



Frontiersman

Facing the truth, however great the cost.

March 2018

An Even Better Idea

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Allegations of misconduct by cops are usually investigated by Internal Affairs, which is a part of the police department. That's a stupid idea. It's like letting some of the foxes decide if the other foxes ought to have eaten the chickens. Probably, the good ol' buddies over at Internal Affairs will tend to sympathize with their good ol' boy cop friends. Sometimes, civilian review boards might become involved in such investigations but I'm skeptical about the veracity of such schemes. I expect that the members of such boards might be carefully "selected", or maybe they're just easily manipulated. Either way, the result is likely to be the same.

Here's an idea. What if cops who're accused of misconduct were investigated, judged, and sentenced by a panel of prisoners (excluding former cops), randomly selected from nearby prisons? We could call them criminal courts. I like the sound of that. I doubt if prisoners would be predisposed to sympathize with the accused cops, as are those good ol' buddies over at Internal Affairs. Indeed, the prisoners would probably be just the opposite. That's a good thing. It would give the cops something to fear and, therefore, an actual incentive (for a change) to avoid misconduct in the first place.

Let's face it. For now, such punishment as cops receive for misconduct is as likely as not to be a joke. Suspension with pay? That isn't punishment. It's a paid vacation. Suspension without pay? It's still a vacation. A letter of censure in a personnel file? In some police departments, that might actually look good on a résumé. Even all of those riots in protest of police misconduct don't hurt the cops. They result in smashed storefronts and burned businesses, giving the insurance companies an excuse to raise their rates. They give the news agencies an opportunity to scare people, and to boost their ratings. They don't hurt the cops. On the contrary, they give the cops additional opportunities to bash heads, kick asses, hire more cops, and justify it all in the name of keeping the peace. Such riots also demonstrate the stupidity of the rioters which, of course,

ought to be self evident. After all, they didn't burn down the police station. They burned down the business district. They're idiots. Occasionally, a cop might actually be punished by the Internal Affairs charade, but it's rare. When such a thing happens, I expect that the people in Hell probably have to wear overcoats. (Get it? Overcoats? A cold day in Hell?)

Does my criminal court idea seem extreme? What are the alternatives? People could wait for the cops to decide for themselves to stop acting like nazi thugs, or for the circus over at Internal Affairs to start doing something about it. I don't think that either of those things is going to happen. After all, they're all cops. People could just accept things as they are, and do nothing. Edmund Burke is attributed with telling us where that leads. People could try to defend themselves. David Koresh tried that. Look what happened to him, his family, his home, and his friends. The legislatures? The courts? They're part of the problem. Marches and demonstrations? They're not quite as bad as riots but probably no more effective. I'm not aware of any march for gun rights in which the demonstrators actually carried loaded weapons. Furthermore, if people try to have a protest without a government permit, then the cops treat the protest like it was a riot, demonstrating that protest is a regulated privilege, not a right. Anybody who's in doubt about that would do well to recall the 1968 Democratic National Convention, in Chicago.

Yes, it's an extreme idea, maybe even a crazy idea, but then so was the *Declaration of Independence*. Extreme problems call for extreme solutions. This is an extreme problem. The cops are out of control. They're behaving like nazi thugs. They're enforcing a fascist police state. The time is past for moderate measures. Cops who behave like nazi thugs ought to be treated like nazi thugs. Those who don't like it can leave their jobs and find other work. There must be something useful that they can do.

Sadly, the present constitutional regime prohibits the implementation of the criminal court idea. So, it's a good idea, but not a useable one. Writing about it has been interesting, but here's an even better idea. It's time for "the people" to abolish the government, and start over from scratch. Maybe this time, they can avoid creating a constitutional police state. 🦅

Letters to the Editor

Hello Sam....

... I will share what ever knowledge you send me to the few discerning people here who can hold an intelligent conversation. I share your *Frontiersman* because of the many publications I read, yours is often well thought out. I like to read anything that covers upcoming legislation, info in the prison industrial complex and how to fight it. I am about to file a habeas corpus appeal which I will draft up myself. Mainly on ineffective assistance of "public-pretender" counsel. So, if you have any pearls of wisdom to impart on this it would be invaluable.

I will also see what I can do around here, such as barter my writing and drawing skills in exchange for postage stamps, and send them to you whenever I can.

Thank you for what you do, you are a purveyor of knowledge.

Sincerely,

—a prisoner

Greetings from Arkansas

Hey, I just accidentally ran across a really weird piece of old American history, that I think all of your old frontiersmen out there will find to be very interesting.

You see I was just sitting here in my little prison cell reading on a couple of my old "true crime" books, and I noticed that "Charles Manson" and "Ted Bundy" were both at the university of Berkley college campus in San Francisco California during the summer of 1969, and these 2 guys who were about the same age must have crossed each other's paths, or who knows they both might have met or partied together?

But your *Frontiersman* readers can verify these same facts themselves by them reading these 2 very interesting "true crime" books!

"A Stranger Beside Me" by Ann Rule

"The Life & Times of Charles Manson" by Jeff Guinn

These days it seems to be that there is a mass shooting somewhere almost every week, and it's only getting worse, and the thing that I can not understand is why are all of these "boys and men" doing this horrible act when the fact is there is absolutely no financial incentives at all for them to do this? But if these crazy idiots are going to go on these stupid mass killing sprees, then I suggest that they consider robbing banks instead, because they might actually be able to pull it off, and end up wealthy out of the deal, then I could easily understand the money as being a good incentive to help motivate them into committing this crime. But right now if president "Donald Trump" is reading this issue of the "*Frontiersman*" then he

should step up now and declare that any more future mass shootings will be "acts of terrorism" on American soil, and subject to the immediate death penalty without trial, and the gunmen taken before a military firing squad, and have this execution televised to the world as a direct warning to let everyone know that America will now shoot all mass shooters quick! But even better yet, it would really be great if the president would sign an order, to allow all of the victim's family members to stand together and do an old fashioned style televised public stoning slinging their stones at the gunman until he is dead and bloody! You see this will send a very powerful message to all of the village idiots in America, and this will also help give all of the grieving family members a little closure. Television is now our best tool at spreading this message to others, and this is the sort of thing that will help president Donald Trump easily win the hearts of all good Americans and it will guarantee him a win in his re-election too!

—Howie in Arkansas

At first, I was hesitant to print your letter because you're advocating the kinds of government behavior that are typical of terrorist regimes. Such terrorist governments unilaterally execute people without trials, using government death squads. If they execute people publicly, then it's for the purpose of terrorizing others into submission. More likely, people will just disappear into death camps. I don't advocate such behavior by any government and I'm uncomfortable about printing letters that do. I decided to print your letter anyway, but with some cautionary editorial comments.

The various killings to which you refer were reported by the government news media. While they were all tragedies, it might be that at least some of them were perpetrated by political provocateurs, whose job it was to scare people, so that they'd crave just such government tactics as you suggested. Don't believe everything that the government tells you, especially if it makes you want to let the government get away with killing people without a trial. It's possible that you're being manipulated by government lies and propaganda.

It's a dangerous world and there are a lot of crazy people in it. Even so, the kind of government that you suggested eventually becomes more horrible than the incidents that caused you to suggest it. My suggestion is to find other ways for people to protect themselves. It isn't entirely ridiculous to consider the idea of everybody in the entire population carrying guns. I think that would be better than increasing the powers of the police state.

—editor

Starting Over

Sam Aurelius Milam III

I've seen various names used to refer to constitutions. Some people call them organic law. I believe that's a silly name for them. Things that are organic are things that eat, breathe, and so forth. Some people have called them fundamental law. I don't believe that they're fundamental. In terms of inherent status, they're equivalent to legislation in that both constitutions and legislation are enactments of men. Any doubt on that point is dispelled by Article 6, clause 2 of the U.S. constitution, in which the constitution itself declares that the constitution, federal legislation, and treaties all have equal status. Being the enactments of men, constitutions are not even law at all. See *Law vs. Legislation*, in *Milam's Dictionary of Distinctions, Differences, and Other Odds and Ends*, in *The Sovereign's Library*.

Even so, constitutions are the sources of lawful governments. A lawful government doesn't exist by its own authority. It exists by the authority of its constitution. The constitution, not the government, establishes the officers, departments, powers, limits, and so forth, of a lawful government. Any government not so constituted is an unlawful government. The constitution is the source of the government, and not the other way around.

The idea that a government is a creature of its constitution has a consequence that, so far as I'm aware, isn't generally recognized. That consequence is with regard to the continuity of a government. When a constitution is terminated and a new constitution is enacted in its place, then the government doesn't exist continuously through the transition. Rather, the previous government must necessarily vanish when its constitution is terminated. It cannot legitimately exist without its constitution. A new government, under the new constitution, is erected in its place. Some of the forms and powers of the new government might be the same as those of the previous government. The territory claimed by the new government might be the same as that claimed by the previous government. The name of the new government might be the same as the name of the previous government. None of those things cause them to be the same government.

Consider the United States of America that were mentioned in the *Declaration of Independence*, the United States of America that were allied by the *Articles of Confederation*, and the United States of America that was established by the U.S. constitution. The first were sovereign states, cooperating to resist a

common enemy. The second were independent states that had sacrificed some of their sovereignty by way of a treaty known as the *Articles of Confederation*. The third was a single national government, created by a constitution. That they shared the same name and somewhat the same territory is entirely coincidental. Such superficial similarities are legally and constitutionally irrelevant with regard to an allegation of the continuity of a government.

Some issues are raised by the discontinuous nature of government, at the creation of a new constitution, and by the reliance of a government on its constitution, for its legitimacy. For instance, a new government doesn't acquire the obligations, powers, forms, or possessions of the previous government unless there is some instrument, or some provision in the new constitution, that so provides. Such considerations are generally relevant but are particularly so for the American states on the east coast and in the south and, in consequence, for the entire union. I presented, in several of my essays, an analysis of the failures of pedigree and process that arose during the origins and histories of those governments, and of their resulting lack of legitimacy. The essays are available in *Pharos*, under the heading *The Supreme Flaw of the Land Essays*. There have been so many such failures, and they have been so pervasive, that they have entirely extinguished any constitutional legitimacy that those governments might otherwise have had. In my opinion, the governments are so flawed that they cannot be rendered legitimate. I believe that the only remedy is to end them. As I see it, the *Articles of Confederation*, the U.S. constitution, and all of the state constitutions should be terminated, thereby extinguishing all of the existing governments. Then, the people can try again.

To prevent the new governments from having the same deficiencies that afflict the present ones, the people who will write the new constitutions should first divest themselves of their present mental conditioning. That will be a long and painful process of unlearning lies and of discarding false assumptions. They'll need to acquire an understanding of such things as personal sovereignty, the principles of liberty, and the doctrine of social contract. Otherwise, the result will be the creation of police states that aren't any different in substance from the present ones. The best preparation that I can suggest for writing the new constitutions is to study my essays under the heading *Liberty, Sovereignty, and the Doctrine of Social Contract*, in *Pharos*. The sooner started, the sooner finished. 🦅



Nation in Distress

The ability to vote for your master
doesn't make you any less a slave. ☞



Acknowledgments

My thanks to the following: SantaClara Bob;
and Betty. —editor

Websites

<http://frontiersman.org.uk/>
<http://moonlight-flea-market.com/>
<http://pharos.org.uk/>
<http://sam-aurelius-milam-iii.org.uk/>
<http://sovereign-library.org.uk/> ☞

Blonde Jokes

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Don G.

Q: Why did the blonde like lightening?

A: She thought that somebody was taking her picture.

Q: Why did the blonde cross the road?

A: To show the chicken how it's done.

Q: Why did the blonde drive into the ditch?

A: To turn off the blinker. ∞

Frontiersman

Availability — Assuming the availability of sufficient funds, subscriptions to this newsletter in print, copies of past issues in print, and copies of the website on CDs are available upon request. Funding for this newsletter is from sources over which I don't have any control, so it might become necessary for me to terminate these offers or to cancel one or more subscriptions at any time, without notice. All past issues are presently available for free download at the internet address shown below. Contributions are welcome.

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

Reprint Policy — Permission is hereby given 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 author-

Alleged Facts About the 1500s

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Don G. I haven't tried to verify these claims.

- Back then, people cooked in the kitchen in a big kettle that always hung over the fire. Every day they lit the fire and added things to the pot. They ate mostly vegetables and didn't get much meat. They would eat the stew for dinner, leaving leftovers in the pot to get cold overnight and then start over the next day. Sometimes the stew had food in it that had been there for quite a while. Hence the rhyme, "Peas porridge hot, peas porridge cold, peas porridge in the pot nine days old."

- Only wealthy people had constructed floors. Poor people had dirt floors. Hence the term *dirt poor*. ∞

ity to give permission to reprint material that I have reprinted from other sources. For that permission, you must apply to the original source. I would appreciate receiving a courtesy copy of any document or publication in which you reprint my material.

Submissions — I consider 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 editor@frontiersman.org.uk. In case anybody's curious, I also accept gold, silver, platinum, etc. I don't accept anything that requires me to provide ID to receive it.

—Sam Aurelius Milam III, editor