

Frontiersman

March 1996

Home Sweet Barracks

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

—Third Amendment, U.S. Constitution

The Third Amendment, like all of the first ten, is advertised as a limitation on the powers of government. Like most of the first ten, it isn't as advertised. The fact is that it won't prevent soldiers from being quartered in the houses of civilians. In time of peace, all that's required to quarter soldiers in someone's house is the consent of the owner. This might not at first seem like a loop-hole, but it is. Consider that someone may be the equitable owner of his house, but not the legal owner. The consent of the mortgage company might be sufficient. There may be several joint owners. The consent of any one of them, even over the objections of the others, might be sufficient. Consider married people. Do wives necessarily agree with their husbands on political matters? What if the wife consents to the quartering of soldiers, but the husband doesn't? The *consent of the owner* provision is a huge loop-hole.

The Third Amendment protects only people who live in houses. What about someone who owns and lives in a recreational vehicle or a mobile home? In recent years, courts have ruled that recreational vehicles lack the same Third Amendment protections as houses but fall instead under the obligations associated with motor vehicles. What about someone who owns a condominium or an igloo?

Even if a man is the sole owner of his house, and it is indeed a house, "voluntary" is a very slippery con-

The Measure of Evil

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

So far, over 500,000 children have died in Iraq as a direct result of the UN oil embargo, the declared purpose of which is to remove Saddam from power (The News Hour with Jim Lehrer, February 7, 1996). The UN reviews the situation regularly and the deaths of the children are no secret. I can therefore presume that the UN has knowingly killed those children for an agenda that is purely political. Saddam didn't kill that many children when he invaded Kuwait. By that measure, the UN is far more evil than Saddam.

cept. If the choices are arranged properly, a person might "voluntarily" do a lot of things that he doesn't want

to do. I "voluntarily" joined the Naval Reserve to avoid getting drafted. People will "voluntarily" jump from the top of a tall building, if the building happens to be burning under them. This may seem like a facetious or snide position. However, consider the situation in the light of the coercive power of government. Consider the many circumstances which can profoundly affect a home owner's choices, and over which the government usually has a lot of control. Consider that changes in zoning laws can reduce the "value" of property, and restrict the options when the owner decides how to use it. Consider how a home owner might be affected by the selective enforcement of building codes and inspection requirements. Consider the withholding of building permits. Can a home owner defend himself against eminent domain proceedings and the condemnation of his property? Then there's property tax assessment. Those people work for the government, and it can be dangerous to annoy them. These and other methods might be used in time of peace to coerce "voluntary" consent from a home owner.

In time of war, the method of using a house to quarter soldiers is more direct. It need only be prescribed by law. Under authority delegated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, the Congress can pass any law that it considers necessary and proper to execute any other power delegated in the Constitution, including quartering soldiers in a house. The fact is that the Third Amendment can be accurately re-stated, with no change in meaning, as

"Soldiers may be quartered in any house, in time of peace, with the consent of an owner, and in time of war, in whatever manner may be prescribed by law."

There's only one way to keep soldiers out of our homes. We (the people) must be more powerful than the soldiers.

Counter-Attack in the War on Drugs

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

The U.S. drug Gestapo routinely uses dogs to sniff luggage, searching for drugs. Here's a suggestion. When you prepare for a trip, make sure there's nothing incriminating in your luggage and your ID is current, then rub your luggage with marijuana. When the dogs respond to it, the Gestapo will search it and find nothing. When they ask you about it, shrug your shoulders and look puzzled. They'll have to let you go. If enough people do this, we can make the drug dogs utterly worthless.

Book Review

by Don Cormier

Although nearly a decade old, this book, obtainable in libraries

The Paleolithic Prescription: A Program of Diet & Exercise and a Design for Living
by S. Boyd Eaton, MD; Marjorie Shostak; and Melvin Konner, MD, PhD.
Harper & Row, Publishers, New York; 1988

and in used book stores, is a "must read" for those people interested in improving personal health and community life.

The basic ideas of the book are implied in it's dedication:

"To the memory of our ancestors, whose genes we bear, and to the small number of remaining hunters and gatherers who have taught us so much about ourselves."

The authors claim that human bodies and communities evolved in a certain environment, that we were well suited to that environment, but that we have changed the environment so that now we are suffering from maladaptations. To improve our personal health and community life, we need to adopt some of the life-style elements which were prevalent about 10,000 years ago, in the Paleolithic age. They claim that we can get a good idea of what the Paleolithic life-style was like by studying the habits of modern hunter-gatherers.

The book's main prescriptive points can be summarized without too much difficulty.

With some exceptions, the Paleolithic diet was high in fiber content, high in vitamin content, moderate in protein content, and low in fat. Modern experiments and surveys suggest that people who follow a similar diet have a reduced risk of developing cancer or heart disease. Therefore, to reduce the risk of getting cancer or heart disease, a person would be prudent to adopt a high-fiber, high vitamin, low fat diet.

As far as paleontologists and archaeologists can tell, tobacco and alcohol were late introductions. The health hazards associated with the use of both substances are well documented so, for perfect Paleolithic health, they should be eschewed.

The Paleolithic lifestyle included a lot of running, jumping, climbing, and heavy lifting. Think about hunting a large beast, such as a mammoth, and carting it back to the cave! Therefore, to use our bodies as they were designed by evolution, we should include aerobic exercise in our daily routine, and possibly weight-lifting as well.

Studies cited in the book suggest that a high state of physical fitness, as defined by body-fat content, measures of heart rate, and the speed of muscle tissue recovery after use, is associated with resistance to disorders of "old age". Such exercise strengthens bones and tendons, and makes people less prone to be damaged by accidents.

It is believed that modern hunter gatherer societies which function at a technological level similar to that of Paleolithic societies exhibit social patterns which resemble those of Paleolithic times. The book's authors admit that there are great variations in the social arrangements of

modern hunter-gatherer societies, but that certain patterns are common to most if not all such societies.

In many modern hunter-gatherer societies, babies are breast-fed, and kept close to their mothers' bodies for a long time. They are indulged. The common child raising style for infants and toddlers can be described as permissive. When the child reaches the age of six or seven, stricter discipline is gradually introduced. By the time the child reaches puberty, discipline is often quite strict.

Contemporary American methodology is almost the opposite of this pattern. The implication is that we should change the way we treat our children, to avoid many of the psychological and behavior problems which are becoming so disturbing.

In most contemporary hunter-gatherer societies, learning occurs more through play and direct observation of adults than through intentional instruction. The child's "project" is to learn to survive, and the child is immersed in the survival situation from the moment of birth. The implication is that our teaching methods, though perhaps needed for imparting detailed abstract information, go against the way we most easily learn.

The book is very good, but it has two significant flaws.

The first is that the authors present little proof for the idea that human bodies have not evolved much in 10,000 years. It is true that the current scientific consensus supports this position, but better documentation within the text would have been an improvement. In other aspects the book is highly documented, with profuse background information on the theory of evolution, modern hunter gatherer societies, human physiology, and disease patterns.

The second flaw is that the Paleolithic prescription is no easy-to-swallow pill. No matter how sensible it would be to make the recommended changes, laziness and greed stand in the way of making them. We may enjoy watching National Geographic specials about exotic tribes, but few of us really want to give up our couch potato life-styles. ∞

Long ago, an author whose name I no longer remember said that there would not be, anywhere in the universe, beings more intelligent than we are. The reason, he said, is that any intelligent species will eventually attain the level of intelligence necessary to control its environment. After that, he reasoned, the environmental influences that encouraged further increases in intelligence will no longer operate upon that species. However, intelligence doesn't equal wisdom. Even though our species might not evolve any further, I see nothing to prevent it from degenerating.

—editor

Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

I'm 45 years old, but my wife says that I have the body of a 30 year old man. What do you think about that?

—Health Nut

Dear Health Nut

If the cops find out, you're in big trouble.

Dark Reflections

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

In the October 1995 issue of this newsletter, I commented that man is the only animal species in which the females don't automatically know their proper place and function. A female reader commented, in response, that man is the only animal species in which rape occurs. This turns out to be incorrect. Unwelcome sexual aggression, including rape, has been observed among several animal species. I found one article¹ which points to documentation of such behavior in dogs, elephant seals, flies, red deer, and a particular species of solitary bees. I've heard undocumented reports of rape among dolphins, sea otters, and some primates. I have personally observed it being attempted in my own yard by drakes. In general, I've noticed that of all the bizarre behavior of the animals of the world, the most bizarre is that which deals with reproduction. For example, I saw recently on a PBS documentary a species of salamander in which the male bites the neck of a disinterested female, injecting an aphrodisiac into her. After that, she's his willing slave until he's done with her. Compared to the diversity of the strange reproductive behavior that is widely observed among animal species, the forced impregnation of a reluctant female (even a human female) doesn't seem to be a very remarkable reproductive technique. While I will concede that we are civilized, I will also insist that we are civilized **animals**. It's likely that we have been animals longer than we have been civilized and that the civilization is somewhat superficial. Indeed, if we are to believe the cries of the various groups of reformers, human biology tends rather strongly in favor of rape. Why else would it be (allegedly) so likely in spite of the virtually universal condemnation and severe penalties? People who like to preach about politically correct human sexual behavior should probably keep our origins more firmly in mind.

Some of our behavior does seem to support the notion that rape is a part of our biological heritage. Why is it, for example, that supposedly civilized men are so likely to rape women? If it is as likely as we are told, then a very high percentage of men must be potential rapists. If the percentage is really that high, then why do we regard the behavior as

¹ *Stop It, Ya Big Baboon!*, by Natalie Angier, New York Times, October 15, 1995, p E2.

Who Ya Gonna Call? Bug Busters!

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

I've heard that the government can monitor essentially all phone calls with software that responds to key-words, alerting surveillance recorders or personnel to conversations that might be of interest to the government. Here's a suggestion from *Dreamland* (KSFO,

abnormal? Maybe rape is natural sexual behavior for human males, and has been repressed by "civilization". If this is true, then we can't afford to ignore it; the consequences of repressed behavior can often be far more undesirable than the original behavior. Perhaps this is a clue to the reason for some of the more damaging behavior that occurs in our species.

Eyes of the Beholder

Mirror, mirror, on the wall
Showing nothing, hiding all.
Mirror, mirror, dare I see,
More than you reflect of me?
—Sam Aurelius Milam III

I doubt that sexual aggression by men is entirely the result of male attitudes. Why, for example, do women have such admiration for virile men who are physically superior to them in speed, size, and strength, that is, men who could easily rape them? For that matter, why do these physical differences between the sexes exist at all? Has our species been that strongly shaped by the genes of male ancestors who were big enough to be capable of rape and female ancestors who were unable to prevent it? Why do women try so hard to be as physically alluring as possible, even around men who are not their mates? Is the resulting attention **really** unwanted? Why do they insist on forcing their way into close proximity with men, pretending that the men will "ignore" their sexuality, and then flaunting it as obviously as possible? If they play with fire, are they **trying** to get burned?

There's more here than meets the eye. If sexual aggression by men and its provocation by women are as much a part of us as these questions might suggest, then our present legislative attempts to control human sexual behavior won't work. I'm not even convinced that sexual aggression by men is a problem. The reformers haven't yet proven the validity of their assumptions about "politically correct" sexual behavior in our species. They haven't even acknowledged that their personal opinions **are** assumptions. Instead, they treat these assumptions as though they are the Inspired Word of God and then enact them into repressive legislation.

One thing is certain — whatever strategy we may eventually choose to address the so-called "problem" of sexual aggression by men, we're not yet ready to choose it. The fact is that we all need to take a much closer, longer, and more honest look at ourselves than we have ever done before. It's likely that most people will refuse to do it. If so, then **that** is the **real** problem. ♥

560 AM, Sunday, February 25, 1996). Start randomly sprinkling all of your calls with such words as bomb, kilo, or anything else that will trigger the software. I expect that something like "naked 8 year-old girls" ought to get their attention. If every call contains their key-words, then their method of surveillance will be worthless. 🦋

Frontiersman
435 South White Road
San Jose, California 95127
Produced at Mere Keep




Nation in Distress

Ladies — Take note of The Law of the Wildwood:

If you don't like
dealing with the
Big Bad Wolf,
then...



...DON'T
GO INTO THE
WOODS!



In Germany they came first for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me, and by that time no one was left to speak up. —Attributed to Martin Niemoeller (1892-1984)

The Nineties Niemoeller

by Dante DeAmicis

First they came for those under 18 years old, but since I was older than dirt, I did nothing.

Then they came for those suspected of illegal drug use but since I only abuse myself in legal ways, I did nothing.

Then they came for more and more firearms from more and more people, but since I never understood how to use those things anyway, I did nothing.

Then they came for the self-employed, but since I work for a big corporation, I did nothing.

Then they came for those whose yards didn't look like those in Sunset Magazine, but because everyone has an obligation to uphold my perceived property value, I did nothing.

Then they came for foreigners in this country and I said "It's about time. I have enough trouble fighting people born here", so I did nothing.

First they came for those under 18 years

Then they came (no pun intended) for the prostitutes, but if I stood up for prostitutes then people would say, "Oh, another guy who has to pay for it" so I did nothing (except go for the long term package deal like everyone else).

Then they invented something called "controlled growth" which turned out to mean more subsidized office buildings and fewer homes, but a shortage of housing will increase my home's value, so I did nothing.

Then they found ways to take a bigger chunk of my pay, but since I got my hand in the till like everybody else, I did nothing (except whine about it).

Then, I was told, they came numerous times for things called rights, due process, and all kinds of other boring legal stuff, so I changed the TV channel and did nothing.

Now, everything is just one big impoverished police state so it doesn't matter if they come for me or not. ∞

The one must be sacrificed for the good of the many, until the many are all sacrificed, one by one.

—from *Joyleg*, by Ward Moore and Avram Davidson

If you don't want to keep receiving this newsletter, print 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.

Back issues or extra copies of this newsletter are available upon request.

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.

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.

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 postage stamps. I don't accept checks, money orders, 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's curious, I also accept gold, silver, platinum, etc. I'm sure you get the idea. —Sam Aurelius Milam III, editor