

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This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date.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

September 2008

---

## From Everlasting to Everlasting

Sam Aurelius Milam III

In response to my article [Reality Control](#), in the July issue of this newsletter, Sir Donald the Elusive sent to me two newspaper clippings. One clipping was from the *Wall Street Journal* for July 3, 2008. The other was from the *San Jose Mercury News* for July 4, 2008.

The clipping from the *Wall Street Journal* presented a book review, *Bookshelf*, by Marc Leepson. The book that was reviewed was *The Fourth of July and the Founding of America*, by Peter de Bolla.

The title of the book is a bad start. America wasn't founded on the fourth of July. America wasn't founded on any date. America grew into existence over the years as people came to this continent and they and their descendants built better lives for themselves here. The unrecognized truth that's denied by the title of the book is that there's a difference between America and the United States of America. The United States of America is a political entity, a government. America is a place, an idea, a culture, a body of beliefs, and so forth. The United States of America, the present one, has been here for about 219 years. America has been here for something like 500 years, give or take a few decades according to when you think its identity began to emerge. Whatever the exact numbers are, it's a dismal error to confuse America with the United States of America. I'm an American. I'm not a U.S. citizen. America is my homeland. The United States of America, the government, is my enemy.

As the book was presented in the review, it wasn't of much interest to me except to the extent that it appears to be a compilation of some of the historical errors and misconceptions that are held by most of the people in this country.

In his review, Mark Leepson placed himself among those who are in error. Near the beginning of his review, he stated, "Adams was speaking about the red-letter day when the Continental Congress voted to declare America's independence from Britain. That memorable event — when the United States of America was born — occurred on July 2, 1776..." So, he attempted to correctly note the date but neglected to mention that it wasn't **this** United States of America that was born then. It wasn't the United States of America that existed prior to this one. It was the United States of America that existed before that one, the one that issued the *Declaration of Independence*. That United States of America wasn't even a nation. It was a union of independent nations. Notice, in the *Declaration of Independence*, the careful use of plural and singular descriptions of the **colonies** as independent **states** versus the **state** of Great Britain.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

—from the *Declaration of Independence*

→

---

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire. For PayPal payments, use [editor@frontiersman.my3website.net](mailto:editor@frontiersman.my3website.net).

The other clipping, from the *San Jose Mercury News*, presented the article *Nation's birthday a self-evident truth* by George F. Will. The article presented much the same analysis of *The Fourth of July and the Founding of America*, by Peter de Bolla, as did the review in the *Wall Street Journal*. However, at least the *Wall Street Journal* review referred correctly to the Continental Congress. George F. Will wasn't that astute. In his article in the *San Jose Mercury News*, he erroneously referred to the Continental Congress as the Congress.

The Declaration of Independence was not signed July 4, 1776, by the 56 persons whose signatures would eventually adorn it. Perhaps no one signed it that day; the evidence is murky. Still, uncountable millions believe otherwise because they have seen John Trumbull's painting, in the U.S. Capitol's rotunda, depicting Thomas Jefferson, at the center of six colleagues, holding "his" declaration on July 4, as though for signing.

What Congress actually did that day was agree to print the declaration authorized two days earlier....

The Congress and the Continental Congress are distinctly different bodies. The Congress didn't do anything at all on that day. It didn't even exist until early in 1789. To pretend that it was the Congress instead of the Continental Congress that voted on the *Declaration of Independence* is an error with Orwellian implications. By failing to make the distinction between the two different bodies, the error perpetrates the impression that the Congress has been here all along, that the legislative body that exists today

has always existed, that whatever's true now was true from everlasting to everlasting. George F. Will moved even further than that into an Orwellian mindset. At the end of his article, he wrote this closing paragraph.

What de Bolla calls "the intricate history of the nation's founding document" does not and should not inhibit Americans from asserting the truth that their nation originated on July 4, 1776. They hold that to be a *self-evident* truth, which means they have decided to believe it, thereby making it a self-validating tradition. So there.

Orwell said it as well as that, or better.

... And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed — if all records told the same tale — then the lie passed into history and became truth.... "Reality control," they called it; In Newspeak, "doublethink."

—from *1984*, Section One, Chapter 3  
by George Orwell

So, we're expected to believe that, on July 4, 1776, this United States of America, the one that exists today, was created by an Act of its own Congress, which didn't exist until after the United States of America was created. The U.S. Constitution went into force on March 4, 1789. Yet, by an act of doublethink, the Congress already existed prior to its own authorization by the U.S. Constitution, and created the nation of which it was a part.

Reality control is what it's called. In Newspeak, they call it doublethink. ☹

## Choir Boy

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Don G.

One fine morning, a priest took a walk in the forest. Beside a small stream, he noticed a sad looking little frog sitting on a toadstool.

"What's wrong with you?" asked the priest.

"The problem," said the frog, "is that I wasn't always a frog."

"Really!" said the priest. "Please explain."

"Once upon a time," said the frog, "I was an 11 year old choir boy. I was walking through this forest when I was confronted by the wicked witch of the forest. With a flash of her wand, she turned me into a frog."

"Is there a way" asked the priest, who was a

very sympathetic man, "of reversing the spell?"

"Yes," said the frog. "If a kind person would pick me up, take me home, give me food and warmth, and a good nights sleep, then I would wake up as a boy once again."

The priest picked up the frog, took it home, gave it food, and placed it by the fire. At bedtime, the priest put the frog on the pillow beside him. When the priest awoke, he saw the 11 year old choir boy beside him in his bed.

"And that, Your Honor," said the lawyer, "is the case for the Defense." ∞

---

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire.  
For PayPal payments, use editor@frontiersman.my3website.net.

## Letters to the Editor

Sam:

RE latest newsletter online: “However, the slow accumulation of such lies, carefully orchestrated for the sake of political expediency, is a plausible notion.” [[Train of Thought](#), August 2008, pages 1-2 —editor] Any piece of nonsense if repeated enough becomes orthodoxy. This is especially true of feminism. Look at how such nonsense as “one in four women are raped” and “women make 76 cents on the dollar to men”, by being repeated endlessly, have become not simply widely accepted among the public, but also the basis for public policy. It might be worth an article examining the very Orwellian nature of feminism.

—Joseph; of Northridge, California

*I've written a lot about the arrogance, the hypocrisy, the insensitivity, the repressiveness, and so forth, of the feminists. I don't think that I ever specifically mentioned them as being Orwellian. However, in at least one passage in 1984, Orwell did specifically mention women as being more susceptible than men to at least one aspect of Ingsoc.*

The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it. All marriages between Party members had to be approved by a committee appointed for the purpose, and—though the principle was never clearly stated—permission was always refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another. The only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party. Sexual intercourse was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema. This again was never put into plain words, but in an indirect way it was rubbed into every Party member from childhood onwards. There were even organizations such as the Junior Anti-Sex League which advocated complete celibacy for both sexes. All children were to be begotten by artificial insemination (*artsem*, it was called in Newspeak) and brought up in public institutions. This, Winston was aware, was not meant altogether seriously, but somehow it fitted in with the general ideology of the Party. The Party was

trying to kill the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it. He did not know why this was so, but it seemed natural that it should be so. And so far as the women were concerned, the Party's efforts were largely successful.

—from 1984, Section One, Chapter VI  
by George Orwell

*I haven't taken any surveys but it's my impression that women have been the main force behind the anti-sex movement in this country. However, they haven't been trying to eliminate sexual behavior, but to control it. They haven't reasoned it out logically. It's a consequence of their genetic mandate to control men ([From the Nesting Urge to the Wander Lust](#), July 2007, page 4). Sexual allure, pregnancies, and children have always been among their more effective weapons for that purpose. “If you really cared about the children then you'd blah blah blah!” and so forth. That's why women are so adamant about being in control of everything that has anything to do with sex, reproduction, or children.*

*Whenever women get into politics, their mandate will inevitably result in a matriarchal police state. In recent decades, they've been accomplishing exactly that. They've used every conceivable twist on sexuality to mobilize government as their favorite weapon of intervention and control in all of our lives. However, by their success, they've shot themselves in the foot. They've traded whatever liberty they or we might otherwise have had in exchange for the security that they perceive to result from the control of men by government. However, security is merely the temporary condition that governments claim to provide while they're actually replacing liberty with servitude. The women haven't yet realized their error. By the time that they do, it will be too late. Indeed, it's probably already too late. As women understand it, there isn't any security anywhere, ever, nor ever will be.*  
—editor


*I received a message from Carl Watner, of The Voluntaryist, in response to my article [Train of Thought](#), August 2008, pages 1-2. He notified me that, in his issue for the fourth quarter of 2002, Number 115, he published History Assumed!, an article that deals with the falsification of history. It's a good article, but too long to reprint here. However, it's available on the internet at this address.*

<http://voluntaryist.com/articles/115c.php>

—editor

---

Please use the enclosed envelope to send a contribution. I prefer cash. For checks or money orders, please inquire.  
For PayPal payments, use editor@frontiersman.my3website.net.



Nation in Distress

If the government taps your phone, then look at the bright side. At least your opinion will be heard.

—June 7, 1979

[Milam's Notes](#)

---

### Acknowledgments

My thanks to the following: SantaClara Bob; Lady Jan the Voluptuous; my mother; Dewey and Betty; and Sir Donald the Elusive. —editor

### Things About Cops

Original Source Unknown. Forwarded by Don G.

- Bullets work on veteran cops. They also work on weight lifters, martial arts experts, department marksmen, vice cops, SWAT jocks, and any others who consider themselves to be invincible.
- When a civilian sees a blue light approaching at a high rate of speed, he will always pull into the lane that the cop needs to use. ∞

---

### Frontiersman

**Subscriptions and Back Issues** — Printed copies of this newsletter, either subscriptions or back issues, are available by application only.

**Cancellations** — If you don't want to keep receiving this newsletter, then print REFUSED, RETURN TO SENDER above your name and address and return the newsletter. When I receive it, I'll terminate your subscription. You can also cancel by letter, e-mail, carrier pigeon, or any other method that gets the message to me.

**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-

### Court Quotes

From *Humor in the Court* and *More Humor in the Court*, by Mary Louise Gilman, editor of the *National Shorthand Reporter*. Forwarded by Don G.

- Q Did you ever stay all night with this man in New York?  
A I refuse to answer that question.  
Q Did you ever stay all night with this man in Chicago?  
A I refuse to answer that question.  
Q Did you ever stay all night with this man in Miami?  
A No.  
Q Are you qualified to give a urine sample?  
A Yes. I have been since early childhood. ∞

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, then I prefer cash, prepaid telephone cards, or U.S. postage stamps. For checks or money orders please inquire. For PayPal payments, use [editor@frontiersman.my3website.net](mailto:editor@frontiersman.my3website.net). The continued existence of the newsletter will depend, in part, on such contributions. I don't accept anything that requires me to provide ID to receive it. In case anybody's 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 [editor@frontiersman.my3website.net](mailto:editor@frontiersman.my3website.net).