Notice:

contact information, click here.

This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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



Frontiersman

Facing the truth, however great the cost.

March 2006

Heroes and Villains Sam Aurelius Milam III

I'm a fan of the miniseries *Amerika*. I've watched it several times. I've watched bits and pieces of it several times in addition to that. I've gone through it slowly, bit by bit, writing down quotations.

I intend to watch it again in future years.

Over the years since I first saw it, I've pondered the situations and characters that are presented in the story. One scene that comes occasionally to mind is the nighttime skirmish at the town square of Milford, Nebraska, where the local Americans are fighting the Russian troops of the United Nations Special Service Unit (UNSSU). The fighting is pretty much over except for one annoying UNSSU army tank that's blasting holes in the fronts of all of the (unoccupied) local buildings on the main street of town. The locals are armed mostly with shotguns and hunting rifles. They can't do much about the army tank. Then, a hero rides to the rescue. He's a man in a small gasoline tanker truck. He drives the truck toward the army tank, accelerating along the main street, and slides it sideways against the tank, causing a large gasoline explosion. The explosion destroys or disables the tank. Of course, it also kills the hero. The suicide attack isn't presented as much of a big deal. It's only a few seconds of action in a rather long movie. I don't recall that the character even had a name in the dialog. He was, nevertheless, presented as a hero. He died for a cause in which he believed, supporting it in the best way that he could.

Now, consider a different suicide attack. When the presumed Muslim hijackers reportedly flew the allegedly hijacked airliners into the World Trade Center towers, people's reactions varied from scathing contempt to utter baffle-

ment. Nobody could even remotely understand why anybody would be such a monster, or such a nitwit, as to intentionally crash an airplane into a building.

Now, reconsider the miniseries Amerika. we can understand the courage and the heroism of the man in the gasoline tanker truck, then why can't we understand the courage and the heroism of the presumed hijackers? Is it just because the truck driver was on "our side" and the presumed hijackers weren't? What does that have to do with anything? Courage is courage, regardless of the allegiance of the hero. If the 911 attacks had actually happened as reported (which they didn't), then the presumed hijackers would have died for a cause in which they believed, supporting the cause in the best way that they could. The target was of a different kind but the courage is the same.

"You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy,' But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust. For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? And if you salute only your brethren, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

-Matthew 5:43-48 Revised Standard Version

When Americans praise one man's sacrifice just because he's on our side and condemn another man's similar sacrifice, just because he's the enemy, that's arrogance and hypocrisy. It's jingoism masquerading as patriotism. For so-called Christians, who loudly proclaim America to be a Christian nation, it's also an indication of their error. If America had **ever** been a Christian nation, then Americans would have behaved differently and the sorry atmosphere of hatred and fear might have been avoided.

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire.

For PayPal payments, use frontiersman@pharos.pricelesshost.net.

In Loco Exemplum¹

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Children watch their parents and imitate them. They don't even know that they're doing it. They just do it. It's been that way for thousands of generations and it probably hasn't changed at all during those generations. It's every bit as natural and fundamental as a chick imprinting on a hen. It's in the genes.²

In bygone ages, children watched their parents work. It didn't matter if a parent was hunting game, or planting crops, or preparing food, or building shelter. Whatever it was, the parents engaged in their daily processes of survival within the sight of their children. The children watched and the children learned.

In more recent times, most of the parents' work has been removed from the sight of their children. In many cases, maybe in most cases, the children don't observe the parents' work and probably aren't even aware of it. Instead, if the children see the parents at all, they see them

- 1 The intended translation is "In Place of an Example". I welcome a better Latin phrase from that unknown Latin expert lurking among my readers.
- 2 Please note that a chick will imprint on the first creature that it sees. The process is a genetic mandate but it isn't limited to the chick's actual genetic mother. The same sort of thing is true of children. Whoever they perceive as their parents will satisfy the genetic mandate to imitate. It doesn't necessarily have to be the genetic parents. "The hand that rocks the cradle...."

<u>Letters to the Editor</u>

Hi Sam,

Hope all is well.

Thanks again for continuing to express all your ideas....

Warm wishes, —Millie; Baltimore, Maryland

Hi Sam! I loved the article about the bible translations. One thing I'm puzzled about is why Christians need to believe that every word of the Bible is inspired by God. Think about it. If you want information about Italy, you read books about Italy. Some books may contain misinformation but, in general, if you read enough books about Italy, you get a pretty good idea of what Italy is like. It's the same with any subject. So, if Christians want to know about Jesus, I can understand them wanting to read the best, earliest sources, but why make the

after the parents are finished with all of their work for the day. What the children see is the parents "unwinding", relaxing, or being entertained in some way.

While the parents' work is being done, the children must go to school or find some other way to pass their time. Granted, school can provide some benefits. At school, children can acquire a kind of knowledge, a sort of education. Teachers can impart facts and, maybe occasionally, beliefs. Peers can influence behavior, at least temporarily. However, all of those people are outside of the genetic mandate to imitate. Only the parents have that genetic mandate. As a child ages, the mandate might fade, disappear, or transfer elsewhere. ever, the parents are the priority sources of example during early childhood for the fundamental things that shape a child's future character.

So, in recent times, children have grown up receiving from their parents, if they received any example at all, examples of how to unwind, how to relax, or how to be entertained. Should we be surprised if there has been a tendency for children to be fat, lazy, focused on entertainment, demanding of instant gratification, irresponsible, and uninterested in work? The trend is to remove children from the home at ever earlier ages. The predictable results ought not to surprise anybody.

claim that these writings are supernatural? It's really an unnecessary embellishment. Of course, the historical source of this "divine inspiration" rigmarole is political.

Speaking of things political — I certainly agree that the US government had a motive to create the 9/11 incidents — but I don't put much stock in images available over the internet. It's just that it's too easy these days to fake images in ways that defy easy detection. Of course, this cuts both ways — we don't know how much of the official line is fictionalized with computer altered or generated images. From talking to middle easterners now living in California, there are CERTAINLY plenty of people in the mid-east who hate the US government, and who would be willing to support genuine terrorism. I think I may have said before that the whole "War on Terrorism" is a ridiculous cate-

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire. For PayPal payments, use frontiersman@pharos.pricelesshost.net.

gory error. "War", literally, is a violent struggle between armies, for control of a specific territory. The war is over when there is a conquest or peace negotiation. The "war" on terrorism, like the "war" on poverty, or the "war" on drugs, is only a metaphor. In fact, I doubt that there is really a war in Iraq. Yes, there is fighting in Iraq, but do the insurgents constitute a real army? Possibly yes, but it's very hard to tell from the reports we get.

Anyway, enough for now. —Sir Donald

Have you ever seen a Pentagon photograph that DID show airplane wreckage? —editor

Letter to the Editor:

Concerning the Pentagon incident

As you suggested in your newsletter it is clear that a large passenger aircraft did not really fly into the Pentagon; perhaps it was some sort of remote piloted drone such as a Global Hawk. It apparently was only a staged "Terrorist" attack. It even hit a portion of the Pentagon that was being renovated, where there were minimal personnel.

I go into this on my web-site (URL: http://www.JWebster.com, click on menu item "Conspiracy Theories"). I even have a link for watching a short Shockwave video that shows those same pictures.

What I believe happened on 9/11 is that the Pentagon officials knew ahead of time that the Terrorist attack was going to occur, but they had to allow the attack to be carried out so that their source of information would not be compromised. However they couldn't allow the attack on the Pentagon itself so they intercepted and shot down that plane targeting the Pentagon a safe distance away. They then had to fake a smaller controlled plane crash into the Pentagon to prevent the Public from getting suspicious. Note that the officials would have known that the passengers of the plane were doomed anyway so would have given little thought to shooting it down themselves.

This is an example of how "our" Government is now working under a mentality of "The Ends Justify the Means" where lying to the Public is "No Big Deal".

—John Webster

Sir John the Generous

I don't believe that any of the targets were hit by hijacked airliners that day. I believe that each target was hit by a vehicle that had been specifically configured to do the required damage to the designated target. The hijacking of the airliners was a cover. The hijacked airliners and their passengers "disappeared". I haven't done enough research yet to be willing to put into print what I believe happened to them. Maybe later. —editor

Comment re: February 2006 Frontiersman:

It seems every time the Frontiersman discusses the Bible, it uses the term "so-called Christians." Do you believe all Christians are "so-called Christians"? What is the difference between "so-called Christians", and just plain "Christians?"

Thanks for your intriguing publication.

-Tom; Redwood City, California

I started using the phrase "so-called Christians" because I got tired of people accusing me of Christian bashing and of whining, "We're not all like that." I believe that the vast majority of people who call themselves Christians are "like that". However, probably not all people who claim to be Christians are "like that". So, I decided to start making the distinction. Now, when I accuse somebody of being repressive, hypocritical, arrogant, judgmental, and so forth, and of using government to impose so-called Christian beliefs on others who don't share them, then I call him a so-called Christian. A real Christian wouldn't have those attitudes or do those things. A real Christian would be Christ-like. So-called Christians have those attitudes and do those things. They're more Bush-like than Christ-like - you're either "for 'em or against 'em". If you're against'em, then you're the enemy.

For a long time, I referred to so-called Christians as Puritans. Critics eventually convinced me that "Puritan" wasn't a useful term for my purposes. After that, I started complaining about the behavior of Christians. Critics eventually persuaded me to make the distinction that you've noticed. So now, I complain about the arrogance, hypocrisy, and belligerence of so-called Christians.

I suggest that you read my articles "Live and Let Live" (September 1995, page 2) and "Paths of Righteousness, Death of Liberty, For His Name's Sake" (September 2000, page 1). Actually, the Frontiersman contains many articles about so-called Christians. Just do a word search on the website.

—editor

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire. For PayPal payments, use frontiersman@pharos.pricelesshost.net.



Nation in Distress

Abolish the Department of Homeland Security.

<u>Acknowledgments</u>

My thanks to the following: Sir James the Bold, SantaClara Bob, Lady Jan the Voluptuous, Sir Donald the Elusive, Millie, of Baltimore, Maryland, and Tom, of Redwood City, California.

—editor

Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth Dear Buck

Can you suggest a good academy where they teach fencing?

—Ready to Learn

Dear Ready to Learn

Around here we don't go to no academy. We just pound iron posts into the dirt and string bob wire on 'em.

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-

New Office Slang

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Lord Jeffrey the Studious

- <u>404</u> Someone who is clueless, from the web error message, "404 Item Not Found" which means the document requested couldn't be located. "Don't bother asking John. He's 404."
- <u>Adminisphere</u> The rarefied organizational layers above the rank and file, the source of decisions that are often profoundly inappropriate or irrelevant.

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 prefer cash, U.S. postage stamps, prepaid telephone cards, and so forth. For checks or money orders please inquire. For PayPal payments, use frontiersman@pharos.pricelesshost.net. I don't accept anything that requires me to provide ID to receive it. In case anybody is curious, I also accept gold, silver, platinum, etc. —Sam Aurelius Milam III, editor

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire. For PayPal payments, use frontiersman@pharos.pricelesshost.net.