

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

February 2001



Evil Seeds, Evil Crop

Sam Aurelius Milam III

On Wednesday January 3, 2001, two cops were killed in Eden, Idaho, while trying to serve a search warrant for suspicion of marijuana.¹ The same report that announced the deaths of the cops also mentioned in passing (journalistic fairness, I suppose) the death of the man who allegedly killed the cops, and who was himself killed in the same confrontation.

A subsequent report (I don't remember which station) briefly covering the funeral of the victim, alleged that he had been shot 22 times. Since the first shot or two probably dropped him, the remaining 20 or so shots were a typical shooting spree at a dead man, by the cops. When I later searched the websites of the local TV stations to confirm what I had heard, the report wasn't there. The other stories presented that day were archived, but not that one. Anyway, scant concern was expressed regarding this man's death during any report that I saw. As I said, it was mentioned in passing. The deaths of the cops were reported, repeatedly, as a tragedy. According to the coverage, you'd think that it was the worst thing to happen in the history of the state. Hundreds of cops showed up at the funeral, which became almost a royal pageant of despair, complete with a parade of mourning cops. Meanwhile, the victim of the police shooting, the one presumably shot 20 or so times after he was already down, was buried quietly, with little fanfare, and almost no notice by the news media. As I said, they didn't even archive the report.

Such disparity in reporting is typical. The establishment media doesn't report the deaths of people as tragedies, when those people are murdered by cops. Such an event is reported as

¹ Local News 8, P.O. Box 1001, Pocatello, Idaho, 83204, 5:30 report, January 4, 2001, news@localnews8.com, <http://www.idaho8.com>

a shootout with a cultist, as a standoff with a survivalist, as an attempted apprehension of a suspected terrorist, or as some other such event. Without exception, each such victim is characterized in some way that demonizes him sufficiently so that it's OK that the cops killed him. Such events are not reported as a human being murdered by a cop, in other words, as a tragedy. Such media bias is blatant pro-government propaganda. It glorifies cops and glamorizes tyranny in the name of law enforcement. It is outright pro-cop brainwashing and it is an insult to Americans.

The brainwashing might have worked on some Americans, but in my case it backfired. Cops could have been good. They could have been useful. They have chosen to be otherwise. So, when cops are arrogant, when they strut around like thugs, when they use no-knock search warrants and kick in the doors of people's homes, when they harass people, beating or killing those who dare to resist, when they arrest and imprison people who haven't harmed anyone, when they seize other people's property (civil asset forfeiture), when they murder people who are minding their own business or trying to defend themselves, when they attempt to disarm everyone, then they don't deserve any sympathy. Today, they do all of those things and more, routinely and without a qualm. Today, they don't deserve any sympathy, so I won't give them any. Today, when I hear of a cop killed "in the line of duty", I'm satisfied. He probably shouldn't have been doing whatever he was doing. He probably shouldn't have been were he was. He was probably being arrogant, belligerent, brutal, intrusive, and he was probably wrong. He and his kind have been that way for a long, long time. For years, they have been sowing the evil seeds of an evil crop. They shall reap what they sow. Today, when a cop is killed "in the line of duty", I lay the blame squarely at their feet. He probably got exactly what he deserved.

Reprints from K-House eNews:
Clinton Approves International Criminal Court
<http://www.khouse.org/enews/2001-01-02.html>

President Clinton has approved the signing of the U.N. treaty creating an International Criminal Court in spite of reservations about the form and procedures of the proposed court. The United States earlier voted against the proposed court, because the Pentagon feared our troops stationed in U.N. actions around the world could become targets of politically motivated charges. U.S. representatives to the conference attempted to pass an amendment which would force any proposed case to be approved by the Security Council, in essence allowing the U.S. to veto the prosecution of Americans, but it was overwhelmingly defeated by the assembly of delegates at the Rome convention.

Another serious concern is that the rights guaranteed U.S. citizens by the Bill of Rights (or the rights of citizens of other countries guaranteed under their laws) have no binding power over the prosecutors of the international court. National sovereignty in these matters will cease to exist.

There is no right to trial by jury. Appeals will be heard by the court's own appeals judges. There is no right to be free from testifying against one's self, right to a speedy trial, protection against cruel or unusual punishment, right to an attorney...etc.

Currently the international "crimes" under the court's jurisdiction involve war crimes and things such a genocide. However, the jurisdiction of the court was deliberately left open-ended by the treaty, and it is the court itself that determines what comes under the realm of its jurisdiction. This means it can create new international "law" any time it wishes, thus making the court into lawmaker, judge, jury and appeals court all in one. In short, there is little any country will be able to do to protect its citizens.

Funding for the court and its 18 judges would come from assessments against the participating nations in a manner similar to the way U.N. dues are currently assessed. However, in addition, the court will be given the right to confiscate the property and assets of the accused, and to convert those assets for its own use upon

conviction. The opportunities for corruption here are limitless.

Clinton rationalized that by signing the treaty the U.S. will have at least some influence over the makeup of the court, including the appointment of judges and writing of rules, even if the Senate never ratified the document.

Sen. Jesse Helms, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has vowed to fight Senate ratification of the treaty. "By signing, the president has effectively given his approval to this unprecedented assault on American sovereignty," said Helms. ∞

Internet Speech Under Global Fire
<http://www.khouse.org/enews/2001-01-16.html>

Freedom of speech and the press is a core right, which is crucial for maintaining freedom. Of course, the people most often watched by the press are those in government and so government is often hostile to a free press, because it doesn't want light shed on its misdeeds.

An article by Reporters Sans Frontieres (Reporters without Borders) in France lists a total of forty-five countries that restrict their citizens' access to the Internet. Of those, twenty are extremely hostile to the global communications system.

Authoritarian regimes have particular problems with the Internet.

Although the Internet is a major factor in economic growth, it also opens the floodgates of free speech and information and therefore constitutes a major threat. The great dictators of the 20th Century all made a major point of seizing control of the organs of public communications.

Typically the rationale for the restrictions is that of protecting the public from "subversive ideas" or defending "national security and unity." Governments restrict access by forcing users to subscribe via a single state-run Internet Service Provider (ISP) or using government-controlled filters on various ISPs, which block access to sites regarded as unsuitable. Sometimes the filters actually force users to register with the authorities.

It will prove interesting to see which side of the struggle wins the battle. As economic pressures mount, the efforts of countries to keep their people from world communications may prove insurmountable. ∞

Suspicious Confirmed?

Sam Aurelius Milam III

In connection with the previous item regarding control of our use of the internet, I have a story of my own. I thought that it might be interesting (and lucrative) to accept the recent generous offer by Saddam Hussein of grants to poor Americans. I seem to qualify. However, when I tried to access the websites of the Iraqi Foreign Ministry and of the Iraqi Presidency, I received a message notifying me that the attempt had failed.

Using addresses from the same index (CNN Interactive), I was able to access various other Middle East websites, including the following: Cyprus Home Page, Egypt State Information Service, Official Pakistan Page, CyberIran, Palestinian National Authority Official Website, The Office of the Prime Minister (Israel), Jordan Government (National Information Service),

Liberty Video: *Chicken Run*

Reviewed by Don J. Cormier

Imagine what it would be like if chickens had human thoughts and feelings. Furthermore, imagine what it would be like if chickens KNEW they were being imprisoned by farmers, being exploited for their eggs, and being fattened for slaughter. How would chickens feel? What would chickens do? Wouldn't some of them decide to escape or, as they say, "make a run for it"? That is the premise of the hilarious animated feature *Chicken Run*.

Chicken Run brilliantly satirizes World War II prisoner films such as *Stalag 17* and *The Great Escape*. All the cliches of *Hogan's Heros* are lovingly modified to fit chickens, but the film doesn't stop there. Throw in touches of *Indiana Jones*, *Rocky*, and *The African Queen* and the result is a paradox: a film that mocks old stereotypes while bringing them back to vibrant life.

I suppose that *Chicken Run* could be interpreted as pro-vegetarian propaganda, but that would be a mistake. The film's political message is really pro-freedom.

Ginger, the film's chicken heroine, is mystically driven to seek freedom despite nearly unending setbacks. This is contrasted with the mostly passive behavior and fearful, unfocused thinking of the other hens. There is a very significant scene in which Ginger tries to explain to the other fowl what it would be like to live as

Royal Embassy of Saudi Arabia, Lebanon On-Line, Libya Home Page, and Turkey Online. Each time that I tried to access the Iraqi websites, I received a message notifying me that the attempt had failed. I was able to access "general interest" Iraqi websites, but not the official websites. There were a lot of other websites listed. Some others that I could not access included: Voice of Bahrain, Oman, and Yemen.

Is my access being blocked by some agency of the U.S. government? I don't know. However, I'd be interested in knowing if any of my readers can successfully access the Iraqi websites. Here are their addresses.

<http://www.nisciraq.net/>

<http://www.nisciraq.net/mofa>

<http://www.nisciraq.net/iraq/index.htm>

I'd be even more interested in knowing if any of you can get one of those grants. ¶

wild chickens. Because farm life is all the other chickens know, they raise all sorts of seemingly sensible objections to the idea. The more Ginger tries to explain, the more ridiculous her vision seems to the other hens — but we as the audience know that what she's proposing is in fact possible; that it's the way chickens lived prior to domestication. Any anarchist or libertarian who has tried to explain to conventional citizens that it's possible to live with little or no government will identify with Ginger's frustration!

In the film, the impasse is broken by the arrival of Rocky the Flying Rooster, an apparent living example of a free-range chicken. This gives the hens psychological energy. After numerous exciting adventures, the chickens end up living in a wilderness area, exactly as Ginger had described. The implication is that humans also can escape our un-free situations, with enough faith, perseverance, etc...

The film's animation technique must be singled out for praise. It appears to be clay stop-motion animation, but given today's computer programs, it might be partly or completely digital. Whatever it is, it's so beautifully done that, except for the deliberate use of comic distortion, one might almost mistake it for a live-action effort. Peter Lord and Nick Park, the creators of *Chicken Run*, deserve an Academy award for their work. ∞



Nation in Distress

Even if it is imposed by a majority with its vote, the arbitrary and coercive control of someone's behavior, with punishment for disobedience, is still slavery. The so-called "Rule of Law" isn't a justification. It's an excuse.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What do you call a cowboy who looks for the worst bronco in the whole rodeo? —Gotcha

Dear Gotcha

I don't know, but it had better not be a buck hunter.

Acknowledgments

- My thanks to [The Affiliate](http://www.the-grand-barn.com/), <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/>, and Sir Donald the Elusive 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 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 Sir Donald the Elusive

- If lawyers can be disbarred and clergymen can be defrocked, then doesn't it follow that electricians can be delighted, musicians can be denoted, cowboys can be deranged, models can be deposed, tree surgeons can be debarked, and dry cleaners can be depressed?
- Why do we say something is "out of whack"? What is whack?
- Do infants enjoy infancy as much as adults enjoy adultery?
- If someone offers you a penny for your thoughts and you give him your two cents worth, should you try to collect the other penny?
- Why do croutons come in airtight packages? They're just stale bread
- Why isn't 11 pronounced onety one?

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