

Notice:

This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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



Frontiersman

Facing the truth, however great the cost.

December 2011

Options

Sam Aurelius Milam III

I noticed in passing lately that the Comcast Guide listed some documentaries about Prohibition. I didn't bother to watch any of them. I can probably guess most of what was in them. They probably noted that Prohibition was a mistake. They might have pointed out that Prohibition added uncertainty to the purchase of alcoholic beverages. I'm not sure about this but Prohibition hooch might have been more likely to damage a person's health than what people bought at the liquor stores, prior to Prohibition. Of course, Prohibition made it more risky to acquire, possess, or consume the stuff for other reasons. For example, such behavior could land a person in jail. Worse yet, Prohibition created a vast industry of criminal activity. What could have been more predictable in advance or more obvious in retrospect? When the government creates crimes it's obvious that it also creates criminals. Worst of all, those criminals gave the government a dandy excuse to increase its police powers. Maybe the decision makers in the government had exactly that purpose in mind when they enacted Prohibition. The most distressing thing about Prohibition is that most people seem to be too stupid to learn the lesson that it provided. That is, if Prohibition worked a certain way for alcohol, then why would anybody think that it will work any differently for recreational drugs?

People have been using recreational drugs for longer than recorded history can record. Whether or not somebody believes that such drugs are harmful, or evil, or should be illegal won't prevent other people from using the drugs. Anti-drug reformers might legitimately use education in an effort to persuade people to refrain from using recreational drugs but the prohibition of drug use will invariably fail. Worse yet, such attempted prohibition will prove to be far more harmful than the drug use that it pretends to prevent.

The only difference that can be made regarding the use of recreational drugs is the circumstances under which people will use them. I see two options.

Option One — Recreational Drugs are Prohibited: Under Option One, people will buy recreational drugs of uncertain quality from criminal drug dealers. They'll pay exorbitant prices. They'll risk adverse reactions, death, or prison. Their purchases will support a vast industry of criminal activity and reinforce the government's excuses for its repressive police powers. The benefits that are unique to Option One will accrue only to the drug dealers and to the cops.

Option Two — Recreational Drugs Are Not Prohibited: Under Option Two, people will buy recreational drugs of predictable and consistent quality from places like the Walgreen's Pharmacy. They'll pay reasonable prices. Maybe their insurance might even pay for the drugs. People might still risk adverse reactions to the recreational drugs but at least there'll be an easily accessible record of what they used. Medical help will be available. The lessons learned from any such adverse reactions will help the pharmacies to be more careful in the future. People who take the recreational drugs won't have to buy them from criminals or worry about going to prison. The funds that they spend on recreational drugs will go to the pharmacies, not to the drug dealers. Neither the drug dealers nor the cops will benefit. The benefits that are unique to Option Two will accrue only to the consumers of the recreational drugs and to the pharmacies. The producers of recreational drugs, of course, will benefit under either option.

Which of the two options that I've suggested seems more likely to cause the most harm? Anybody who's in doubt about it should watch those Prohibition documentaries. The main thing that the documentaries probably didn't mention is that prohibition didn't end. It has become diversified and pervasive. Today, most people seem to regard prohibition as a normal condition. Let's repeal prohibition. ¶

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire.

For PayPal payments, use Frontiersman@manlymail.net.

Gone But Not Forgotten

Sam Aurelius Milam III

In October, I watched the Fort Knox episode of *Brad Meltzer's Decoded*. The documentary included a lot of important information. Some of the positions that I've taken over the years with regard to money, finance, and the political significance of such things were supported by information that was provided in the documentary. However, the most important information didn't address money, banking, or finance. It addressed an entirely different subject. That information was part of an [interview of Craig Hulet](#), a foreign policy analyst, Vietnam veteran, and former Senior Armorer for the troops that guard Fort Knox. The interview was conducted by Buddy Levy (a professor), Scott Rolle (an attorney), and Christine McKinley (an engineer). They're the regular investigators for the program. Here's the transcript of that interview.

Buddy Levy: What do you believe is inside Fort Knox?

Craig Hulet: I was stationed in Fort Knox after I returned from Vietnam. I was a Senior Armorer, and I issued weapons to those people that guarded Fort Knox, a platoon sized group that guarded Fort Knox. We were told to issue no ammunition. And because I was a returning vet, I questioned it and the officer in charge was a friend of mine. He pulled me aside and said we don't issue weapons with ammunition simply because there is no gold in Fort Knox.

Scott Rolle: So this was your OIC, your Officer in Charge?

Craig Hulet: Yes.

Scott Rolle: He tells you there's no gold in there but did you see it empty for yourself?

Craig Hulet: Nobody ever sees Fort Knox.

Scott Rolle: Well how would the Captain know that, then?

Craig Hulet: Because he would be privileged to that information, given his position.

Scott Rolle: Do you know if he ever got inside himself and saw it with his own eyes or is this information he'd heard?

Craig Hulet: He said it that he understood that there was no gold and he did give me a reason why because I thought well then this is foolish, what are we doing? There's people that are gonna come to Fort Knox, let's assume they believe there's gold....

Christine McKinley: Yeah....

Craig Hulet: They're gonna come armed so either way we're stuck with no ammunition and these people believe there's gold. Well he said it's simple, we let 'em in and we zip it up.

Christine McKinley: We let 'em in, we zip it up, but, well, wait a minute....

Craig Hulet: In other words, they disappear.

Christine McKinley: Oh. So, if, if I broke into Fort Knox, you didn't have ammo to protect it, and I got in....

Craig Hulet: We just zip it up.

Christine McKinley: You just make me disappear, so I don't come out and announce to everybody, hey guess what....

Craig Hulet: There's no gold in Fort Knox. That's not gonna happen.

Buddy Levy: Will the government ever really come clean on what happened to the gold in Fort Knox?

Craig Hulet: No. No, they don't tell us anything unless they're absolutely forced to. This isn't a crime, that's, that's what's most important to me, to understand it. When you realize that this is a policy of the government, this is not theft, this is not, you know, this is not crooks and liars, you're not gonna catch anybody, put anybody in jail, what we're gonna find is that we've got a policy in place still to this day that says we're not gonna be on a gold standard, and now we can never be on a gold standard, there's not sufficient gold, because they've already sold it.

Buddy Levy: Let's assume for a minute that you're right, that there's no gold in Fort Knox, what is in there, what are they guarding in Fort Knox, if there's no gold there?

Craig Hulet: The myth that there's gold. The perception of gold. The perception of the American people still have a government that is protecting their interests and the first interest is the economy, and jobs, and your future.

Christine McKinley: If there's a true inventory of Fort Knox and we find it's empty, what does that mean for us? What does that mean for me?

Craig Hulet: That your children, grandchildren, your future, you've been robbed.

The agenda of the documentary was to investigate the possibility that there isn't any gold in Fort Knox. During the course of that investigation, a situation of much greater signifi- →

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire.

For PayPal payments, use Frontiersman@manlymail.net.

cance came to light. That situation is the open admission by a former Fort Knox guard, on national television, that the authorities at Fort Knox will cause intruders to disappear. The alleged justification for such behavior is pretty much irrelevant. A government should never make people disappear.

The sinister policy at Fort Knox isn't unique within the U.S. government. I noted in my essay [Unnamed Agency](#) that the U.S. government disposes of people who get in its way. In that essay, I claimed the existence of an established, nationwide system of disposal camps, in which such people are executed and cremated. *Unnamed Agency* is a credible essay without the necessity of any additional corroboration but the Fort Knox episode of *Brad Meltzer's Decoded* is the first time that I've ever seen my claims actually confirmed on national television. Craig Hulet came right out in the open and declared that the government will make

somebody disappear. He didn't claim that an intruder would be arrested, jailed, and given a trial. He didn't make any reference to due process. He didn't mention reading somebody his rights. He said that the authorities would make the intruder disappear.

The documentary was excellent. Its only disappointing aspect was that the producers didn't acknowledge the significance of the policy about the U.S. government that they discovered. Instead, they ignored it. Whether or not it was a part of the original agenda of the documentary, making people disappear is a lot more important than making gold disappear. I believe that the producers ought to have further investigated that aspect of the situation. I believe that they still should. Maybe the next season of *Brad Meltzer's Decoded* will include an episode with just such an investigation if, of course, Brad Meltzer doesn't disappear first. I can only hope. ¶

Letter to the Editor

Sam,

Greetings! Sam, I want to share something with you in hopes that you may understand what transpired in my delay in writing to you back! But as you know Sam we live in a world that no one has any rights whatsoever!!! A world where if you go against the grain, you either shut up and take it or you fight for what is right and hold your ground! I sat in my cell one day looking at that essay concerning 9/11 [[Unnamed Agency](#) –editor] and I came to realize that it wasn't complete! I remember in a letter you wrote to me, to let you know if anything was amiss! So I did! And lo and behold I was arrested early in the morning, nine of them took me to the program office and told me I was going to the hole because I threaten to kill the president! "I'm like, you got to be kidding! and was I a political prisoner?" I was like law suite! :) I came to realize Sam that something is amiss in 9/11 and no one wants the truth to come out! Innocent people were murdered and I feel further study into this may yield more truth! Like in your November 2011 newsletter [[The Principles of Liberty](#), –editor], Sam the United States has to prove they had nothing to do with 9/11, instead of falsely accusing inmates of trying to murder the president! Not counting the fact that the secret service came and see me asking all kinds of questions! Our tax payer dollars should not be

wasted on fruitless investigations! These type of actions show us that the tree of liberty isn't growing but is being dried up by these tyrants! In closing Sam, you did an outstanding job on November 2011 newsletter! Keep up the good work, friend!

Sincerely,

—name withheld

I'm planning a revision to the 911 essay. Since I didn't receive your previous letter, I don't know what you intended to suggest regarding that essay. It sounds like you should keep it to yourself until you can discover a more nearly secure way to send the information. Did they take your copy of the essay?

By the way, I was visited by FBI agents, in May of 2006, prior to writing the essay, while I was engaged in some research about the Boeing airplanes.

—editor

Pet Peeve

Sam Aurelius Milam III

I occasionally see pet supply ads that are more than normally stupid. The ads refer to people who have pets as "pet parents". I can tell you for a fact that unless the mongrel came out of that woman's birth canal, then she isn't a "pet parent". She's a pet owner, and I use even that term with reservations. See [Right Treatment](#), on page 1 of the May 2011 issue. Anyway, the mutt isn't a member of the family. The mutt is a dog. Let's have some respect for the idea of family as a human institution. ¶


Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire.

For PayPal payments, use Frontiersman@manlymail.net.



Nation in Distress

For any government, the main usefulness of high ideals is to motivate and manipulate the people.



Acknowledgments

My thanks to the following: SantaClara Bob; Lady Jan the Voluptuous; my mother; Dewey and Betty; and Eric, of Ione, California. —editor

Rules of the Workplace

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by David, of Idaho Falls, Idaho.

- If you're good, then you'll be assigned all of the work. If you're really good, then you'll get out of it.
- At work, the authority of a person is inversely proportional to the number of pens and pencils that he carries.
- When you don't know what to do, walk fast and look worried.
[It also helps to carry a clip board. —editor]
- The person who most recently quit or was most recently fired will be blamed for everything that goes wrong. ∞

Frontiersman

Subscriptions and Past Issues — Printed copies of this newsletter, either subscriptions or past issues, are available by application only.

Cancellations — If you don't want to keep receiving this newsletter, then return it unopened. When I receive it, I'll terminate your subscription.

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. 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.

Interesting Facts

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Steve, of Mililani, Hawaii. I didn't try to verify any of them.

- The term "the whole 9 yards" came from World War II fighter pilots in the South Pacific. When arming their airplanes on the ground, the .50 caliber machine gun ammo belts measured exactly 27 feet long before being loaded into the airplane. If the pilots fired all of their ammo at a target, then the target got "the whole 9 yards."
- The only two days of the year on which there aren't any professional sports games are the day before and the day after the Major League All-Stars Game.
- Only two people signed the *Declaration of Independence* on July 4th. They were John Hancock and Charles Thomson. Most of the others signed on August 2, but the last signature wasn't added until 5 years later. ∞

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.

Payment — This newsletter isn't for sale. If you want to make a voluntary contribution, then I prefer cash or U.S. postage stamps. For checks or money orders, please inquire. For PayPal payments, use Frontiersman@manlymail.net. The continued existence of the newsletter will depend, in part, on such contributions. I don't accept anything that requires me to provide ID to receive it. In case anybody's curious, I also accept gold, silver, platinum, etc. —Sam Aurelius Milam III, editor

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire.

For PayPal payments, use Frontiersman@manlymail.net.