


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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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
May 2000

Men, Animals, and the Scientific Method

Sam Aurelius Milam III

This article is about human male sexual behavior and two theories that might explain and predict such behavior. One theory, advocated largely by feminists and people who have been brainwashed by them, claims that men are above the “animals”, that their intelligence overrides their animal instincts, and that men can and should “just control themselves”. I call this the Feminonsense theory. The other theory, which I modestly call Sam’s Theory, claims that men cannot always control their sexual behavior but instead are often driven by it.

Let’s digress for a moment and consider the scientific method. One of its precepts deals with the evaluation of theories. If a theory agrees with or explains the observable data or behavior and successfully predicts future events, then that theory is a candidate for acceptance. If a theory conflicts with or fails to explain the observable data or behavior or fails to successfully predict future events, then the theory is a candidate for rejection. Now, lets try the two above noted theories against some observed behavior.

First, the assumptions: Bill Clinton is widely, perhaps universally, accepted as a sane and intelligent man. He is probably above average in most of his abilities. There isn’t any reason to suppose that he is atypical with regard to his ability to “just control himself”. The question before us then, given those assumptions, is this. Why did he get involved with Monica Lewinsky? If the assumptions noted above are valid, then it was obvious to him at the outset that the downside of the relationship would far outweigh its benefits. Given the noted assumptions regarding Bill Clinton, behavior consistent with the Feminonsense theory would have been to avoid the relationship. The Feminonsense the-

ory therefore is completely in conflict with the observed behavior. Sam’s Theory, however, is completely consistent with the observed behavior.

The other consideration is how well each theory predicts future behavior. As it happens, both theories fail. The Feminonsense theory fails because it is inherently in conflict with normal human male behavior. Lacking coercive manipulation of male behavior, it will never correctly predict such behavior. Sam’s Theory fails for a completely different reason. It fails because normal male behavior has been systematically repressed by the arbitrary imposition of a plethora of regulations, legislation, and rules, all specifically intended to compel human male sexual behavior to conform to the Feminonsense theory. I suggest that those who are unconvinced can test my claim. First, of course, they’ll need to locate an environment in which human males have the option of behaving normally, without the influence of the aforementioned restrictions, and males whose behavior hasn’t already been repressed by those restrictions. Then they can select a test subject. In order that his behavior not be influenced by the test itself, he shouldn’t be told that he’s a test subject. After observation, which theory most successfully predicts his behavior? For such a test to be valid, the test subject must be reasonably representative of the human male population in all applicable respects. For example, eunuches and hundred year old monks might not exhibit normal male sexual behavior. If the test subject is homosexual, then it would be inappropriate to test his behavior toward females. He must be tested against other males. You get the idea.

Remember, preconceived notions don’t have any place in the scientific method. It doesn’t matter which theory is the most attractive. Objectivity is necessary. Which theory fits the observable behavior? Which theory predicts future behavior? ♂

Big Mistake

Sam Aurelius Milam III

The U.S. Constitution was supposed to be a limitation on the powers of government. Instead, it has become a limitation on the rights of the people. That has happened primarily because people have accepted two ideas.

- The only rights they have are those which can be directly construed from the U.S. Constitution. No other rights are deemed to exist.
- Since the only valid defense of rights is that they are “Constitutional”, the only place where they can be defended is in court.

The designation of the U.S. Constitution as the only acceptable source of rights has resulted in the utter destruction of other rights, besides “Constitutional rights”, which might have existed. Otherwise, people could have had any rights they wanted, just by insisting upon them. Limiting the defense of rights only to the courts has resulted in the few “Constitutional rights” being converted into mere privileges, granted by the courts. Rights should have been defended by people’s behavior, in their daily lives.

How could otherwise intelligent people make such a mistake? One reason is that they don’t have a good definition of rights. Ask someone for such a definition and he will give you a list of things that he believes to be rights. However, a list isn’t a definition. People don’t even understand that distinction. Furthermore, everyone has a different list. The result is that nobody knows what behavior ought to be regarded as a right, and we waste our liberty squabbling.

The first correction that must be made is to recognize the distinction between a right and a privilege. If someone granted it, then it isn’t a right. If someone gave permission to exercise it, then it isn’t a right. If some institution has jurisdiction over it, then it isn’t a right. A right is (in part) something that you can do or that you can refuse to do, as you chose, without asking permission, paying a fee, getting a license, submitting to a test, and so forth. A right is YOURS. You can do the thing or refuse to do it, as you chose. Rights don’t come from the Constitution, or the Bill of Rights, or a court, or an agency. If they exist, it is because you exercise them. That is the first lesson of rights. You don’t ask for them. They aren’t granted. You exercise them. Otherwise, they don’t exist. ¶

Abolish the “Family” Courts

Sam Aurelius Milam III

The “best interest of the child” isn’t the most important standard upon which to base a body of legal doctrine. Children (future adults) are ill served if their “best interest” is used as an excuse to reduce adults to a condition of servitude. If the “best interest of the child” results in the creation of a police state (which it has), then it would be better if children weren’t protected at all. Children are important, but liberty (mine, yours, and theirs) is more important. ¶

Reparations?

Sam Aurelius Milam III

Occasionally, I still hear people claim that reparations are due to the present black descendants of previous black slaves. Those claims fail on several points. First, the reparations will not be paid by previous white slave owners, but by presently living white folks, like me. However, I didn’t kidnap anybody from Africa and force them to come here to be slaves. Therefore, I don’t owe any reparations. Furthermore, the reparations will not be paid to the slaves, but to the presently existing descendants of those slaves. Those descendants weren’t kidnapped and brought here forcibly, so reparations aren’t due to them. Their claims fail on another point. Those black descendants of previous slaves claim that they’ve been harmed by what was done to their ancestors. How’s that? Where would they be if their ancestors **hadn’t** been kidnapped? Maybe they’d be starving in Ethiopia, slogging through the mud in Mozambique, or dying of AIDS in Botswana. They sure wouldn’t be in America, if they existed at all. Events that were atrocities for their ancestors have been a blessing for them. I’m sorry that slavery happened. We can all grieve for it and hope that it doesn’t happen again. Beyond that, I think they should count their blessings and get on with their lives. ¶

My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. —Abraham Lincoln in a Letter to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862

Accidental Death Statistics

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Steve, of Fremont, California. I haven't tried to verify the numbers.

A recent article in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer concerning accidental deaths caused by physicians from research of Laura Key USA Today triggered a chain of thought that resulted in the person cruising the web (not me) finding some statistics and doing a few calculations.

- Number of physicians in the US: 700,000
- Accidental deaths/year : 120,000
- Accidental deaths/physician: 0.171
- Number of gun owners in the US: 80,000,000
- Number of accidental gun deaths/year (all age groups): 1,500
- Accidental deaths/gun owner: 0.0000188

Therefore, doctors are approximately 9000 times more dangerous than gun owners. ∞

Home Improvement Ideas

A reprint from The Green Panthers, P.O. Box 31231, Cincinnati, Ohio 45231-0231, panthers@eos.net. Or visit their website — <http://www.greenpanthers.org>

With more and more homes being attacked in paramilitary raids, we offer the following suggestion on how to protect your family and property:

Doors: Replace all hollow doors with solid wood, or preferably metal ones. Dead-bolt locks are okay for stopping the average junkie looking for a TV to steal, but will probably not stop a tactical entry team. Add heavy slide latches at the top and bottom of exterior doors. The "Door Club" (made by the company that makes "The Club") will also help slow battering rams.

The old-fashioned door lock consisting of a heavy wooden beam resting in large hooks on either side of the door is still the best lock ever designed. ∞

Letter to the Editor

We attended a program for the kids last night at my daughter's elementary school. It was supposed to be sort of a cultural mini-tour of three countries: India, Ireland and Mexico. There were tables where the kids could do artwork common in the various cultures under the guidance of parents from those countries. [My daughter] really enjoyed it, but a couple of things happened which were disturbing to me.

True Story: Carjacking Foiled

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Sir Jeffrey the Studious

Returning from shopping, an elderly lady found four males in her car. She dropped her shopping bags and drew her handgun, proceeding to scream at them at the top of her voice that she knows how to use it and that she will if required: so get out of the car. The four men didn't wait around for a second invitation but got out and ran like mad, whereupon the lady proceeded to load her shopping bags into the back of the car and get into the driver's seat.


Small problem: Her key wouldn't fit the ignition. Her car was identical and parked four or five spaces farther down. She loaded her bags into her car and drove to the police station. The sergeant to whom she told the story nearly tore himself in two with laughter and pointed to the other end of the counter, where four pale white males were reporting a carjacking by a mad elderly white woman; no charges were filed. ∞

The first thing [my daughter] wanted to do was to make designs on the concrete outside the building with chalk. This activity is associated with a harvest celebration in India. The principal (she's not from India) who was outside watching the kids kept repeating over and over again, "Just designs, no words." Finally my curiosity got the best of me, and I asked why the kids couldn't write something if they wanted to. Her reply, "They might write something they shouldn't," shocked me speechless, so I never did find out what sort of banned material the kids were likely to produce with their parents and principal looking on.

Later we were inside when a cop came roaring up the sidewalk to the main entrance on his motorcycle. He stood just inside the door for a few minutes, then left the some way. This seemed like a very unlikely place for any serious criminal activity to be going on, so what purpose could such a dramatic appearance serve? Could it be to make kids accustomed to/tolerant of bazaar behavior on the part of cops? Am I paranoid? —Steve; Fremont, California

You're not paranoid. The schools are one of the main sources of propaganda and brainwashing for the police state.

The school mentioned above is Mission San Jose Elementary, 43545 Bryant Street, Fremont, CA 94539. The principal is Barbara Lowe. I suggest that everybody write her a letter. —editor



Nation in Distress

If a kid's old enough to earn
his own money, then he's
old enough to decide for
himself how to spend it
—
even on cigarettes.

END THE PROHIBITION.



Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What's a pedophile?

—They Arrested Daddy

Dear They Arrested Daddy

Somebody who likes to work with feet.

Acknowledgments

• My thanks to Sir Donald the Elusive and Sir John the Generous, <http://www.jwebster.com/>, and for their contributions.

• My thanks to [The Affiliate](http://www.the-grand-barn.com/), <http://www.the-grand-barn.com/>, of Vankleek Hill, Ontario for regularly printing reviews of the *Frontiersman*.

—editor

Men Can Be Proud Because...

Source Unknown — forwarded by Warren, of Pocatello, Idaho

- Underwear is \$10 a three pack.
- If you are 34 and single, nobody notices.
- Everything on our faces stays the same color.
- Three pairs of shoes are more than enough.
- We don't have to clean the house if the gas meter reader is coming.
- Car mechanics tell us the truth.
- We can sit quietly and watch a game with a friend for hours without worrying, or thinking, "Is he mad at me?"
- Same work — more pay.
- Gray hair and wrinkles only add character.
- We can drop by and see a friend without having to bring a little gift.

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 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 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