

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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.
July 2003

Champion of Liberty

Sam Aurelius Milam III

How many hours per week do you spend doing things that are specifically intended to restore your liberty? How many hours per month? How many hours per year? You probably don't spend any time at all doing things that are intended to restore your liberty. Oh, I know, you work overtime, the kids need your attention, your wife she, your dog it. Nevertheless, you aren't doing anything to restore your liberty.

How many things do you do that tend to sacrifice your liberty? Do you submit to drug tests at work, show a driver's license every time somebody demands it, provide your Social Security number to any bureaucrat who requires it, submit to searches at the airport, let them search your car at bridges and tunnels, license your dog, apply for building permits to work on your own house? The list is interminable.

How many people are there who are doing everything they possibly can to place additional restrictions on your behavior? People who work for the local government, the county government, the state government, the federal government, the world government? Anti-gun people, anti-abortion people, anti-pornography people, anti-domestic abuse people, anti-drunk driving people, anti-drug people, anti-cell phone while driving people, anti-sexual abuse people, feminists, Christian evangelists, seat belt advocates, environmentalists, fat people, old people, sick people, handicapped people, the food police? Anybody with an agenda. Again the list is interminable, and they're all restricting your behavior, each for the sake of his own "worthy cause" without regard for your liberty.

Do you even know of anybody who's trying to restore any of your liberty? Do you know of anybody who's working full time toward the restoration of your liberty? Yes, you do.

My life is dedicated to trying to restore liberty on this continent, including your liberty. Not only that, I'm living according to the principles that I advocate. Do you know of anybody else who's doing that? There might be others who are doing what I'm doing, but I doubt it.

The woman who owns this farm doesn't want me here any more. She wants me to leave. I was supposed to have been out of here by June 1. I'm still here because I don't have any place to go. In spite of my repeated requests, I haven't received any offers of donated accommodations. I'm not receiving sufficient contributions that I can pay rent and utilities. If I sink into the ranks of the anonymous homeless, then I'm not going to be able to struggle for your liberty any more. If any of you people want this work to continue, then it's time for you to start giving me some support. Those few of you who are already trying to help me know who you are, and you know that this article isn't directed at you. It's directed at the subscribers who want to keep taking this newsletter for free, keep expecting me to solve the problems for them, and keep expecting me to do it without any funding. I'm tired of dedicating my entire life to the good of people who won't even sacrifice their junk food or cigarettes one week per month and send the extra cash to me instead, so I can continue trying to help them.

Help me restore liberty on this continent.

- Make and distribute extra copies of the *Frontiersman*.

- Publicize Pharos:

<http://www.ida.net/users/pharos/>


- Shop at Moonlight Sales:

http://www.myplanet.net/moonlightsales/Moonlight_Sales.html

- **Send cash contributions (no checks, please) to *Frontiersman*, 479 E. 700 N., Firth, Idaho 83236.**

- Seek liberty in your own life.

Frontiersman T-Shirt Adult XL (46-48)



\$20 Each — Cash Only.

No Checks, No Money Orders, No Credit Cards.

Send cash payment to:

Frontiersman, 479 E. 700 N., Firth, Idaho 83236

Stray Thoughts

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Junk E-Mail — If you don't like junk e-mail, then cancel your e-mail service. If you have e-mail service, then junk e-mail is part of the deal. Stop whining. Just trash it. They have as much right to use the service as you do.

State-of-the-Art Medicine — The mindless pursuit, in medical facilities, of state-of-the-art equipment and techniques is insane. It's a big part of the reason that medical services are so expensive. Why is it better to have state-of-the-art services that nobody can afford when, instead, we could have adequate services that many people could afford?

Heinous Policy — On June 5, 2003, Attorney General John Ashcroft told the members of the House Judiciary Committee that the Justice Department used to be in the business of prosecuting criminals but now is in the business of preventing crime. No single change in policy could be more heinous. The prosecution of criminals is based on the existence of a corpus delicti and requires the presentation of evidence. The prevention of crime is based on a presumption of guilt and requires open-ended surveillance, intrusion, and control. The prosecution of criminals is intended to punish guilt. The prevention of crime is intended to punish capability. According to the principles of crime prevention, I could be imprisoned to prevent rape merely because I'm capable of it and especially if I advocated it.

Stock Market — It's my opinion that the best way to solve the problems associated with the stock market is to not have a stock market. After all, it's completely unnecessary. If somebody wants to buy stock, he can buy it directly from the corporation. If he wants to sell it, he can sell it back to the corporation. He can advertise it in the classifieds. He can offer it on eBay, or post a flier at the laundromat. There isn't any reason for having a stock market.

Disagreement — A newsletter subscriber commented recently that he doesn't agree with everything that I print in this newsletter. I expect that. Sure, I like it if people agree with my opinions, but the newsletter has a more important purpose than that. I'm trying to teach people that they have to stop forcing others to behave according to beliefs that they don't share. There's nothing wrong with disagreement. There's everything wrong with punishing people for it.

Superiority — Anybody with a cause is convinced that he's correct. I'm convinced that I'm correct. My conviction isn't any more inherently credible than that of anybody else. However, my doctrine has one point of superiority over all of the others. My doctrine doesn't advocate that others be compelled to comply with it against their will, whether or not they agree with it. Therefore, it doesn't matter if my beliefs are correct or incorrect. Either way, my doctrine is superior to the others.

A White Man's Notes

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Gender Bias on the 5 O'clock News — During the five days from June 9 to June 13, I kept a log of news items on the “6 For Your Health” segment of the local 5 o'clock news, on channel 6. I was looking for items that fit specific categories: men's health issues, women's health issues, and health issues that were not gender specific. Two of the items require a little explanation. On June 12, they presented an item on childhood obesity. It might have qualified for the non gender specific category except that every adult in the item was a woman and all but one of the children were little girls. Therefore, I assigned it to the women's health issues category. On June 13, there was an announcement of nominations for “best nurse”. Because of the preponderance of women in that profession, I also assigned that item to the women's health issues category. That said, here's what I found: Number of items dealing with non gender specific health issues — 5; Number of items dealing specifically with men's health issues — 1; Number of items dealing specifically with women's health issues — 5. The token item that related to men's health issues was so frivolous that I don't know why they bothered to report it. According to that item, at some unknown time in the future, men will be able to buy Wrigley's Viagra chewing gum. Whoopee.

Such blatant gender bias is unacceptable in what is supposed to be the objective reporting of the news.

Might Be the Ultimate Chick Flick — On the evening of Father's Day this year, I didn't feel like working so I sat and watched a movie. It was *Follow the Stars Home*, presented by the Hallmark Hall of Fame. The plot was pretty simple. A man and woman learned that their child would be born handicapped, somewhat of a “vegetable”, requiring extreme care, and having a very short life expectancy. The man said he couldn't deal with it and wanted an abortion. The woman wanted to have the child. Since men aren't permitted any authority in such decisions, she decided to have the child and he decided to leave. The movie might have been more enjoyable had it not been for the political correctness that permeated the story and the characters. I didn't pay any attention to the

credits and I'm not familiar with the pedigree of the movie, but I got the impression that it was written and directed entirely by women in a social services agency or family court somewhere.

Of the three men who figured in the plot, two were portrayed as jerks and the other as completely submissive to the desires of the women. That certainly corresponds with the way that most women seem to view men. Either a man is submissive to a woman's will, or he's a jerk. Any woman who doesn't agree with me on this has probably already decided that I'm a jerk.

The three women who figured in the plot were all single, independent, self-reliant, loving, nurturing, long-suffering, trusting — exactly the way that women like to think of themselves. The one with the handicapped child even refused to accept the child-support payments provided by the father. Fat chance. That's a feminist flight-of-fancy if ever there was one.

The children in the plot were all girls — no boys to clutter the action. The girls were well-behaved, attentive, forgiving, and didn't cause any problems if they could avoid it. Even the handicapped girl was a little angel. She was invariably sweet, never made a mess, had pitiful seizures, and required endless mothering — just what the women needed for a feeling of self-worth.

Whenever alcohol or tobacco entered the plot, they were invariably associated with one form or another of brutality. I'm surprised that the writers didn't take a poke or two at drugs, pornography, or the PGA.

Even the puppy was cute and lovable. One of the jerks crassly kept him in a cage and brutally threw him into the river. He was heroically rescued by one of the little girls.

At the very least, this movie was an odd selection for Father's Day, unless maybe we were expected to be enlightened by it. The only lesson that I found in it is the extent to which the advocates of political correctness and feminism will use a movie to promote their agenda. These are the same people who decry the presentation, in movies, of sex, violence, embedded advertising and so forth. I guess the bright side is the hope that movies don't cause people to be politically correct any more than they cause people to be violent.

Letters to the Editor

This message is, in part, in reply to "A message from OTAR", last month. —editor

I do not know how any thinking person can support either the Republican or Democratic political parties. Both parties are just using different tactics to pervert the ideals that each citizen should be actively defending. Thus I believe that anyone that supports either political party is voting against his own best interests.

I must admire terrorists, not for the evil they do, but for acting upon their beliefs. The government of the USA could be compelled to actually represent the majority if the people of the USA were to act upon their beliefs instead of trusting in the good nature of evil to protect their interests. —Sir James the Bold

I "assembled" the following message from various comments that Sanazay Bob made in response to my article "Creation Lesson", in the June 2003 Frontiersman. —editor

Another possibility in your lead story on Creation is that the Genesis account is incomplete.

After all, Genesis is not like a Heathkit manual on how to build a creation. Adam and Eve are mentioned by name because of the personal relationship they had with God. This does not "prove" that God did not create other humans. The Genesis account tells us that God created all of the animals, fish, and birds ... but does not claim that He only created one male and one female of each. Likewise with humans.

You have made the mistake of assuming that "all Christians" have such narrow-minded views ... that we are all non-thinking robots. Bullshit! Choose "Republican" or "Democrat" or "Libertarian" or even "baseball player" in assuming that "all" members of a certain group have the same beliefs and interpretations of a given subject material. It doesn't work. Usually the most vocal are the most wrong, aren't they? When one of these self-righteous zealots takes the stage, I assure you that I cringe much more than you ever could, OK?

Learning how to "live our lives" is far different than creating a Creation. You don't have to play God to find guidance for how to relate to God and the people around you.

Almost anything that needs to be interpreted "literally" falls apart. Fast. You need only look to "zero tolerance" policies to see how nuts THAT is. You might enjoy <[You CAN be a fundamentalist and still be a Christian. It's not MY job to determine the validity of their Christianity; and it's certainly not THEIR job to determine the validity of mine.](http://www.thisis>true.com/zt.html></p></div><div data-bbox=)

There's certainly enough evil out there to oppose. Debating how we got here is of little consequence in the great scheme of things. What we do while we ARE here is much more important to me.

The purpose of recounting the Creation in Genesis was not to tell us all of the steps that God went through in the process. While there are some extremely narrow-minded people who insist that each and every word in the Bible represents a historical, physical event, I, and many other Christians recognize that many passages are allegorical in nature and present a spiritual rather than a physical truth. —Sanazay Bob

If the Creation story as told in Genesis is incomplete, which you admit, then by definition you don't know which part of the story was omitted. How do you know that God didn't use evolution to create the world? Maybe that's the part that was omitted. See my fourth Ravings essay. In general, I have demonstrated beyond question, in my second Ravings essay, that the Bible is inaccurate. It follows that Christians don't have any business insisting that the Creation story should be taught in the schools as God's Absolute Truth.

Many Christians do, indeed, claim that the Bible is a Manual on how to live. They interpret the book literally and demand literal compliance. They use the legislatures to impose that dogma onto the rest of us. They use the police, the courts, and the prisons to punish those of us who disagree with them. I haven't claimed that all Christians are that way. However, the evangelistic faction is. If you don't want repression committed in the name of Christianity, then you're going to have to "out shout" them. It may not be your business to determine the validity of their Christianity but they have made it their business to determine the validity of mine, and I'm not even a Christian. When they impose Christianity on the rest of us against our will, then the rest of us are eventually going to hold all Christians responsible. See the next letter to the editor, for example.

Finally, I believe that it is foolish to ignore how we got here. Learn from the mistakes of others. You won't live long enough to make them all yourself. —editor

→

Frontiersman

Yes. I agree that religious extremists aren't a problem so long as they don't force their way of life onto other people. But making the connection between the Republican party and Christianity, which the Republicans have done to secure the cult vote and obtain power for themselves, we must acknowledge there is a bias for pushing conservative or Christian beliefs into legislation.

So we have the abortion issue where the Republicans want to outlaw abortion based on a biblical belief of a "soul", and if you disagree with them they want to put you in prison (for murder or child abuse or whatever they come up with). I am of course Pro-Choice, but I am not going to vote for a law to mandate everyone has to have an abortion and if they don't then they are a criminal.

Then we have the issue of pornography. The conservatives have and continue to destroy lives, businesses and livelihoods by attempting to prosecute publishers and store owners with

obscenity laws all because they feel guilty after "rockin' their weasels" if you know what I'm saying. This of course based on a biblical belief that God made a mistake by giving us sex organs and an attraction to other humans outside our immediate family (you know, Cain and his Mom). I have no problem with pornography as long as it involves consenting adults and is directed properly, but I am not going to vote for a law that mandates everyone enjoy pornography as much as I do.

So evangelism is intrinsic to conservative Christian Republicans. Evangelism is in their very nature, part of what it is to be a conservative.

I will even say repression of conservative extremism, especially in a creative environment such as Hollywood, is in fact self-defense, a means to survival and not reverse-repression as the "leftist" agenda is to provide more choices and not mandate fewer choices.

—Marko of OTAR

Mystery Child

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Don G.

While visiting England, George Bush was invited to tea with the Queen. He asked her what her leadership philosophy was. She said that it was to surround herself with intelligent people. He asked how she knows if they're intelligent.

"I do so by asking them the right question," said the Queen. "Allow me to demonstrate." She phoned Tony Blair and said, "Mr. Prime Minister. Your mother has a child, and your father has a child, and this child is neither your brother nor your sister. Who is it?"

Tony Blair responded, "It's me, ma'am."

"Correct. Thank you and goodbye, sir," said the Queen. She hung up and said, "Did you get that, Mr. Bush?" "Yes ma'am. Thanks a lot. I'll definitely be using that technique in the future!"

Upon returning to Washington, he decided he'd better put Rumsfeld to the test. He summoned him. "I wonder if you can answer a question for me."

"Why, of course, sir. What's on your mind?" asked Rumsfeld.

"Uhh, your mother has a child, and your father has a child, and this child is not your brother or sister. Who is it?"

Rumsfeld hemmed and hawed and finally asked, "Can I get back to you on that, Sir?"

Bush agreed. Rumsfeld immediately called a meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and they puzzled over the question for several hours, but nobody came up with an answer.

Finally, in desperation, Rumsfeld called Colin Powell at the State Department and explained his problem. "Now look here, your mother has a child, and your father has a child, and this is not your brother or your sister. Who is it?"

Powell answered immediately, "It's me of course, you idiot."

Much relieved, Rumsfeld rushed back to the President and exclaimed, "I know the answer, sir! I know who it is! It's Colin Powell!"


And Bush replied in disgust, "You're wrong, you idiot. It's Tony Blair!!" ∞

Late Night Presidential Humor

Forwarded By Citizen Assistance Network, Supportcan--9433632@Autocontactor.Com


Democrats were quick to point out that President Bush's budget creates a 1 trillion dollar deficit. The White House quickly responded with "Hey, look over there, it's Saddam Hussein!" —Craig Kilborn

President Bush has said that he does not need approval from the UN to wage war, and I'm thinking, well, hell, he didn't need the approval of the American voters to become president, either. —David Letterman



Nation in Distress

Crime prevention by
government is a
more heinous
process than the
crimes that it
pretends to prevent.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

Our student council is collecting money so we can give a new thesaurus to every student in school. Will you make a donation?

—Student Council Member

Dear Student Council Member

You're not fooling me any. The thesaurus is extinct.

Acknowledgments

My thanks to the following: Lady Shirley the Benevolent, Sir James the Bold, Sir John the Generous, and Sir Donald the Elusive. —editor

Sixth Grade Test Bloopers

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Reverend W. Dale Blackford, strong4man@earthlink.net

- Solomon had three hundred wives and seven hundred porcupines.
- Socrates was a famous Greek teacher who went around giving people advice. They killed him. He died from an overdose of wedlock. After his death, his career suffered a dramatic decline.
- Julius Caesar extinguished himself on the battlefields of Gaul. The Ides of March murdered him because they thought he was going to be made king. Dying, he gasped out: "Tee hee, Brutus."
- Queen Elizabeth was the "Virgin Queen." As a queen she was a success. When she exposed herself before her troops they all shouted "hurrah."

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 docu-

ment 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, U.S. postage stamps, prepaid telephone cards, and so forth. I will accept checks or money orders only by prior arrangement. I don't accept 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