

Re: Min's Intro & Essay #1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004-07/2249.html>

From: a poor misguided soul (*miscconcepts_at_netscape.net*)

Date: 07/25/04

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 2004 16:08:12 GMT

Daniel Joseph Min wrote:

>
>
> *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,

sci.archaeology: Re: Min's Intro & Essay #1

unfortunately I still need somebody to flip my burgers at McDonalds.

--

That's not really Saddam, it's one of his surgically altered look a-likes.
www.patism.co.nr