

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

Spousal Abuse as Humor

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Several weeks ago, I was clicking around the channels trying to find something that I could bear to watch when I happened upon a developing situation in *Everybody Loves Raymond*. It seems that Raymond's wife and mother had conspired to manipulate Robert, Raymond's brother, into a fit of jealousy regarding a previous girlfriend. (According to the laugh track, the manipulation was funny.) Raymond discovered the scheme, and was trying to reveal it to Robert. Raymond's wife objected, so she elbowed Raymond in the solar plexus so hard that he fell down. (Laugh track again, funny.) Then she knelt beside the chair in which Robert was sitting and attempted to continue the deception. (Laugh track. Funny.) When Raymond struggled to his feet and again tried to speak, his wife elbowed him in the groin so hard that he rolled over behind the chair, groaning. (Laugh track. **Really** funny.)

As I watched the situation unfold, I couldn't help but recall all those whining women on all those "public service" announcements assuring us of the fundamental evil of men who physically abuse women. I couldn't help but speculate on the hypocrisy of the show that I was watching. If the situation had been reversed, if Raymond had been beating his wife, then the viewers would have been outraged. The sponsors would have dropped the show like a hot potato. The network would have canceled it. Women would have lamented the sorry example set by Hollywood. However, it wasn't Raymond who was beating his wife. It was his wife who was beating Raymond, so it was funny. In the weeks since the program aired, I haven't heard even a whisper of protest from the feminists. ♂

Reflections on the Recall Election

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Candidates — For a long time now, a goal in this country has been to extend suffrage to people that didn't previously have it. I'm not saying that's necessarily a good idea, but it has been a goal. Universal suffrage is a bit of an overstatement but it's a convenient term, so I'll use it. The goal has been universal suffrage.

If universal suffrage is a good idea, then why not universal candidacy? Why should there be any limitations on who can be a candidate? Why should potential candidates be eliminated in advance by arbitrary eligibility requirements, before the voters even get to consider them? I suggest that, henceforth, anybody at all should be able to declare himself to be a candidate for any office, and then try to convince the voters that he's qualified. It worked pretty well in the California recall election. Even with 135 candidates, most of whom were unknown to most of the people, the voters were still able to find the fellow they wanted and vote for him. I think the same method should be used in all elections. No more conventions. Just let people declare their candidacy, let the political parties endorse somebody if they want to, and let the voters decide.

The Problem — Sadly, even with the best of intentions, Arnold Schwarzenegger won't be able to solve the problems. That's because the problems aren't being caused by the government, but by the people. They want the government to provide every possible service and solve every possible problem, but each person wants somebody else to pay for it. If Schwarzenegger tried to solve **that** problem, then he'd become very unpopular and would probably be recalled. The problems won't be solved until the people stop whining for the government to do everything for them, and start learning to do things for themselves. ♀

**Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. Cash is preferred.
Checks are accepted only by prior arrangement. Please inquire.**

Another Solution

Jim Sullivan

Here's another solution to campaign finance reform. Do away with the political campaign entirely, at least the one for U.S. president. Yes, it's hard to imagine, but it could happen. All the proposed campaign reforms and the attendant non changes about presidential elections that Americans have come to dislike, indeed, to loathe, like never-ending campaigning, interminable fund raising, uncoordinated primaries, and all the rest of it could be eliminated — some might even say exterminated. And as a result, many citizens might just be motivated to return to the polling booths to, once again, vote. However, where the presidency is concerned, that might no longer be necessary because the new concept wouldn't require it.

The proposed solution is to privatize presidential selection. After the last election, the country was halfway there anyway. The one with the most votes didn't win. What's more, the U.S. Supreme Court virtually said who the president was going to be.

Privatizing would mean amending the U.S. Constitution, but that could be done. The new provision would allow the Federal government, specifically congress, to contract out to a private U.S. based corporation, like, say, Enron, Global Crossing, or Arthur Andersen. That firm would be responsible for appointing the U.S. president every four years. Candidate status, primaries, money raising, and campaigning itself could and would be eliminated once and for all. Let the company that has the contract to choose the chief executive do so, and keep the general public away from the process entirely.

Naturally, the person chosen would be required to conform to the U.S. Constitution's rules concerning eligible potential presidents: a minimum age of 35 and being a U.S. born citizen. Other than those two requirements, all that would have to be done is to select a suitable and capable individual to fill the job.

That would include, but not be limited to (it is to be hoped) someone who is healthy, highly intelligent, well educated, speaks one or more foreign languages, studies history, understands science, knows economics, has an appreciation

of the arts and letters, comprehends theology, and is aware of humanitarian and environmental world goals. Oh, and possess ethics and morals, too. The president's membership in any particular political party would be immaterial.

The U.S. government would pay for this presidential selection. The contracted firm could be compensated with a pre-set fee, say, one hundred million dollars for providing the president. If the president proved worthy, another four-year term (with a two-term limit) could be bestowed upon that person. The firm that had selected the president could be rewarded by a grateful American population with, perhaps, another one hundred million dollar payment. This would still be a bargain for Americans.

If, on the other hand, that firm didn't provide a first-rate president, he or she could be terminated from the job at any time by a simple majority of congress. And the firm that had selected such a person would have to pay back half its fee. Moreover, that firm would lose its contract to supply future presidents.

Of course, the president would have to deal with congress, both major political parties, and the supreme court, not to mention government bureaucracy. The chief executive would also need to handle all matters that the currently elected president faces: war and peace, justice for all, prudent fiscal policies, budgeting, and what have you. But the president would not have to work on getting elected or having to make disingenuous, promise-the-moon pledges to constituents in exchange for votes. In short, this person would not owe anything to anyone, not even to the firm that hired him for the president's position. Moreover, he would be compensated annually as are most corporate CEOs, handsomely and in the millions of dollars.

Could this new method of getting a U.S. president be any worse or more haphazard than the method now in use? Just look at chief executives this country has elected. It's difficult to see any new method and end result that could be more disastrous than the present one.

So, let's consider privatizing the job, avoiding campaign rhetoric and hoopla. No TV sitcom or soap opera would have to be preempted. ∞

**Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. Cash is preferred.
Checks are accepted only by prior arrangement. Please inquire.**

Stray Thoughts

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Presidential Gaffe — If I said vigenar instead of vinegar, people would criticize my pronunciation. So, why does the President get away with saying nucular, instead of nuclear? 🗨️

A White Man's Notes

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Provocation is Abuse — From time to time, I see advertisements for various institutions that offer counseling sessions wherein men are supposed to learn to avoid violent behavior against women. I've never yet seen an advertisement for a counseling session wherein women are supposed to learn to avoid provoking such behavior.

Femithink — The knowledge that a woman gained from her past relationships is called experience. The knowledge that a man gained from his past relationships is called baggage.

No Surprise — All my life, I've been hearing how women prefer sensitive men. Of course. It's a lot easier to control a sensitive man.

Virtue — The greatest possible virtue in a woman is if she knows how and when to keep her mouth shut. 🗨️

Letters to the Editor

Dear Frontiersman:

I'm enclosing \$20 Canadian.... I read it [the *Frontiersman*] sometimes. I agree strongly with about half of it and disagree strongly with the other half.

I hope you can get some decent value out of the money. I know not everyone in the U.S. accepts Canadian money, but I haven't any U.S. money on hand.

I like your idea of making murder, theft and so on civil offences, so that one could sue the person who had murdered one's child or spouse or friend. I think the statement, "a crime should be a violation against the body politic" needs a lot more to establish it than you've given, though. Precisely why should it not include violations against citizens of the body politic? Your argument is original and practical, but I'd like to hear its basis in philosophy or logic.

—Sharon; Amherst, Nova Scotia

I didn't have any convenient place to spend the Canadian dollars, so someone took it to the bank to exchange it for me. The thief at the bank gave

her \$14.39 in U.S. dollars and then withheld a \$5 "miscellaneous fee" for the exchange — yet another example of why I claim that banks are dens of thieves.

The body politic is the people of a politically organized nation, considered as a group. An injury to an individual usually doesn't harm the body politic. An injury to the body politic, by definition, harms the members of the body politic. That should be the distinguishing feature of something deemed a crime — that it harms not just one or a few people, but that it harms all members of the body politic. Notice that when a crime is prosecuted, it is always "The People" vs. somebody. The named party isn't an individual, but "The People", that is, the body politic.

When a crime is prosecuted, the resources of the body politic are used to fund the prosecution. That is, the people all pay for the prosecution through taxes. That's proper if the body politic is the party alleging injury. However, if the injury was to one person or to a few people, not to the body politic, then there isn't any justification for funding the prosecution out of tax dollars. The prosecution should be funded by the person or people alleging injury.

Think how nice it would be if all of those victimless crimes were to become victimless civil violations, and could be prosecuted only by the victims, and not by the government. —editor

Re: inmate; Jamestown, California

Despite being off topic, the point is valid. To answer inmate's question, social pressure is the difference. Women now have privileges undreamed of in the days of inmate's examples. Social pressure gave women greater power even though most would mistakenly call it equality. The consequence is that the woman now must be considered an adult before legally making any major decisions, like having sex. That is why it is called 'statutory rape' when the woman has yet to be emancipated. —Sir James the Bold

Some Rules By Men, For Women

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Don G.

- Check your oil! Please!
- Whenever possible, please say whatever you have to say during commercials.
- The relationship is never going to be like it was the first two months we were dating. Get over it.
- If it itches, then we'll scratch it. We do that.∞

**Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. Cash is preferred.
Checks are accepted only by prior arrangement. Please inquire.**



Nation in Distress

If people are required to get a permit from the government before they can protest the government's behavior, then the time is past for protests and the time has arrived for a revolution.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

Do you have any experience at fly fishing?

—Novice

Dear Novice

No. I could never find a hook small enough to catch flies. I just use a fly swatter.

Acknowledgments

My thanks to the following: Sir James the Bold, Sir John the Generous, Sanazay Bob, Brian, of Delta, Colorado, Sharon, of Amherst, Nova Scotia, and Sir Donald the Elusive. —editor

Sixth Grade Test Bloopers

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

- Delegates from the original 13 states formed the Contented Congress. Thomas Jefferson, a Virgin, and Benjamin Franklin were two singers of the Declaration of Independence. Franklin discovered electricity by rubbing two cats backward and declared, "A horse divided against itself cannot stand." Franklin died in 1790 and is still dead.
- Beethoven wrote music even though he was deaf. He was so deaf he wrote loud music. He took long walks in the forest even when everyone was calling for him. Beethoven expired in 1827 and later died for this.

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.

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. Please inquire. 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

**Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. Cash is preferred.
Checks are accepted only by prior arrangement. Please inquire.**