

Opinion

— EDITORIAL —

Lukewarm on new online impersonation bill

We've read with interest multiple editorials and articles in other local media referring to an allegedly fake Facebook account through which someone impersonated a local Democrat Precinct Committee Person (PCP)—without evidence to the contrary, we take his word on that—by friending and messaging several others in the community.

We've found some of the media response to be curious and certainly filled with amateur attempts to draw a correlation between the makeup of those who wound up on his friends list one way or another—and the perpetrator.

We've watched half-baked editorial finger-pointing attempts to connect random parties—everyone from those in favor of a past school board recall attempt... to third parties who had never even heard about the fake account... to local Republican PCPs. The head-scratcher of a theory seems to be that since mostly the liberally inclined chose to add this person to their Facebook friends, obviously the culprit must come from the other side of the mystical fence.

In all this tortured and misguided logic, we've never once read a reference to those who *didn't* choose to become friends with the fake account.

We know we didn't. Two of us on this Editorial Board also received friend requests from the alleged fake account. We're aware of several prominent conservatives in the community who received friend requests and also didn't accept.

From our perspective, there appears to be no particular pattern to the friending attempts, but due to the name on the account, the combination of those who actually accepted the requests makes

perfect sense. They weren't "targeted," we don't believe, to any larger degree than we were. On Facebook, people tend to accept requests from people they know or would like to get to know. People who receive requests from individuals they don't know or don't want privy to their personal information tend to decline such requests. Such was the case with us, our friends, and family. And when we received a second friend request from the same account, we then blocked the obnoxious individual so that no more requests could come.

From this situation, though, we understand several local voters approached Rep. Cliff Bentz with a request to draft legislation. Another Representative with local ties, Jodi Hack, sister of former County Clerk Tami Green, co-sponsored the ensuing bill, which would criminalize online impersonation. All things said, we're not totally opposed to an online impersonation bill.

We've read this one, though, and the language stating that if a person feels "humiliated," they're entitled to sue for compensation for that humiliation. We've seen too many laws triggering too many court cases in which lawyers try to prove or disprove just how a bad a plaintiff felt.

If a waitress spills a drink on us, or someone describes us in a way we maybe don't like, and as a result we feel embarrassed, is a lawsuit appropriate? Do we really want a society in which hurting our little feelers is considered a crime?

Strike that "humiliation" wording, and we'd have no objection to the rest of the bill. As it is, we wonder if the bill will ever make it out of Committee.

To the largest degree, whom we accept onto our social media pages and what we choose to communicate in emails, texts and private messages is a personal responsibility.

We agree there are con artists and crooks out there in the world who prey on the weak-minded and naive. If they use the internet to defraud an individual financially, it's criminal, just like it would be off the internet. We suspect we're still unaware of many details in our local situation, but it's our understanding that no one was financially or otherwise harmed in the Baker County instance. As it is, we feel fairly lukewarm about this bill.

—The Baker County Press Editorial Board

— LETTERS TO THE EDITOR —

Disagree with Southwick's maneuvering

To the Editor:

I was concerned when the Baker County Sheriff announced his retirement to the Baker County Board of Commissioners that he also endorsed as his replacement to fill the unexpired portion of his term a friend of his, a lieutenant that was promoted to that rank a few months ago from the rank of sergeant. According to my understanding, at the time the sergeant was promoted, Sheriff Southwick also demoted to lieutenant the undersheriff who had been in that position for about nine years. As a general rule, the undersheriff would have become the interim sheriff and would have served in that position for the unexpired portion of the sheriff's term of office.

I have no problem with Sheriff Southwick recommending to the Baker County Board of Commissioners someone to fill the unexpired portion of his term, but I do have a problem with what he did a few months ago in order to give a particular deputy the opportunity to take over and run the Baker County Sheriff's Office. Is this one of those "good ol' boy" type of promotions?

I think it would be a great idea for the Baker County Commissioners to carefully look at any and all potential candidates to ensure that the appointment is an ethical one before selecting a new leader of the Baker County law enforcement team.

Robert Brady
Baker City

Road Closure or Timber?

To the Editor:

When did we come to the point in Eastern Oregon, that we found ourselves negotiating our access to public lands for

timber harvest and why is this an acceptable model for our elected officials?

The answer lies directly under our noses, but for the fact that a great deal of us don't know it exists. Collaboration and the bringing together of "interested" parties to negotiate projects is killing our individual rights each and every day.

The Grant County Court, as one example, has decided to align itself with the financial interest of Iron Triangle and its ability to realize a profit from the "stewardship contract" given throughout the county.

In order for Iron Triangle to move forward with getting its projects completed, they must keep the Forest Service happy. Mr. Beverlin, newly appointed Forest Supervisor for Malheur National Forest, made this very clear in early February when he informed the American Forest Resources Council that any interference or preventing the Forest Service from performing road closures will jeopardize timber outputs on the Forest.

That my friends is where we have come as a region and where the FS has come to as an agency. You don't support what we want to do, we'll break you, period, end of story. So, what other choice do these companies have? Either Hells Canyon Preservation Council litigates a timber project if it's not closed afterward, or the FS simply does not allow the project because you can't keep the public shut up about it. This isn't just in Grant County; it's throughout the Eastern Oregon Counties and the only way to address it is to tell the commissioners that our motorized access is not to be negotiated.

We're being held hostage friends, who stands up and says enough is enough.

John George
Bates

Letter to the Editor Policy: The Baker County Press reserves the right not to publish letters containing factual falsehoods or incoherent narrative. Letters promoting or detracting from specific for-profit businesses will not be published. Word limit is 375 words per letter. Letters are limited to one every other week per author. Letters should be submitted to Editor@TheBakerCountyPress.com.

Advertising and Opinion Page Disclaimer: Opinions submitted as Guest

Opinions or Letters to the Editor express the opinions of their authors, and have not been authored by and are not necessarily the opinions of The Baker County Press, any of our staff, management, independent contractors or affiliates. Advertisements placed by political groups, candidates, businesses, etc., are printed as a paid service, which does not constitute an endorsement of or fulfillment obligation by this newspaper for the products or services advertised.

— GUEST OPINION —

Federal jurisdiction: fact or fiction?

By James Iler
Special to The Baker County Press

In a recent issue of *The Baker County Press*, I noted at least four comments by City and County agencies and private associations citing their concerns that necessary local laws and practices may be in conflict with "federal law."

The simple fact is that the federal government's actual constitutional authority and jurisdiction is limited to its own employees and the land ("territory") actually owned by it (with jurisdiction granted by the state over that deeded land). Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States is very clear, and very restrictive. Read it yourselves.

However, the federal government (US Congress) has the constitutional power and right to make any laws it wants for its own territory. See Article 4 Section 3. That territory includes only Washington D.C. and the maritime enclaves (Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, etc.) and the land it actually owns within the "several States of the American union."

And those private internal laws are not required to recognize any constitutionally-protected rights of any people found within its territories. Those actually living in federal territories ... or unknowingly claiming that they live in this federal territory ... are virtual corporate slaves.

Said Congress lawfully and constitutionally created the IRS and BATF and USFS and DHS and FEMA and "Obamacare" and all the other alphabet agencies to operate within their private territorial jurisdiction and venue, and are effective only against their corporate agency employees and territorial "US citizens" and others who volunteer to be under their jurisdiction. Get that?

So why are the people of Baker County so concerned about being subject to the severely limited federal authority that is so clearly defined in the constitutions? If we are living in one of the "several States," and not in Washington D.C. or one of Congress' maritime territories, how do their unrestricted (non-constitutional) powers reach us?

The "United States Government" is a private Delaware corporation. It deceptively creates a territorial "residency" and induces you and me to enter its territory for the purpose



Submitted Photo

James Iler has studied law and the constitution for two decades, and is dedicated to educating others about their God-given rights. He is an Oath Keeper living near New Bridge and Baker City, and his writings are found on BakerCountySolutions.com.

of placing us under their far-reaching non-constitutional authority. It deceptively encourages us to apply for federal benefits and permissions and licenses and grants, and to enter interstate banking relationships and be "taxpayers" and thereafter be subject to all its agencies' administrative and executive orders ... all within their private, foreign jurisdictional venue where the People are granted mere privileges by their corporate masters, and no rights exist.

"Government agencies" are virtually all just private corporations. They are listed on Dun and Bradstreet as "privately-held companies with federal TIN and CUSIP numbers. They act in their sovereign constitutional capacity only in international affairs. They are for-profit corporations, like Safeway and Shell Oil. Their commercial paper is traded on the international securities exchanges.

They have no inherent powers over you unless you are their employee or "reside" in their very limited federal territory!

Local governmental agencies that are concerned about the costs of butting heads with what they perceive as "federal law" need only to challenge the interloping federal agency to produce admissible evidence that their conduct or claim of authority is in harmony with Article 1, Section 8, or else provide evidence of a lawful and binding voluntary contract made under full disclosure.

Sovereign constitutional government was created by the people to protect their inherent God-given rights. When it strays from this fundamental purpose, it is not your government.

When its employees act in fraud against the rights and interests of the people ... and against their solemn Oath ... they commit treason. It is that simple. Study and know your rights, then claim your rights ... or lose them.

— CONTACT US —

The Baker County Press

PO Box 567
Baker City, Ore. 97814

Open Monday-Thursday for calls
9 AM - 4 PM
Open 24/7 for emails
Office location: TBA

Phone: 541.519.0572

TheBakerCountyPress.com

Kerry McQuisten, Publisher
Editor@TheBakerCountyPress.com

Wendee Morrissey, Advertising and Sales
Wendee@TheBakerCountyPress.com

David Conn, Advertising and Sales
David@TheBakerCountyPress.com

Published weekly every Friday.
Subscription rates per year are \$29.95 all areas, e-mail delivery. \$39.95 print issue, home delivery, Baker City city limits only. \$49.95 print issue, mail delivery, outside Baker City city limits only.
Payment in advance.

A division of
Black Lyon Publishing, LLC

Copyright © 2014

YOUR ELECTED OFFICIALS

President Barack Obama

202.456.1414
202.456.2461 fax
Whitehouse.gov/contact

US Sen. Jeff Merkley

503.326.3386
503.326.2900 fax
Merkley.Senate.gov

US Sen. Ron Wyden

541.962.7691
Wyden.Senate.gov

US Rep. Greg Walden

541.624.2400
541.624.2402 fax
Walden.House.gov

Oregon Gov. Kate Brown

503.378.3111
Governor.Oregon.gov

State Rep. Cliff Bentz

503.986.1460

State Sen. Ted Ferrioli

541.490.6528

Baker County Commissioners Bill Harvey; Mark Bennett; Tim Kerns

541.523.8200
541.523.8201