


Notice:

This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date. For current contact information, [click here](#).

This special issue of the *Frontiersman* is dedicated to the memory of Timothy McVeigh.  
He beheld a dark and evil force, and dared to defy it.



# Frontiersman

*Timothy McVeigh Memorial Issue*

*June 11, 2001*

*Eventually we all must face the Truth,  
however great the cost.*

## **ATF Declares War in Waco**

Sarah Foster, from *The Gun Owners of California*, Summer 1993, Originally reprinted with permission, May 1994

The day following the firestorm at the Branch Davidian complex, President Clinton issued a warning (or threat?) that people “tempted” to join cults and become involved with the likes of Waco’s David Koresh should be “deterred by the horrible scenes.” Senator Howard Metzenbaum also discovered a lesson: Waco showed the need for tight federal firearms laws.

Did the Senator call for a similar control on firearms by federal agencies such as the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), which have each developed a mini-army with all the hellfire of the modern military at their disposal? Are you kidding?

As a libertarian I find these remarks chilling and read other lessons in the fire. For me, the Waco horror was a lesson in how quickly the media and the American public will excuse any action of government, no matter how egregious, against a person or group it thinks is bad enough. Thus, because Koresh was labeled a cult leader it was OK to launch a military-style operation against him and the Branch Davidians, the only reproach being that ATF failed to “do the job right” at the get-go and things got messy.

Which brings us to guns and Senator Metzenbaum’s claim that here was proof positive of the need for their control. But Waco, if anything, proves the opposite. Those scenes should

put us on red alert against such a proposal.

We’ve seen such scenes 100 times over on our TV screens. We’ve watched what governments do to people they don’t like: in Germany, in China, in Russia. But this time it was our government we watched, folks. The government of, by and for the people of the United States. That wasn’t Tiananmen Square or the Warsaw Ghetto on our TV screens. It was Texas, and those were real American tanks and soldiers moving against real American citizens, none of whom had been formally charged with either a state or federal crime.

Waco showed our government in action: a government whose agents now think there’s nothing wrong in conducting “no-knock” raids and full-scale military operations against civilians, a government whose agents use tear gas against women and children, a government whose agents have so little compassion they mock the sufferings of their victims.

That’s right. TV reporters in Dallas, who were first on the scene as the flames subsided, allegedly saw the commandos giving each other the “high five” sign and heard them joke about how much they enjoyed — enjoyed — their “Texas barbecue.”

The fact that a large number of ordinary people possess effective weapons and could muster significant firepower is apparently the only thing keeping our government in check. Think about it. If our government behaves as it does while we still have some gun rights, have you any doubts how it would behave if we have none?

∞

## The Terror

Sam Aurelius Milam III, May 1995

As I watched the response to the bombing in Oklahoma City, I was appalled by its contrast with the mellow disregard for the atrocities at Waco and Ruby Ridge. People who twiddled while the U.S. government murdered women and children in Texas and Idaho recoiled in horror when women and children were killed in a federal office building in Oklahoma. Apparently people think that women and children in federal buildings are more precious than those in religious compounds or mountain cabins. It's difficult to judge whether this attitude is mere brainwashing or actual stupidity.

In fact, this atrocity was unusual mostly because it wasn't committed by the U.S. government. In Panama, for example, the U.S. government killed hundreds of women and children during its violent pursuit of Noriega. Around the world, the U.S. government has murdered women and children who happened to be in its way. When officials call the Oklahoma City bombing an act of terrorism, the definition of *terrorism* being used is clear: terrorism is any atrocity committed by some group or person other than the United States government.

Everybody was hurt by this bombing, with one exception: the U.S. government will benefit from it. Before the dust had even settled, people were obediently bleating for stronger preventive measures. The main result will be a vast increase in the power of the U.S. government. Officials will now be able to justify more intrusive systems of surveillance and control than anybody ever expected.

Today, the U.S. government enslaves the people it was intended to protect. It murders those who refuse to submit. The consequences of its escalating terrorist behavior can no longer be avoided. One of these consequences is that events like Waco and Ruby Ridge call for a response in kind. People are learning to resist and, increasingly, that response will be forthcoming. The likely course of events is obvious. Clearly, women and children should avoid the vicinity of federal buildings in the future.

The terror in America has only just begun. ☛

## Different Echo, Different Drum

Sam Aurelius Milam III, July 1995

The discussion of the Oklahoma City bombing continues. I recently read an article, *Echoes of April 19*, that appeared in the June 1995 issue of *California Liberty*. Although the article contained some libertarian ideas, it also contained the statement:

"Nobody disputes that this event was a terrible tragedy, a truly hideous act of destruction and terrorism that ranks with the worst atrocities of any group of thugs, anywhere."

Even if this analysis were correct, someone somewhere would dispute it. In fact, it's pure Clintonista propaganda.

In general, terrorism is an attack against non-combatants and is often associated with demands by somebody who claims responsibility. Was the Oklahoma City bombing such an act? I think not. Consider: Americans have lately suffered atrocities and acts of war committed by armed civilians who work for the U.S. government. The bombing was an attack against some of those very civilians. As such, it was a legitimate action against combatants. The other victims were collateral casualties, just like when the government attacks a target. The collateral casualties were unfortunate but unavoidable. After all, it wasn't a smart bomb. Also, there were no demands and nobody claimed responsibility. Only in the government press would an attack be automatically called terrorism just because it is anti-government.

I suppose the confusion shouldn't surprise me. For a long time now, U.S. citizens have failed to understand the deteriorating behavior of the U.S. government. They have believed that they could compromise with increasingly coercive authority. They have thought that comfort or the illusion of security justified the loss of liberty. They have done everything possible to pretend that there is no problem, even though the nature of government has never been much of a secret. Although some of the blame for the present state of things lies with the government, you can't really blame wolves for being wolves. A wise shepherd will guard his flock. A foolish one will lose it. Much of the blame therefore lies with the weak, lazy, cowardly, or ignorant U.S. citizens who have allowed things to get this bad. It's just that I hope for better than that from libertarians... ☛

## PIGS

Sam Aurelius Milam III, July 1995

Here's how I understand the present system: when someone is killed and someone else is suspected of having done it, then the suspect is indicted and given a trial. There are some things wrong with that system, but that's the way it's presently supposed to work. In that system, extenuating circumstances don't prevent the trial. They're presented at the trial, where they're considered. Based on these and other circumstances, a judge or a jury rules on the case.

I watched the news coverage of the recent Congressional Waco Hearings. I heard with my own ears and saw with my own eyes when Attorney General Janet Reno accepted responsibility for the conclusion of the Branch Davidian siege. People were killed during that confrontation. Janet Reno accepted responsibility.

Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman is currently being tried in connection with the World Trade Center bombing. He didn't take part in the action, but merely (allegedly) directed it. This is much like Janet Reno's position with regard to the Branch Davidian siege. If Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman must be tried for the World Trade Center bombing, then Janet Reno should be tried for the Branch Davidian siege. Her position as Attorney General, just like any other extenuating circumstance, can be considered by a jury. The sad fact is that, unlike the rest of us, People In Government Service can do whatever they want, regardless of the law. The worst punishment they're likely to receive is suspension from duty and a letter of censure in a personnel file.

I believe it's now appropriate for a militia unit to arrest Janet Reno and hold her in custody until she can be tried before a court of appropriate jurisdiction. If the militia units are not yet capable of this, then we need to strengthen them. Decimus Junius Juvenalis (50 - 130 A.D.) wondered who will guard the guards. The answer is: we will.

### Expendable Children — Over There

Sam Aurelius Milam III, July 1997

The blood-thirsty nitwits in this country are now gloating over the Timothy McVeigh sentence. None of them care that the US government is a far more likely perpetrator of the Oklahoma City bombing. After all, the US gov-

ernment is the **only** party that has benefited from it. Far more than anybody else, it had both the means and the motive. Nevertheless, the nitwits can finally get some revenge for the 168 people (Oh my! Children, too!) that were killed in the bombing. They don't care that the US government continues to encourage the deaths of other children elsewhere in the world. Consider this news item:

BAGHDAD, Iraq (AP) - Less than a third of the food expected under a U.N.-approved deal has reached Iraq and 30,000 children have died of poor nutrition or lack of medicine this year, Iraq's trade minister said today. He blamed the United States. Iraq has been under U.N. sanctions since 1990, when it invaded Kuwait and spurred the United States and other countries to send troops into the Persian Gulf. The United Nations in December gave Iraq permission to sell \$2 billion in oil over six months to buy needed food and medicine.

AP Top News at 1 p.m. EDT. Date: Sun, 1 Jun 97 10:30:46 -0700. AP NewsBrief by SIOBHAN McDONOUGH. Delivered via the Farcast (TM) business intelligence service <<http://www.farcast.com>>.

The nitwit position seems to be that it's OK for people (including children) to die for the benefit of US policy but not OK for them to die for the sake of opposition to it. Maybe it's just OK for children to die in Iraq but not OK for them to die in the USA. In either case, hypocrisy reigns.

### Remember Waco, Remember Reno

Sam Aurelius Milam III, April 1998

As another anniversary of the Branch Davidian massacre drifts by, Janet Reno remains unpunished. She publicly admitted responsibility for the massacre, yet she hasn't been prosecuted. Meanwhile, the Oklahoma City victims continue to be remembered as heroes, the Oklahoma City bombers as terrorists. The bombers are criticized most vehemently for killing the children who were in the federal building. However, the bombers didn't attack the children. They attacked a federal building that just happened to have some children in it. That is far different than if they had attacked an elementary school that just happened to have some federal agents in it. I don't know if the bombers were even aware of the children. However, the federal agents (FBI and BATF) who attacked the Branch Davidian compound were certainly aware of those children. Lon Horiuchi (FBI) was aware of the children in the cabin at Ruby Ridge when he looked through a telescopic gun sight

and shot Vicki Weaver in the face. However adamantly the federal government may decry so-called terrorism, it is the federal agents who are the terrorists. If they continue to place children in federal buildings, then it will be clear that their intention is to use the children as shields, a tactic the federal government hypocritically attributes to Saddam Hussein. Such cowardly behavior by federal terrorists wouldn't surprise me a bit. ¶

### Danforth's Folly

Sam Aurelius Milam III, October 1999

On the very day of his appointment, Special Counsel John Danforth revealed that his investigation of the Branch Davidian Massacre will probably be a failure. First, he professed a high-sounding concern with fundamental principles of government, such as those expressed in the Declaration of Independence. Government operates by the consent of the governed and its purpose is to secure the "rights" to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then, he refused to address much of the behavior of the government that might be a violation of those principles. Instead, he limited his investigation to a few selected questions. Was there a cover-up? Did government agents kill anybody? Who started the fire? He solemnly calls these the "dark questions". I call them symptoms of the bigger problem, which he refuses to address.

There are prior and fundamental questions that should be asked. Do unproven allegations of "child" or "gun" violations justify a potentially lethal confrontation, and its execution as a para-military invasion? Where did the government get the authority to pursue a potentially lethal confrontation against Americans who had not been convicted of a capital offense? The accused individuals hadn't even been to court. Were they presumed innocent until proven guilty? Does refusal of a citizen to cooperate justify lethal response by government? Is "failure to appear" a capital offense? If equal treatment under the law exists, then why weren't the Branch Davidians treated the same as Presbyterians? Were the Branch Davidians members of the governed? Did they consent? Did the government secure their "rights" to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Why did the government believe that it could get away with such a siege? Do government agents be-

lieve that they aren't accountable for their actions? Once it was in position, why couldn't the U.S. government, the most powerful government in the world, afford to simply back up a few yards, out of range of alleged (defensive) gunfire from the besieged Americans in the compound, and continue to negotiate? The occupants of the compound weren't going anywhere. Wasn't time on the side of the government? Why was there such a sense of urgency to end the confrontation? What did the government fear, that caused the sense of urgency? After Janet Reno accepted responsibility for the murders, why wasn't she hauled into court? I surely would have been. The surviving Branch Davidians were.

Unless John Danforth has the courage to address such questions, then his investigation will be of little value. ¶

### Danforth's Folly Revisited

Sam Aurelius Milam III, April 2000

In September of 1999, John Danforth was appointed as a Special Counsel to resolve, once and for all, the Branch Davidian Massacre. In my article *Danforth's Folly*, October 1999, I predicted that his investigation would be worthless. It would be nice if I'm wrong, but so far the massacre remains unresolved, the perpetrators remain at large, and justice remains a fantasy. As I've said before, when the peaceful pursuit of justice becomes irrelevant, then the violent pursuit of justice becomes inevitable. Eventually, it even starts to seem desirable.

Now, as another Waco anniversary slides past and the murderers remain at large, I wonder if the various homicidal maniacs who reside within the U.S. government have pondered their options. I'd suggest that they certainly shouldn't put their children in federal buildings any more. Maybe they didn't know any better before the Oklahoma City bombing, but they do now. If they continue to do it anyway, then it will be clear that they're trying to use the children as shields. I expect that the children will be ineffective in that capacity. If there's another attack, then I'm sure that the bureaucrats will shamelessly and tearfully use the dead children as another propaganda bonanza to advance the cause of repression, just like they've done every time that children have been killed — by anyone except government agents. ¶

## Regarding My Defense of Timothy McVeigh

Sam Aurelius Milam III

My defense of Timothy McVeigh has attracted a little criticism. I was reminded, for example, that “two wrongs don’t make a right”. Now that’s a lame criticism if I ever heard one. Who’s talking about two wrongs? What we have here is an unending string of atrocities and outrageous behavior committed by the U.S. government, for as far back into its history as anyone cares to look. Timothy McVeigh’s attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building wasn’t a “second wrong”. It was a response in kind to one or two of the most recent examples of the sort of outrageous behavior for which the U.S. government has long been known.

The criticism is also beside the point. Just for the sake of argument, let’s pretend that there were “two wrongs”. The real point then is that the “second wrong” is always a response to the “first wrong”. Rather than whine that “two wrongs don’t make a right”, it’s the responsibility of the people in power to make sure that they don’t commit the “first wrong” or, if they do, that they provide a remedy before the “second wrong” happens. The U.S. government is the party with the power. It committed the “first wrong” and it didn’t provide a remedy. The imprisonment of Janet Reno, Louis Freeh, Lon Horiuchi, et al. for life at hard labor without parole might have been a nice beginning but, as I said, there wasn’t any remedy. Indeed, historically there never has been. Hypocrisy, not remedy, is the response of the U.S. government to its own atrocities. Two wrongs may not make a right, but if the second wrong is the only remedy available, then I’m for it.

The U.S. government and its media stooges call the attack on the Murrah federal building an act of terrorism. However, the U.S. government is routinely guilty of far worse atrocities. There are so many examples that it was difficult to decide which one to cite. I chose the Massacre at Wounded Knee, December 29, 1890. I took the following brief account from Reference 1.

... When the rain of ammunition ceased, over 300 Lakota people lay dead from gunfire, cannonfire, or manual butchering within the encampment and within adjacent ravines up to two miles away. The dead were Lakota men who had been disarmed before the weapons

fire began, women, many with babes in arms or waiting to be born, and children. The soldiers walked away from their crime against humanity and left the dead where they lay....


A heart-breaking video account of the massacre is presented by Reference 3. That account, however, fails to mention the twenty Congressional Medals of Honor that were bestowed upon U.S. Army personnel as a reward for their participation in the slaughter of defenseless Lakota men, women, and children. (See Reference 2.) For the U.S. government to condemn Timothy McVeigh as a “terrorist” is such an outrageous act of incredible hypocrisy that it sickens me. It also motivates me.

I’ve been accused of making a hero of Timothy McVeigh. I didn’t make a hero of him. He did it himself. He recognized the dark and evil nature of the U.S. government and then he dared to attack it. His action might have been politically and strategically counterproductive, but it was tactically successful and it was done in a worthy cause. I admire him for his recognition of the truth and for his determination to confront it. His only failure, so far as I can determine, was his failure to avoid capture. Even in captivity, it seems that he behaved with honor and dignity. Yes, he was a hero and, hopefully, a role model for the future.

Revolutions are not caused by people, but by intolerable governments. Timothy McVeigh’s motivation appears to have been the outrageous behavior of the U.S. government. He would probably have minded his own business, had the U.S. government not motivated him to do otherwise. I’d probably be writing Science Fiction, instead of this, if the U.S. government didn’t similarly motivate me. Hopefully, a growing number of others are being similarly motivated as the U.S. government continues its intolerable practices of arrogance, brutality, and hypocrisy. That government must bear the responsibility for what has happened in the past, and for what is likely to come. 🦅

### References

1. *The Murder of the Wind of Peace*, by Wanbli Sapa, <<http://www.dickshovel.com/WKa.html>>
2. *The Medals of Wounded Knee*, by Jerry Green, <<http://www.dickshovel.com/GreenIntro.html>>
3. The American Experience (PBS), *The Way West*, Episode 4, “Ghost Dance”, WGBH, Boston




Nation in Distress

## WHERE WERE ALL THE WEEPING MOURNERS



## WHEN THE BRANCH DAVIDIAN CHILDREN DIED?



### Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What's your opinion of the Intifada?  
—Visiting Palestinian

Dear Visiting Palestinian

Well, I've never eaten one, but I do like enchiladas, tostadas, tacos, and burritos.

### 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*, of Vankleek Hill, Ontario, <http://www.the-grand-barn.com/>, and *The Thought*, of Glendale, Arizona, <http://home.att.net/~guildmaster/wsb> for printing reviews of the *Frontiersman*. —editor

### Frontiersman

Timothy McVeigh Memorial Issue

**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 docu-

### Poor Scott

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Did you hear about what happened to Scott Waddle? After he left his career as a submarine commander, in the navy, he began training for a new career as an airline pilot. It was a tragically short career.

“Crash Dive! Crash Dive! Crash....”

Poor Scott.

### Actual Writings on Hospital Charts

Source Unknown. Forwarded by Sir Donald the Elusive

- Rectal examination revealed a normal size thyroid.
- She stated that she had been constipated for most of her life, until she got a divorce.
- I saw your patient today, who is still under our car for physical therapy.

ment 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