

Re: Min's Intro & Essay #1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-07/2196.html>

From: Morgan Groves (m_groves_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 07/24/04

Date: Sat, 24 Jul 2004 23:38:37 GMT

"Daniel Joseph Min" <Real.Min@Colorado.USA> wrote in message
news:0PzMc.22\$6H6.31161@news.uswest.net...

The following article is my first in a series of new essays on various social and political challenges facing the world today, in which I offer their most equitable and constructive solutions. Being a verbose and definitive author by nature—and very frank in my portrayals—I'm unable to present my theories on any such important matters merely in "a 1000 words or less" (as most publishers prefer essays which are by definition short, and speak only in generalities, and aren't "offensive" to anyone, not even Atheists, E.L.F., the ACLU, Usama Bin Laden, or militant left-wing Democrat-Anarchists). So if you should find any of my essays "offensive", then that means I'm doing my job right. Therefore, I've decided to write a whole new series of essays (formatted HTML) on definitive and important topics, beginning with the family and its survival, which is the foundation of civilization (my next essay will be on abortion)...

SURVIVAL OF THE FAMILY

—by Daniel Joseph Min

(word count 1275)

WITHOUT adequate income to pay for the basic necessities of life, families suffer. People suffer. Poverty-driven crime-rates rise along with its ever-more impoverished class, and median-class tax-payers are left to foot the bill. Taxes rise, disposable incomes drop, and government programs to help the poor inevitably end up bankrupting the whole economy—and great depressions ensue, giving rise to civil unrest, even civil wars, world wars, and finally global thermonuclear holocaust if that's what it takes—ironically followed by world peace. Think about it. Prevention has always been and shall always be the best medicine, the best remedy for all human ailments. "A stitch in time saves nine". So here's what we do...

By federal law, all new-borns should be medically sterilized at birth by the attending physician, unless his or her parents have previously deposited requisite funds into a federally-insured, interest-bearing account reserved exclusively for that child. Account access will be electronic-only and highly-secure, and will be

constantly monitored by the federal government. Significant or blatant misuse of these funds will be a serious felony, and, depending upon the infraction, the offending parent(s) would most likely serve time in a federal penitentiary, several years perhaps. Any monies earned while in prison would be reimbursed directly to the aforesaid account until restitution is paid in full, and with interest. Perhaps that would be the most equitable determination of time served: Let the punishment fit the crime. Don't put such thieves in prison to rot. Rather, put them in there to work! But not for their own profit, mind you, but strictly to pay back all monies stolen from their victims. Let us law-abiding taxpayers pay for their imprisonment, that's fine. But let the prisoners themselves make restitution for their own crimes, and pay all monies due to their victims—plus interest. Make their detention as profitable as possible for their victims, thereby helping the thieves get out of prison as early as possible, hence, giving them real incentive to work—reminding them every day as to exactly why they're incarcerated, and exactly why they're working to make restitution in full. That should teach them an unforgettable lesson not to do it again. If not, then any serious second offence would be tantamount to a life sentence without parole, and they would work six days a week until their dying day.

That's a far cry from "imputed income" against "dead-beat" parents who never had the money in the first place. We're not torturing the poor merely for being poor in a world where thousands of over-qualified applicants per week are applying for part-time, minimum-wage, no benefits grunt-worker positions which offer absolutely no possibility for advancement, and require an I.Q. of maybe 70. Much rather, we're punishing thieves who've stolen real money from the innocent, i.e. thieves who've actually had the stolen money in their hands. Do you see the profound difference here? Poor people simply don't have money. Thieves do, and it's stolen!

Any new-born child's exclusive account ought to cover an estimated half of that child's basic expenses like food, clothing & shelter from their birth up until his or her 18th birthday, and should also provide for an estimated half of the tuition & expenses needed to get a 4-year college education at a reputable university (to get a bachelor's degree with good grades). At today's prices, that's a total of about \$300,000 in deposit to cover half of these projected expenses, more or less. If that child's previously wealthy parents aren't able to make enough income over the first 22 years of that child's lifetime in order to cover the other half, then, at least, that child will not have been starving for 18 years, and will yet have some statistical shot at success—albeit he or she may never attend college, and is therefore likely to struggle from paycheck to paycheck for the rest of his or her adult life—i.e., if they can even find a job. The good news is, those poor struggling children will NEVER give birth to any children of their own, as they obviously cannot afford to take care of them. But the rich won't like it, since the poor are their slave-class, just like the Hebrew slaves were to Pharaoh in Egypt, or like illegal immigrants are to the produce industry, and other corporations who similarly enslave their penniless employees—like a company store. And the rich won't like the fact that any forfeiture of the child's account will be transferred in full to a federally-mandated charity in order to help cover the other half of said deposits nationwide, which monies would be distributed equally among all legal citizens in the nation who're under the age of 18, again, in federally-monitored, interest-bearing electronic accounts. That means no lawyers are involved—a thing which the rich will go absolutely ballistic over. But that's their problem.

Back to the children. Barring said deposit, sterilization at birth should be mandatory and wholly uncontestable under federal law. That way, any child left unsterilized is guaranteed sufficient monies to survive in modest comfort, and to get a college education when they reach adulthood. That's what this deposit is for. It's for the child. It's his or her personal and inviolable guarantee that they, too, may grow into

adulthood and get a college education, and have the financial opportunities to eventually support their own progeny—perhaps even to deposit such additional funds as would prevent their own grandchildren's sterilization someday. I.e., from parent to child, to grandchild, ad infinitum. That way, everyone's a winner—except for the lawyers.

In cases where a sterilized child should eventually inherit or otherwise acquire the \$300,000-plus fee (i.e., forever accounting for inflation), then that person may be unsterilized only if said fee has been deposited—i.e., in order to cover the non-sterilization fee for that's person's potential future son or daughter, which would then require an additional deposit in order to cover the cost of inflation between the time of initial deposit, up until the actual birth-date of that potential parent's future child. Less-affluent, yet unsterilized citizens are still permitted under federal law to have up to three sterilized children, but then the parents must be sterilized upon their third child's birth. But...

DNA testing should in all cases determine who the father is. E.g., consider a mother of three children, each of whom have had a different father. Then each father has only fathered one child, not three, at least by that particular mother. If any father has fathered three children by any one or several women, then he gets sterilized. The whole idea is to be precisely fair and equitable to everyone concerned. As in this case, any poor mother who's had three children gets sterilized. And any poor father who has fathered three children is likewise sterilized. That's being perfectly fair, and prevents those poor mothers & fathers from bringing any more poor children into the world. We've already got more than enough poor and suffering children to go around as it is. The last thing we need is more poor and suffering children. Do you want children to suffer? I don't. But neither can we prohibit humankind's God-given commandment to be fruitful & multiply. We can however, and we should, limit just how "fruitful" poor parents can be. That's being fair.

Will those sterilized children born to poor parents suffer from poverty? Most probably they will. But the family lineage ends with them. Barring winning the lottery or something, they can bear no more children. Wealth tends to run in families. But even the poorest child can rise to power, be it financial, political, religious, or otherwise. It may be according to their natural-born talents and God-given purpose in life. In such cases, no man-made laws will stop the Earth from turning.

—fin—

I have a hard time taking seriously the guy who told everyone back in 1999 to "get to higher ground if you can." No amount of attempted rationality will make up for that.
