

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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
November 1999

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or law of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. —Article 6, clause 2, U.S. Constitution

Unholy Trinity

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Most people believe that the U.S. Constitution is the “Supreme Law of the Land”. Let’s take a look at what it really says.

“This Constitution...”

[AND]

“...the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof...”

[AND]

“...all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States...”

[SHALL WHAT?]

“...shall be the supreme law of the land...”

This means that there are three equal parts of the Supreme Law of the Land — Constitution, laws, and treaties. A law, in order to be a part of the Supreme Law of the Land, must be made in pursuance¹ of the Constitution. That restriction doesn’t apply to treaties. Any treaty, constitutional or not and provided only that it exists under the authority of the United States, is a part of the supreme law of the land. Worse yet, treaties are enacted beyond most of the normal “checks and balances” of the U.S. government. The House of Representatives isn’t even involved in creating them and the Supreme Court can’t judge them. A treaty that can command the status of “Supreme Law of the Land” can be made by as few as 68 men — the President and 67 senators.

The U.N. Charter, for example, is equal in status to the U.S. Constitution as part of the

¹ A carrying out or putting into effect....

—American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language

Supreme Law of the Land. The International Court can have authority equal to that of the Supreme Court. Although such obligations as NATO and the UN are the most prominent examples, they aren’t necessarily the most important. There are thousands of treaties and agreements.² Each treaty and (probably) each agreement³ has authority equal to that of the U.S. Constitution. It seems to me that such a transfer of power to foreign countries should be intolerable to U.S. citizens. The only remedies that come to mind are to either

- end U.S. participation in all treaties, or
- repeal Article 6, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

Any other alternative seems to be a tacit acceptance by U.S. citizens of an unacceptable transfer of power to foreign interests.

² [Treaties in Force](#), A List of Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States in Force on January 1, 1999, Compiled by the Treaty Affairs Staff, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, available for download in PDF format

—<http://www.acda.gov/state/>

³ The title *Treaties in Force* uses the term treaty in the generic sense as defined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that is, an international agreement “governed by international law, whether embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments and whatever its particular designation.” The term “treaty” in its restricted usage in the United States denotes international agreements made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate in accordance with Article II, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States. In addition to such “treaties,” this publication covers international agreements in force for the United States which have been concluded by the Executive (a) pursuant to or in accordance with existing legislation or a prior treaty, (b) subject to congressional approval or implementation, and/or (c) under and in accordance with the President’s Constitutional powers.

—*Treaties in Force*, Foreword

Just Say No

Sam Aurelius Milam III

I always have difficulty convincing folks that I don't have a social security number. Since I had one in the past, they insist that I still have one because "It's impossible to cancel it".

The arrangement between a person and the Social Security Administration can be one of only two things: a contract or extortion. The difference is the essence of simplicity. If somebody participates voluntarily, then it's a contract. If not, then it's extortion. If it's extortion, then I needn't even justify my refusal to cooperate. If it's a contract, then I must have some cause to terminate the contract unilaterally.

I believe that when I originally signed the contract, the other party (government) failed to disclose relevant aspects of the contract and lied about others. The other party subsequently changed the operation of the contract without obtaining my consent. The other party also violated at least one condition of the contract.

The contract was willfully misrepresented as an insurance policy that would provide for my needs in my old age. Subsequently, I discovered that to be untrue. The contract also became a mandatory prerequisite to achieving any of the means of survival. Without proof of the contract, I was prohibited from participating in activities that are expedient, if not necessary, for survival: driving, working, attending classes, obtaining insurance, investing money, and so forth. Finally, the other party allowed, encouraged, and willfully participated in a conspiracy to compel me to violate one of the explicit conditions of the contract. That is, on the face of the original document¹ is expressly stated the condition, "FOR SOCIAL SECURITY AND TAX PURPOSES — NOT FOR IDENTIFICATION". Increasingly, I was compelled to use the contract, or the number associated with it, as identification.

Eventually I recognized the misrepresentation and deceit that had been perpetrated upon me at the initiation of the contract and afterward. I also realized that it had become impossible to continue the contract without violating the expressly stated prohibition of its use as identification. The combination of these factors created an instrument whereby every aspect of my life could be controlled, against my will. When a fraud is discovered, and failing a remedy from the other party,

¹ I still have it, as proof.

the injured party is empowered to terminate the contract unilaterally. Action must be taken upon realization of the fraud or the opportunity is lost. Failure to act will legitimize the fraud, tacitly incorporating in into the contract. Therefore, on June 13, 1984, after deciding that I did not have any other options, I notified the Social Security Administration of the termination of the contract.

The subsequent refusal of the Social Security administration to concur with my termination of the contract is irrelevant. I'm no longer a voluntary party.² The refusal of the Social Security Administration to concur with the termination of the contract cannot in any way have the effect of continuing the contract after I have terminated it. If I do not voluntarily participate, then there isn't a contract. If the Social Security Administration compels me to continue participation against my will, then the arrangement has been redefined as extortion. In either case the Social Security Administration can assign numbers to me every day for the rest of my life. Those numbers do not impose upon me any obligation whatsoever unless I acknowledge them and voluntarily partake of the accompanying "benefits". The fact is that I do not have a Social Security number. Any opinion within the Social Security Administration to the contrary is irrelevant. ♀

Elizabeth's Legacy

Sam Aurelius Milam III

The end of the Dole campaign focused more light on feminist hypocrisy. Women who condemn sexist attitudes in men are now weeping over the demise of the only female candidate. If they had the strict "non-sexist" attitudes that they demand in men, then their candidate's gender would be irrelevant. Instead, they openly support female candidates just because the candidates are female. Not only are these women sexist, they're hypocrites. If they want sexist politics for women, then they should stop condemning it in men. Hypocrisy deserves only scorn and ridicule. ♂

Letters to the Editor

Dear Sam

I feel if the President can "FORGIVE" 5.7 Billion \$ of "debt" owed to the U.S. by "impoverished countries", then it would seem fitting to release a few TAXPAYER "criminals" held in U.S. prisons....

² Indeed, *voluntary party* is redundant. A party to a contract is voluntary, by definition.

In regards to John Webster's article "Pro-Life vs "Pro-Choice", he makes an unsupportable and unprovable statement, which I know to be FALSE! In the 3rd paragraph he states "...society has the right..." NOWHERE in the recorded History of Man, has "society" been endowed by its creator with ANY "RIGHTS"! However, the article is good, as it states the pros & cons in a rational fashion. I agree, and with your 2¢ too.

The saying "evil wins when good men do nothing" is what has caused our present state of affairs! Tyrants cannot even come to power if people would/could just say "no" to any irrational postulation at its inception. The sorry thing about it is (like the 3-strikes law) it is stated (TOUTED) as one thing & implemented as another, eg: Social Security — it doesn't benefit "social" & it isn't secure! It is not an "insurance policy" — so, now that this info is proven, why don't people correct the issue?? and get rid of it? 3-x was touted as to remove VIOLENT criminals — yet proof exists that 78% are Non-Violent cases!!! Yet it is costing the "people" billions! With NO "return" on the alleged investment! Isn't this proof that Gov't is Criminal?!! OR, people just choose to be stupid? And if they have chosen to be stupid (do we need any more proof?) don't they deserve to suffer the consequences of that stupidity?....

Since we have documented evidence that the U.S. Constitution is Null & Void, ie: Lincoln's General Order 100, The Reconstruction Acts of 1867, and §5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act of Oct. 6, 1917 (12 U.S.C. §95a & 95b), then the proof that the "14th Amend." created a new set of Bylaws; why do we allow the Teachers to continue the false teaching that the aforesaid piece of shitpaper has any validity!?!?... —Eric; Calipatria, California

I agree that society doesn't have rights. I also agree that the U.S. Constitution lacks validity. Indeed, it is void from its inception. —editor

Dear Sam,

Little is happening, & yet things are getting complicated. It is a cliché that libertarians are like Republicans on economic issues, but like Democrats on social issues. Those who want to create a theocracy should join Buchanan in a Christian conservative party to the right of the Republicans. It is another cliché that both the Republicans & the Democrats serve the corporations. Libertarians resent the Democrats because it is their role to throw bones to the workers in the form of public education, health care, & social security. Under Clinton, the corporations thrived.

And the failure of the Monica circus was a major blow to social conservatives. So, libertarians should prefer the Clinton camp -- Bill, Hillary, & Al -- to anyone else in the two major parties. Al stood by Bill, for his own selfish reasons, when the Democrats wanted to join the conservatives in stoning Bill for adultery. So circumstances have made Al a symbol of social liberalism. Hillary stood by her man, when the conservatives wanted her to divorce him out of moral outrage (a strange interpretation of Christian marital morality -- perhaps they expected her to enter a convent), because Hillary really is a social liberal, & really doesn't care if her husband fools around, but she can't admit it, in an insanely hypocritical society. So she's driven to invoke Freud to explain her husband's "sins." So anyone who believes in social freedom must start from the Clinton camp & move toward third parties. The hypocrisy of Bush — the cocaine user who runs the Texas police state, where drug users are crucified — is unacceptable from a libertarian point of view.

Ventura wants to develop Reform as a libertarian party. He wants to keep Buchanan out of Reform. He wants to keep his promise not to run for president before 04. He needs to develop Reform from the ground up -- winning local & state elections. He could also use a party spokesperson to run for president & get 5% of the vote -- both promoting libertarianism in presidential debates, & collecting \$13 million for 04. The obvious place to look is Hollywood. Cybel Shepherd is thinking of running for president as a Freedom of Choice candidate. Ventura could help Reform by recruiting Shepherd, & trying to absorb Freedom of Choice, & socially liberal women who support choice, into Reform. But Shepherd should be encouraged to run for, say, governor or senator, somewhere -- against anyone but Al or Hillary, since Shepherd's broader liberal appeal could possibly act as a spoiler, if she did manage to get 5%, & throw the election to hypocritical police state leader Bush, or frank police state leader Giuliani. So Ventura needs to find another actor to run for president -- a libertarian who will not hurt Gore more than Bush (not, e.g., Beatty). Then Ventura will have to worry about competing with the figure he has built up later on. But that's politics.

Third parties need a proportional representation system. Reform must advocate changing state constitutions, & ultimately the US constitution -- it ain't working.

Sincerely,

—Elliot



Nation in Distress

When opposing tyranny,
sacrifice,
but never compromise.



(See *The Dispossessed*, by Ursula K. LeGuin)

Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What do you think we should do about global warming?
—Concerned

Dear Concerned

Let's ask everybody to leave their refrigerator doors open.

Acknowledgments

- My thanks to Sir Donald the Elusive, Sir John the Generous, <http://www.jwebster.com/>, and Shirley, of Urbana, Illinois for their contributions.
- My thanks to *The Affiliate*, <http://www.the-grand-barn.com/>, of Vankleek Hill, Ontario for regularly printing reviews of the *Frontiersman*.
—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 publications. For that permission, you must go to the original source. I would appreciate receiving a courtesy copy of any doc-

Sightings

Source Unknown — forwarded by Sir John the Generous

At a goodbye lunch for a co-worker who was leaving the company due to "rightsizing," our manager said, "This is fun. We should do this more often". Not another word was spoken. We just looked at each other like deer staring into the headlights of an approaching truck.

I knew someone who plugged her power strip back into itself and for the life of her couldn't understand why her system wouldn't turn on.

And finally, a rare double sighting: A friend had a brilliant idea for saving disk space. He thought if he put all his Microsoft Word documents into a tiny font they'd take up less room. When he told me I was with another friend. She thought it was a good idea too.

ument 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