

Envelope-to: owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com
To: owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com
Subject: Shopper Classified Add Response
From: barblee@negeorgiashopper.com
Reply-to: barblee@negeorgiashopper.com
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 2010 11:25:51 -0600

Thank you for the entry to the
Shopper Classifieds. Your entry in misc looks like:

Ad No.: 10156 - Subject: NEAR Spacecraft - Posted on: 03/02/10
Reply to: Sam Aurelius Milam iii at <a href="mailto:
owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com">owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehos
t.com

I'm offering the NEAR Spacecraft for sale as is and in its present location. The details of
my acquisition of ownership and of my offer to sell are available by following the link.

Link <A

href="http://moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com/NEAR_Spacecraft/NEAR_Spacecraft.
[html](http://moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com/NEAR_Spacecraft/NEAR_Spacecraft.html)">NEAR Spacecraft

The Shopper Webmaster.

Envelope-to: owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com
To: Sam <owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>
Subject: Classified Add Removed
From: barblee@negeorgiashopper.com
Reply-to: barblee@negeorgiashopper.com
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 2010 18:54:09 -0600

Your Classified entry in misc on the NEGeorgiaShopper site has been removed.
Please feel free to visit our site again at <http://www.negeorgiashopper.com/>

Thank you

Barbara Lee.

To: barblee@negeorgiashopper.com
From: Sam Aurelius Milam III <owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>
Subject: Re: Classified Add Removed
Cc:
Bcc:

To Barbara Lee, Greetings

At 6:54 PM -0600 3/2/10, barblee@negeorgiashopper.com wrote:

Your Classified entry in misc on the NEGeorgiaShopper site has been removed.
Please feel free to visit our site again at <http://www.negeorgiashopper.com/>

Why did you remove the ad? You could at least have the courtesy of giving me an explanation instead of arbitrarily removing the ad. Did you even bother to look at the documentation of my acquisition of ownership? I doubt it. Typical bureaucrat. You must be stuck in the dark ages. I own the spacecraft. I can offer it for sale if I want to do so.

Thank you

Typically smug.

Sincerely,
Sam Aurelius Milam III

Envelope-to: owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com
From: "Tom Lee" <tomleel@negeorgiashopper.com>
To: <owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>
Subject: Shopper ad removed
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 2010 10:13:41 -0500
Thread-Index: Acq65BujAkDZDXQWS3al6Li3WzVc/Q==

We reserve the right to remove any ad for any reason.

Business ads that aren't paid are removed. Get rich quick schemes, and anything that we deem may be controversial or not in the best interest of The Shopper or its readers will also be removed. We do not have the time to investigate every ad placed. We pay to produce, print and distribute this publication and it is our right to remove an ad from our website for any reason.

If you are interested in paying for our service we take a longer look and still have the right to refuse.

Please do not take this personally in any way. We are trying to sell advertising. We try not to make waves in our community.

I hope this answers any questions that you may have.

Thank you for your time,
Tom Lee
The Shopper

To: "Tom Lee" <tomleel@negeorgiashopper.com>
From: Sam Aurelius Milam III <owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>
Subject: Re: Shopper ad removed
Cc:
Bcc:

To Tom Lee, Greetings

Thank you for your reply to my message. I've been considering your statements as they apply to my NEAR Spacecraft advertisement. I can resolve each and every one of your concerns.

The advertisement of my NEAR Spacecraft isn't a business advertisement. I own the one spacecraft that I want to sell, as an individual.

The fact that selling my NEAR Spacecraft will make me rich doesn't necessarily mean that it's a "get rich quick scheme". If your position is that the advertisement is, indeed, a "get rich quick scheme" then integrity demands that you disclose to me the definition by which you have made that judgment. Lacking any such definition, you're prohibiting my advertisement based on nothing more than your opinion, your whims, and mere speculation.

By the way, the correct form of the statement is "get rich quickly scheme", not "get rich quick scheme". Furthermore, what's wrong with the idea of getting rich quickly? Why would you object to such a thing? Is getting rich in a short period of time, in and of itself, a bad thing?

I didn't place the advertisement in your printed publication. I placed it on your website. For that reason, printing and distribution costs are irrelevant.

Why would the advertisement of my NEAR Spacecraft on your website be other than in your best interest? I expect that any publicity that might result from the advertisement will do you much more good than harm, especially if I actually manage to sell the thing. Imagine the increase in your fame, riding on my coattails.

Of course you don't have the time to investigate every advertisement. However, integrity demands that you take the time to investigate any advertisement that you intend to cancel. Otherwise, you will have made a critical judgment against an individual, and penalized him, without any real evidence that he actually did anything wrong.

I made it very easy for you to investigate my NEAR Spacecraft advertisement. The link to my NEAR Spacecraft Introductory Document was right there in the advertisement. All that you had to do was to click the button. Here's the link again. For the sake of your own integrity, I suggest that you take the time to investigate the situation.

<http://moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com/NEAR_Spacecraft/NEAR_Spacecraft.html>

I can understand your desire to avoid antagonizing your various commercial sponsors. I suggest that you should also pay some attention to your treatment of the individual

human beings who, hard pressed for cash, try to sell their precious odds and ends using your classified advertisements service. Courtesy is always a good business practice and, after all, without those of us who place advertisements, those commercial sponsors that you hold in such high regard wouldn't have any reason to advertise in your publication. Check your priorities. We are just as important to you as are the commercial sponsors about which you are so concerned.

Since I have now adequately addressed each of your concerns regarding my NEAR Spacecraft advertisement, I request that you reverse your decision and publish my advertisement.

Sincerely,
Sam Aurelius Milam III

Envelope-to: owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com
From: "Tom Lee" <tomleel@negeorgiashopper.com>
To: "Sam Aurelius Milam III" <owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>
Subject: RE: Shopper ad removed
Date: Thu, 4 Mar 2010 14:14:58 -0500
thread-index: Acq7vOocGebaiOZtTv2ZOouK1OLROAADB/Yg

The cost to run your ad will be \$1,000,000. Up front and in cash. We charge the same rate to anyone selling unicorns or pixie dust.

You are trying to take advantage of anyone dumb enough to fall for your scheme and The Shopper will not be a part of it. Calling us names will not change our mind. Our decision is final.

My family owns The Shopper and we decide the content of the advertising in the printed version and the website.

Try the tabloids or Craigslist for you future advertising needs.

Thank you for the English lesson.

Thank you for your time,
Tom Lee

-----Original Message-----

From: Sam Aurelius Milam III
[<mailto:owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 12:22 PM
To: Tom Lee
Subject: Re: Shopper ad removed

To Tom Lee, Greetings

Thank you for your reply to my message. I've been considering your statements as they apply to my NEAR Spacecraft advertisement. I can resolve each and every one of your concerns.

The advertisement of my NEAR Spacecraft isn't a business advertisement. I own the one spacecraft that I want to sell, as an individual.

The fact that selling my NEAR Spacecraft will make me rich doesn't necessarily mean that it's a "get rich quick scheme". If your position is that the advertisement is, indeed, a "get rich quick scheme" then integrity demands that you disclose to me the definition by which you have made that judgment. Lacking any such definition, you're prohibiting my advertisement based on nothing more than your opinion, your whims, and mere speculation.

By the way, the correct form of the statement is "get rich quickly scheme", not "get rich quick scheme". Furthermore, what's wrong with

the idea of getting rich quickly? Why would you object to such a thing? Is getting rich in a short period of time, in and of itself, a bad thing?

I didn't place the advertisement in your printed publication. I placed it on your website. For that reason, printing and distribution costs are irrelevant.

Why would the advertisement of my NEAR Spacecraft on your website be other than in your best interest? I expect that any publicity that might result from the advertisement will do you much more good than harm, especially if I actually manage to sell the thing. Imagine the increase in your fame, riding on my coattails.

Of course you don't have the time to investigate every advertisement. However, integrity demands that you take the time to investigate any advertisement that you intend to cancel. Otherwise, you will have made a critical judgment against an individual, and penalized him, without any real evidence that he actually did anything wrong.

I made it very easy for you to investigate my NEAR Spacecraft advertisement. The link to my NEAR Spacecraft Introductory Document was right there in the advertisement. All that you had to do was to click the button. Here's the link again. For the sake of your own integrity, I suggest that you take the time to investigate the situation.

http://moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com/NEAR_Spacecraft/NEAR_Spacecraft.html

I can understand your desire to avoid antagonizing your various commercial sponsors. I suggest that you should also pay some attention to your treatment of the individual human beings who, hard pressed for cash, try to sell their precious odds and ends using your classified advertisements service. Courtesy is always a good business practice and, after all, without those of us who place advertisements, those commercial sponsors that you hold in such high regard wouldn't have any reason to advertise in your publication. Check your priorities. We are just as important to you as are the commercial sponsors about which you are so concerned.

Since I have now adequately addressed each of your concerns regarding my NEAR Spacecraft advertisement, I request that you reverse your decision and publish my advertisement.

Sincerely,
Sam Aurelius Milam III

To: "Tom Lee" <tomleel@negeorgiashopper.com>
From: Sam Aurelius Milam III <owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>
Subject: Space Law, Salvage Rights, and Historical Artifacts
Cc:
Bcc:

To Tom Lee, Greetings

Thank you for your prompt reply. A few of your comments deserve honest answers.

At 2:14 PM -0500 3/4/10, Tom Lee wrote:

The cost to run your ad will be \$1,000,000. Up front and in cash. We charge the same rate to anyone selling unicorns or pixie dust.

I appreciate your sense of humor. In response to a previous advertisement on another service, one man wanted to charge me docking fees on Eros. Another man offered to trade his international space station for my spacecraft. You're not the first person who has tended to make fun of my offer.

You are trying to take advantage of anyone dumb enough to fall for your scheme and The Shopper will not be a part of it. Calling us names will not change our mind. Our decision is final.

Space law is in its infancy. However, the customs of salvage are well established by centuries of precedent. For example, things that are found adrift on the high seas can be claimed by right of salvage. My claim of the NEAR Spacecraft follows in that tradition.

There's a lot of abandoned stuff in the Solar System. In a few years, corporations will be capable of retrieving it. Space law will grow to accommodate that capability. Whatever the provisions of that space law might turn out to be, my ownership of the NEAR Spacecraft will be protected by grandfather considerations.

A dumb person wouldn't be able to afford my asking price. However, there's a sound commercial reason why a corporation might want to buy my NEAR spacecraft. That reason is in addition to just owning the thing. That is, any such purchase would tend to further validate my claims process, particularly with regard to space law. That would enhance the usefulness of the claims process for the corporation. What if the corporation then claimed the Lunar Lander? It's also abandoned, although its legal situation is more complicated. That is, the Lunar Lander is within a US jurisdiction. Note that the NEAR Spacecraft lacks any such encumbrance. It has been abandoned on ground where no national flag has ever been planted. Whatever the case, consider the prices that collectors pay for things. Any party that acquired ownership of any such abandoned historical artifacts could make a fortune. Corporations can afford to think in the long term. In spite of your lack of vision, this is a serious business. I predict that, in a few years, you'll be begging for advertisements such as mine.

I'll ask you one more time to publish my advertisement. If you refuse again, then you will have become a waste of my valuable time. In either case, it's necessary for the record that I document our discussion. You'll be able to find that documentation, when I get around to uploading it, with my other NEAR Spacecraft records. Here, one last time,

is the address.

<http://moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com/NEAR_Spacecraft/NEAR_Spacecraft.html>

Sincerely,
Sam Aurelius Milam III

Envelope-to: owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com
From: "Tom Lee" <tomleel@negeorgiashopper.com>
To: "Sam Aurelius Milam III" <owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>
Subject: RE: Space Law, Salvage Rights, and Historical Artifacts
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 2010 13:02:54 -0500
thread-index: Acq8iXhmg8D8uq3jRqiAZIl3MTvmfQAAwSYg

Thank you for your time. You have the rates that we charge for items such as yours. I will keep your letter on file as well. I will not take up any more of your valuable time, but we are going to decline on the advertising of your spacecraft. If you have any items of a more earthly matter, we will be happy to evaluate them as we see fit.

Good luck in your endeavors,

Tom Lee
The Shopper

-----Original Message-----

From: Sam Aurelius Milam III [<mailto:owner@moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com>]
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 12:30 PM
To: Tom Lee
Subject: Space Law, Salvage Rights, and Historical Artifacts

To Tom Lee, Greetings

Thank you for your prompt reply. A few of your comments deserve honest answers.

At 2:14 PM -0500 3/4/10, Tom Lee wrote:

The cost to run your ad will be \$1,000,000. Up front and in cash. We charge the same rate to anyone selling unicorns or pixie dust.

I appreciate your sense of humor. In response to a previous advertisement on another service, one man wanted to charge me docking fees on Eros. Another man offered to trade his international space station for my spacecraft. You're not the first person who has tended to make fun of my offer.

You are trying to take advantage of anyone dumb enough to fall for your scheme and The Shopper will not be a part of it. Calling us names will not change our mind. Our decision is final.

Space law is in its infancy. However, the customs of salvage are well established by centuries of precedent. For example, things that are found adrift on the high seas can be claimed by right of salvage. My claim of the NEAR Spacecraft follows in that tradition.

There's a lot of abandoned stuff in the Solar System. In a few years, corporations will be capable of retrieving it. Space law will grow to accommodate that capability. Whatever the provisions of that space

law might turn out to be, my ownership of the NEAR Spacecraft will be protected by grandfather considerations.

A dumb person wouldn't be able to afford my asking price. However, there's a sound commercial reason why a corporation might want to buy my NEAR spacecraft. That reason is in addition to just owning the thing. That is, any such purchase would tend to further validate my claims process, particularly with regard to space law. That would enhance the usefulness of the claims process for the corporation. What if the corporation then claimed the Lunar Lander? It's also abandoned, although its legal situation is more complicated. That is, the Lunar Lander is within a US jurisdiction. Note that the NEAR Spacecraft lacks any such encumbrance. It has been abandoned on ground where no national flag has ever been planted. Whatever the case, consider the prices that collectors pay for things. Any party that acquired ownership of any such abandoned historical artifacts could make a fortune. Corporations can afford to think in the long term. In spite of your lack of vision, this is a serious business. I predict that, in a few years, you'll be begging for advertisements such as mine.

I'll ask you one more time to publish my advertisement. If you refuse again, then you will have become a waste of my valuable time. In either case, it's necessary for the record that I document our discussion. You'll be able to find that documentation, when I get around to uploading it, with my other NEAR Spacecraft records. Here, one last time, is the address.

<http://moonlight-sales.ultimatesitehost.com/NEAR_Spacecraft/NEAR_Spacecraft.html>

Sincerely,
Sam Aurelius Milam III