

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

September 2001

Nothing In Between

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Long ago, I concluded that there isn't any freedom in the U.S.A., only regulated behavior (privileges). Events continue to verify that conclusion.

One such event is the recent decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court regarding David Oakley. In 1999, the 34-year-old father of nine was placed on probation for five years by a county circuit judge, and ordered not to father any more children unless he first showed the means to support them. He was threatened with eight years in prison if he failed to comply with the ruling. On Tuesday, July 10, 2001, the Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld the circuit court ruling.¹

Those rulings demonstrate that the government's jurisdiction (albeit a *de facto* jurisdiction) extends to the behavior in question — fathering children. Thus, becoming a father is regulated behavior. Whether or not government usually exercises the power is irrelevant. One case proves the existence of the power, legitimate or otherwise. If the power can be applied to David Oakley, then it can be applied to anybody. If it can be enforced in one case, then it can be enforced in any case, and in all cases. The fact is that the government can grant or withhold permission to become a father. It can place prerequisites on the permission and punish people who become fathers without permission. Fatherhood isn't a right. It's a privilege

The government's *de facto* jurisdiction also extends to the appearance of your lawn.

"In the 'Garden State' of New Jersey, the residents of Maplewood take lawn care seriously. But then again, they don't have a choice.

"Bob Thomsen, Maplewood's officially designated 'lawn cop,' will slap them with a citation if he

¹ *Limited Fatherhood: Court Upholds Ban on More Kids for Deadbeat Dad*, By Sarah Wyatt, The Associated Press, July 11, 2001, http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/dad_limit010711.html

doesn't like what he sees.

" '[The] grass is overgrown,' he observes at one home. 'It just has a nasty, natty look to it.'

"...in Maplewood, N.J., 62 violations have been handed out so far this summer." ²

Thus, the government has the power to impose requirements on the condition of your lawn, and monitor your lawn for compliance. If your lawn doesn't satisfy an inspector, then you can be punished. Whether or not your particular segment of the government normally exercises the power is irrelevant. One case demonstrates that the power, legitimate or otherwise, is there to be exercised if the government wishes to do so. If the power can be applied in Maplewood, New Jersey, then it can be applied anywhere. The power exists. The government wields it. In the U.S.A., having a lawn isn't a right. It is regulated behavior — a privilege.

The list of activities requiring some form of government permission — license, permit, inspection, etc. — is unending. A very few of the many examples are: getting married, owning a dog, driving a car, improving or enlarging your house, getting a job, leaving or entering the country, starting a business, receiving or providing medical treatment, being a lawyer, a beautician, or an airline pilot, etc. ad nauseam. The fact is that Heinlein's gloomy vision of life in the "Free State" is, indeed, becoming a reality in the U.S.A. today.

"...The Free State was an absolute dictatorship; the head man of the ruling clique was designated the 'Liberator'. Their watchwords were Duty and Obedience; an arbitrary discipline was enforced with a severity that left no room for any freedom of opinion.... Anything not compulsory was forbidden...." ³

Anything not compulsory was forbidden. Today in the U.S.A. there are, indeed, only two categories of behavior — compulsory or forbidden — with nothing in between.

² ABC World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, *Lawn Obsession; Sparing No Expense in the Quest for Perfect Grass*, By Bill Redeker, August 2, 2001

³ from *Coventry*, in the collection *Revolt in 2100*, by Robert A. Heinlein, Copyright 1953

International Agencies

Sam Aurelius Milam III

It's an important fact that the wording of a treaty is irrelevant to the eventual behavior of the international agency created by the treaty. Once the agency exists, it will behave without any regard for the limitations presumably imposed upon it by its enabling treaty. How, for example, was NATO able to justify its attack on Serbia, when it legitimately had only the powers provided by the wording of the NATO treaty —

Jurisdiction

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Legislation cannot legitimately be enforced outside of its proper jurisdiction. Further, the proper jurisdiction should not be defined geographically. To do that causes someone's mere presence within a boundary on a map (regardless of how he got there) to place him within a jurisdiction. Consider the Negroes in the old south. To claim that someone is bound by the legislation just because he's present in a certain location means that those Negroes didn't have any basis to object to their slavery. They were situated physically in a region in which slavery was legal. If location is the **only** factor in the imposition of a jurisdiction, then the imposition of slavery on those Negroes was legitimate, because of the rule of law. If location isn't the only factor in the imposition of jurisdiction, then how they got there gave them a basis for objection. We can't have it both ways.

In fact, the philosophy that prevails today is that location is the only relevant factor. How else could it have been legitimate to kidnap Manuel Noriega from Panama and force him into the U.S. jurisdiction? In fact, that wasn't any different in principle from kidnapping Negroes from Africa and forcing them into the U.S. jurisdiction. The two situations are legally identical and equally improper. Slavery is just as real today as it was in the "Old South".

The remedy is that jurisdiction must be voluntary, regardless of someone's location. People must be able to enter an area without entering

to defend member states from outside aggression? Serbia did not attack a NATO member state and, therefore, did not qualify as a target of NATO retaliation.

Such concerns might not seem important except that, pursuant to Article VI, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, treaties are part of the Supreme Law of the Land, equal in status to the Constitution itself. Thus, international agencies have as much authority in the U.S.A. as does the U.S. government — a sobering thought. ¶

a jurisdiction. Far more important however, they must be able to leave a jurisdiction without suffering the onerous burden of being forced to leave their homes to do it. By that I mean that people should be able to leave the jurisdiction without physically going anywhere. A person must be able to do that if a jurisdiction is to be considered voluntary. If a person must physically go somewhere else to leave a jurisdiction, then to call the jurisdiction voluntary is a lie. No matter where he moves, there will be another similar jurisdiction that will forcibly claim him. Therefore, participation must be voluntary without the need to physically go somewhere else.

Escape from intolerable jurisdictions by moving somewhere else became impossible after the colonization of this continent was completed. My suggestion provides the only remaining possible way to peacefully escape an intolerable jurisdiction. Lacking my theory that participation in a jurisdiction is voluntary, then the only other possible choices are to submit to the jurisdiction or to resist it. Resistance inevitably leads to violence. Consider the rise in so-called terrorism and the virtue, indeed the necessity, of my position becomes clear. With no place left for dissatisfied people to go in the world, we must either embrace the notion of voluntary jurisdictions or accept the reality of eternal violent resistance. The legitimate boundaries of a lawful jurisdiction cannot be geographical. They must be contractual. ¶

Letters to the Editor

I was one of several recipients of the following message, as part of an ongoing e-mail discussion. Although it isn't addressed to the Frontiersman, I'm printing it here anyway. —editor

I suppose I should clarify who I am (am not) so your staff can fairly evaluate my claim. I am not a Yurok, although I think I have some small % of Indian blood, don't remember what tribe. I am not a homosexual. I am not a female. I do

not have any physical handicap I'm aware of, nor am I a vocal member of any other politically subsidized victim's group (It would be a disturbance to my way of life to beg bureaucrats for special favors). I do not pose any physical threat to any other person.

So how is my life being disturbed? Having over a third of my earnings confiscated through taxes is a bit disturbing, as is having legions of government thugs threatening and intervening in every aspect of my life. Following are a few specific common occurrences that are disturbing to my way of life.

Having to ask permission from a government parasite before improving my home. Having a pissant neighbor call a government bully to come and harass me about the appearance of my back yard. Having a gun-toting government thug with an IQ of 40 threaten me for driving around the block without wearing a seat belt or riding my bicycle without a helmet. Having to operate my business according to instructions from a government weenie, who has never done an honest day's work let alone operated a business. Having bureaucrats decide what products and services I'm allowed to buy, and who I'm allowed to buy them from, and how much I have to pay for them (e. g. most utility services to my home). Being forced to pay for a school establishment to indoctrinate students, including my daughter, with moral views contrary to my own. The president ordering unprovoked violence against citizens of other countries: Panama,

Iraq, Bosnia, et. al. (Might such action provoke retaliation against me, as a citizen of the attacking country?).

So tell the truth, Jack. Are you really opposed to disturbing people's lives in general, or is disturbing lives OK as long as you get to be on the committee that determines whose gets disturbed? —Steve; Fremont, California

The following letter was in response to my article "To Love, Honor, and Obey", August 2001.

—editor

Sam,

You might find the recent book, *The Decline of Males*, by Lionel Tiger interesting. It deals with similar questions as your article in the August *Frontiersman*.

By the way, as with much of your writing, your over generalization here detracts from your credibility. As to what men want from women, I suggest you speak for yourself. I am one man who would be turned off by some aspects of your ideal wife's behavior.

Also your attributing the same set of personality flaws to all modern women conflicts with my direct experience (We've argued this issue before). For example in my experience many women from Asian and rural American cultures tend to behave much closer to your apparent preference than those from the dominant urban American cultures (those presented in mainstream media).

—Steve; Fremont, California

Alternate Meanings for Words

Forwarded by Susan, of Buhl, Idaho

These are reportedly some of the winning entries in a Washington Post contest in which readers were asked to supply alternate meanings for various words.

1. Abdicate (v.), to give up all hope of ever having a flat stomach
2. Carcinoma (n.), a valley in California, notable for its heavy smog.
3. Esplanade (v.), to attempt an explanation while drunk.
4. Willy-nilly (adj.), impotent.
5. Flabbergasted (adj.), appalled over how much weight you have gained.
6. Negligent (adj.), describes a condition in which you absentmindedly answer the door in your nightie.
7. Lymph (v.), to walk with a lisp.
8. Gargoye (n.), an olive-flavored mouthwash.
9. Bustard (n.), a very rude Metrobus driver.
10. Coffee (n.), a person who is coughed upon.

11. Flatulence (n.) the emergency vehicle that picks you up after you are run over by a steamroller.

12. Balderdash (n.), a rapidly receding hairline.

13. Testicle (n.), a humorous question on an exam.

14. Semantics (n.), pranks conducted by young men studying for the priesthood, including such things as gluing the pages of the priest's prayer book together just before vespers.

15. Marionettes (n.), residents of Washington, DC who have been jerked around by the mayor.

16. Rectitude (n.), the formal, dignified demeanor assumed by a proctologist immediately before he examines you.

17. Oyster (n.), a person who sprinkles his conversation with Yiddish expressions.

18. Circumvent (n.), the opening in the front of boxer shorts.

19. Frisbatarianism (n.), The belief that, when you die, your soul goes up on the roof and gets stuck there.

∞



Nation in Distress

There aren't any rights
in the U.S.A. The
various alleged rights
are not rights. They are
privileges.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What's a tampax? —Listening to Big Sister
Dear Listening to Big Sister

It's an ax with a special head that has a blade on one edge for cutting trees and a flat spot on the other edge for tamping soil.

Acknowledgments

- My thanks to [The Affiliate](http://www.the-grand-barn.com/), of Vankleek Hill, Ontario, <http://www.the-grand-barn.com/>, and [The Thought](http://home.att.net/~guildmaster/wsb), of Glendale, Arizona, <http://home.att.net/~guildmaster/wsb> for printing reviews of the *Frontiersman*.
- My thanks to Sir John the Generous <http://www.jwebster.com/>, and Sir Donald the Elusive for their contributions. —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 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.

Please help me defend liberty.

- Make and distribute extra copies of the *Frontiersman*.
- Publicize *Pharos*. The address is <http://www.ida.net/users/pharos/>
- Shop at Moonlight Sales. The address is http://www.ida.net/users/pharos/Moonlight_Sales/Moonlight_Sales.html
- Send cash contributions (no checks, please) to the *Frontiersman* at 479 E. 700 N., Firth, Idaho 83236.
- Seek liberty in your own life.

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