Emerging European Superstate

More and more citizens of Great Britain are realizing that the emerging European Union is threatening their own sovereignty, despite claims to the contrary of Britain's ruling Labor party. Prior to the recent European Summit in Nice, Germany and Italy sent a confidential joint paper to France indicating the summit should formulate plans to hold an inter-governmental conference (IGC) in 2004 "with a view to the further development of European integration". The secret document was obtained by the Times of London.

British Euroskeptics reacted immediately to this latest evidence that the ultimate goal of the E.U. is a European superstate to which all member states would become subservient. Earlier in the year, British subjects discovered that the E.U. government in Brussels was be-

ginning to have a bigger and bigger say in British affairs, despite claims to the contrary by the Labor government. This brought cries of dismay from the opposition Tory party.

Meanwhile, more than 100,000 Austrians have signed a petition for a referendum examining whether Austria should quit the European Union, obliging the Austrian Parliament to discuss the issue within six months. The petition maintains that the E.U. is stripping Austria of its sovereignty, has undermined its agriculture and has threatened its neutrality.

Austrians are still reeling from the sanctions imposed by other E.U. member states when the far-rightist party of [Jeorg Haider](#) was legitimately included in the new government following elections.

Related Links:

<http://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/0,,47203,00.html>

http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/europe/newsid_1065000/1065323.stm

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/et?ac=003974986755569=wewntnwb=rrrrrrrq=/et/00/12/11/wnice211.html>

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nation/20001212/t000118719.html>

U.S. Senate Ratifies Important Treaty — But No One Knew It; Not Even The Senators

On October 18, the U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification was ratified by the U.S. Senate. According to Henry Lamb, executive vice president of the Environmental Conservation Organization and chairman of Sovereignty International, few Senators even knew it had been ratified. Lamb maintains the treaty had been "skillfully maneuvered through the Senate to avoid the public reaction which killed the Convention on Biological Diversity," which came out of the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992.

The Desertification Treaty was introduced to the Senate by Senator Craig Thomas (R-WY) as part of a package of 34 treaties. The treaties were ratified by a show of hands vote with no record being made of how Senate members voted. Even as late as December, many senators were caught off guard and were unaware that the Desertification Treaty had been ratified.

The U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification claims jurisdiction over 70% of the earth's land area — virtually all land not included in the Convention on Biological Diversity. It creates a structure through which all other environmental

treaties are to be integrated under a common United Nations implementation regime. Under the Treaty, there is no distinction between federal land and privately owned land when it comes to U.N. control of land use.

A summary of U.N. environmental treaty goals: (1) To transfer control of land areas to the U.N. (2) to radically downsize the economies

Book Review

Don J. Cormier

Guy DeBord, by Anselm Jappe

(University of California Press, 1999)

Guy DeBord was the founder and leader of the Situationist International (SI), a poetic, philosophical, and political group which existed in France from the early 1950's to the early 1970's.

The purpose of the group was to beautify and purify everyday life, so that everyday life would have the intensity associated with artistic experience. The SI attempted to do this through the analysis of current social and economic conditions, through artistic and philosophical criticism, and by the creation of "situations" which would bring enlightenment to the participants. DeBord's thinking was based on Marxism, but highly modified by the ideas associated with French modern art, and by his own sharp perceptions. His book *The Society of the Spectacle*, was one of the earliest dissections of the relationship between mass media and the consumer society, and is now regarded as a classic of radical sociological exposition. The SI was prominently linked with the French student riots of May, 1968. Situationist slogans such as "Never work", and "It is better to die in action than live in boredom" were broadly appropriated by the student demonstrators. Situationist influence declined after 1968, partly because of conflicts within the group, and partly because the focus of the group was more critical than constructive. As leader, DeBord insisted on absolute adherence to his way of thinking, and "heretical" members were frequently expelled. Finally, DeBord was left alone.

He eked out a living as a writer in the 1970's and 1980's, maintaining his purity of vision at the price of conventional success. Afflicted with a degenerative nerve disease, he committed suicide in 1994. Anselm Jappe's book is an excellent academic exposition of DeBord's ideas, and his influence on modern culture. As much as Timothy Leary and Andy Warhol, Guy DeBord deserves credit as a creator of the phenomena remembered as "the Sixties". ∞

of western nations (the so-called "big polluters") and to (3) transfer the wealth of the western countries, especially the U.S., to third world countries to help solve environmental problems.

Related Links:

<http://www.sovereignty.net/p/land/treaties.shtml> ∞

Lighting A Fire

Dante DeAmicis

Yes, yes, we both agree

It is so much more, than filling a bucket

It is lighting a fire, a grand and glorious fire

A fire that will burn, a lifetime

And live on, to set another, and another

But first, we will put a scoop in the bucket

For the bucket is at hand

And there have been, endless buckets filled

If we cannot light the fire today

We will fill the bucket

The bucket today, the fire tomorrow

Bucket reality, fire concept

That is sensible, that is progressive

Some of these buckets, after all, will be used

Some, will be carelessly knocked over

As others, thrash about in the dark

But many, will be dumped out

Valuing buckets over contents

We hope, not on too many fires

Let us decide, who will light the fire

Such an important job, cannot be left, to chance and happenstance

Shall they have titles, and robes, and honors

But for now, let us put another scoop in the bucket

How should we light the fire

In a proper, respectful manner?

What rituals, must be devised?

Who should view, the lighting ceremonies?

Which hymns, will be sung?

Regulations! So coarse and profane lightings, will be taboo

Before we continue, put another scoop in the bucket

But wait! We are the cart before the horse

The fuel for the fire, must be decided

The pyres. The briers. The dried bog mires.

Shall the fire consume, in one central place, in one raging bonfire?

Or shall the fires be dispersed, across the land?

We must think on this

After, we put another scoop in the bucket

Yes, yes, lighting a fire is so important

We must not be reckless

There are other interests, to consider

The cold and the dark say, "go slow"


The fire must not burn too hot, or the cold will be displaced

Likewise, heavy smoke is good

Lest the brightness, banish the dark

And look! The cold and the dark are good citizens

They have brought us, a load of buckets ∞



Nation in Distress

Now, THIS year is the
beginning of the new
millennium.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What's an oxymoron?

—Student

Dear Student

A person who's crazy from breathing too much oxygen.

Acknowledgments

• My thanks to Shirley, of Urbana, Illinois, 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

Things To Do At Wal-Mart While Your Spouse/Partner Is Taking His/Her Own Sweet Time

Source unknown. Forwarded by Warren, of Pocatello, Idaho

- Get boxes of condoms and randomly put them in people's carts when they aren't looking.
- Set all the alarm clocks to go off at 10 minute intervals.
- Make a trail of orange juice on the floor to the rest rooms.
- Walk up to an employee and tell him/her in an official tone, "I think we have a Code 3 in housewares", ... and see what happens.
- Put M&M's on lay away.

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.

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