


Notice:

This issue of the *Frontiersman* contains contact information that is out-of-date. For current contact information, [click here](#).



Frontiersman

The Truth Is Within You
March 1997

Discrimination for Fun and Profit

James Majeski

I have read much of what was written about California Proposition 209 including the fact that it was approved by a majority of those who chose to vote on the Proposition. When I read the text of the Proposition, I determined that it merely called for the prohibition of the last vestiges of discrimination that are still tolerated by the government. Nothing that I have read before or since has cast a shadow of doubt upon my conclusion.

Advocates of affirmative action that oppose California Proposition 209 seem to be more interested in the financial advantages of participating in or running the affirmative action programs with the tax monies provided for their activities than in the fact that their activities are discriminatory.

It all seems to come down to money. Those that are being paid to administer affirmative action programs will defend affirmative action because their income depends on it. If their affirmative action program is eliminated, they are out of a job.

It all seems to come down to money. Those that are taking advantage of affirmative action programs will defend affirmative action because their income depends on it. If their affirmative action program is eliminated, they may be replaced by a person with better qualifications for their job.

Perhaps there may be an exception? There may be individuals that really believe that discrimination should be practiced. I know there are some who actually believe that discrimination "in favor of" is better than discrimination "against" although both forms of discrimination are the same. How can anyone discriminate in favor of someone without discriminating against someone else?

If you believe in equality under the law, then any form of discrimination is repugnant. ∞

The [text of California Proposition 209](#) is available from the Frontiersman upon request.

Postscript

John Webster; <http://www.vikora.com/CWS/jwebster/>

In response to those who have written and who feel that "female circumcission"

Refer to [The Gov't Wants to raise your kids](#), by John Webster, on page 2 of the January issue of this newsletter.

is child abuse, I would like to state that there is an important difference. These parents **really** do care about their children and they **really** do believe that this is best for their children. This makes it distinctly different from cases where the parent will cripple the child to get more money **for themselves** in pan-handling **at the child's expense**.

I would point out that while female circumcission may in fact **not** be best for the child (and I for one strongly believe that it is not), you do not change the well inten-

tioned parent's actions through laws enforcing the standards of the majority's culture. Instead, all you need is to present to those parents the information and evidence that shows that indeed their intended actions are not best for their child. If the parents still persist in their beliefs and actions then maybe they know something about their child, their culture, and morality in general that you and I don't know.

I would also state that in libertarian theory many of the "Rights of the Individual" are not realized in the child until that child asserts its rights. So if a female child asserts her rights by running away from home to avoid female circumcission or any other "child abuse" (real or imagined) then no one has the right to force that child to return to her family. ∞

Unfit Candidates

Airline safety activist Victoria Sam Aurelius Milam III Kumic recently advocated¹ that decisions about airline safety regulation should be left to the families of accident victims. Don't be absurd! Those are the **worst** people for the job. They're so disabled by grief that they can't think rationally about the subject. They'd sacrifice the pitiful remaining vestiges of our liberty for — safety? Revenge? If anything, they should be **excluded** from the discussion. ⚡

¹ Nightly News with Tom Brokaw, February 12, 1997

With This Ring, I Thee Dread

I once predicted Sam Aurelius Milam III that the child welfare fanatics wouldn't be satisfied with coerced child support payments but would eventually pass laws forcing fathers to marry the mothers of their kids. I recently heard the advocacy² of tougher standards for divorce for couples with children. When the standards get tough enough then divorce for parents will, in effect, be prohibited. After that, it will be a small step to require that unmarried parents get married or be punished if they don't. ⚡

² The NewsHour With Jim Lehrer, February 25, 1997

The Wrongness and Rightness of the Unabomber

Don J. Cormier

What is the Unabomber saying in his *Manifesto*? Following is a brief summary of the *Manifesto*'s contents:

- Modern society is bad because, although it satisfies certain desires and needs it frustrates other desires and needs which may be more important.
- High-tech, consumerist civilization has dangerously degraded the environment and is continuing to do so.
- High-tech weaponry threatens to destroy our species and the higher forms of life.
- Cybernetics and nanotechnology are developing to such a point that it will soon be possible to robotize humanity and to eliminate old-fashioned freedom forever.
- The primitive way of life which existed during and before the middle ages is the one which best suits humanity in general.

Therefore, modern civilization must be demolished and advanced technology renounced if humans are to survive with any dignity or freedom.

There are a number of flaws in all this. The Unabomber ignores the fact that there have existed many societies that were both low-tech and repressive.* A few examples are the Roman Empire, Pharaonic Egypt, ancient Sparta, and the society of the ancient Polynesians. These examples demonstrate that totalitarianism is not an exclusively modern problem.#

It's true that the combination of advanced technology and wasteful consumerism have caused environmental degradation, but to simply and suddenly give up science and technology would cause the degradation to become worse. Any realistic attempts to undo environmental harm require scientific understanding and, often, the use of advanced technology to deal with toxic waste. Scientific knowledge would especially be needed to safely dismantle and dispose of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.

The Unabomber claims to love freedom, but he does not trust people to use freedom wisely. He claims that unless we abolish technology, people will inevitably abuse it to commit physical and/or spiritual suicide. The argument is analogous to the one put out by gun control advocates, and it is just as arrogant. The Unabomber and the gun control advocates both claim the right to use force to prevent others from exercising free choice.

One final negative point is that, even if one concedes that the Unabomber's goal is good, the mail bomb strategy is a preposterously bad way of achieving it. The nearly random killing of a handful of people cannot change the steamroller course of a civilization which is actively supported by millions of people.

The Unabomber is wrong in some ways, but he is right

* But none that were high tech and repressive. —editor

But maybe high tech totalitarianism is. —editor

in others. He is right when he states that society satisfies some needs and desires at the cost of repressing others. Freud said much the same thing, back in the late 30's¹.

The Unabomber is correct in describing the environmental problems caused by overpopulation and the misuse of technology. Many environmentalists have investigated and publicized these problems.²

The Unabomber is correct in warning that various technologies are developing which could someday turn the the mass of humanity into puppets controlled by some ruling elite. Many distopian authors have been examining this possibility for years.³

The Unabomber is "right" about something else which may be less obvious. Although the strategy of the Unabomber is not altogether logical, there is an underlying coherence to the Unabomber's actions. He hates the world as it exists in reality and wants to live in a different world which could exist in reality. Therefore, in the grand tradition of Pol Pot and Walt Disney, the Unabomber has taken direct steps intended to make his vision real. Relatively few radicals living in the U.S.A. today can take credit for having the same practical integrity. It seems that the majority of radicals today fall into one of two mistaken groups — armchair rebels and activist lemmings. The armchair rebels understand their goal, but take few or no practical steps to realize it. The activist lemmings do a lot, but lack a clear understanding of what they want to accomplish. The rightness of the Unabomber is the balanced relation of his ideas and actions.

1 *Civilization and its Discontents*, Sigmund Freud, W. W. Norton, © 1962

2 *Population, Resources, Environment; Issues in Human Ecology*, Paul R. Ehrlich and Anne H. Ehrlich, W. H. Freeman and Company, © 1970

3 *Brave New World*, by Aldous Huxley, Bantam Books, © 1932, 1946 by Aldous Huxley
1984, by George Orwell, The New American Library, © 1949 by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.
The Tomorrow File, by Lawrence Sanders, Berkley Publishing Corporation, © 1975 by Lawrence Sanders
Eclipse, by John Shirley, Popular Library, © 1985 by John Shirley
—and many others

The Unabomber has sensitized a lot of people to "terrorism" and tainted many otherwise valid objections to modern society. The government couldn't have bolstered its own positions and damaged the opposition's positions more effectively if it had orchestrated the bombings itself. Suppose that's what actually happened. Maybe the bombings were all staged by the federal government, which has both the means and the motive. Maybe Ted Kaczynski is just a convenient and unfortunate scapegoat. How would we know otherwise? Remember Shirley's Law: When dealing with government, you cannot be too paranoid. —editor

Raising Children Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

Dante DeAmicis

It is so fatally easy to make young children believe that they are horrible.

—from *The Once and Future King*, by T. H. White

Notice I said "raising" children, not "having" children. Children should not be seen as something that someone or some couple goes out to "have", like one would have lunch or acquire some possession considered to be de rigueur. Of course this attitude is simpler than sitting down to think about everything a child needs or might need to become a fully developed human being, bursting with potential and with no lifelong emotional scars. It's much too easy to say "Well, a lot of this stuff is government's job". Well, I've got news for you. The government is never going to do all a child needs, although a bona fide culture might, because the government won't, can't, or has an agenda that is not in the child's best interests.

Since I know all of you fertile breeders are too busy trying to figure out how to have more things, I've made a list for you of conditions that are not just nice sentiments and "good ideas if convenient or time permits", but absolute "musts" if we are going to stop pumping out babies that are soon to be abused, neglected, and under developed educationally, emotionally, socially, and spiritually.

1. Backup "parents" — In some religious traditions these are called "godparents". Where the church is strong enough to be the core family's "community", the godparents commitment is written down and they attend important events in the child's life. But their major function is to step in if one or both of the biological parents bites the big one. Of course, who says this has to be done in a religious context?

2. Regular third or fourth family member commitment This was usually an extended family in the same household or neighborhood. They could be grandparents, a spinster aunt, or very close family friends. They are a yell away and are on call for whatever. They are committed to helping raise your child. What, you don't know anyone who would do this? Then don't have a child. Get a dog.

3. Live in an intentional community context — In undeveloped societies this comes naturally. But in our individualized, isolated, production cog, mindless consumer existence, we will have to work at it. People need to be in close proximity and interact on a regular basis with other individuals and families who have some legal overlap in their lives for the purpose of realizing a common goal, common lifestyle, or mutual aid. Committed communitarians create a safe environment of people with different skills and experiences to raise children in. The main reason almost no one does this is because it is a major hassle. I would not insist on such a major change for the disinclined childless. But for raising chil-

dren the right way (although communities have infinite variations) it is a must, so do what you have to do.

4. Invest in education — Most people would find this the most reasonable idea, but I'm not talking about a "reasonable" amount of education. I'm talking: throw the TV in the trash, read to the children regularly, buy periodicals and books books books. Don't give

The TV can be a wonderful tool. Don't throw it in the trash. Use it wisely. —editor

them that "But we have public libraries" unless you live next door to one and it's open till midnight. Home-school or pool with other parents for a "community school". Buy equipment for hobbies. Pay for music lessons. Conduct "family meetings". Most important of all, educate yourself broadly so you are not ignorance personified. Get involved in community activities so that you can involve the children in community activities.

If the best you can do is push them off to a public school or a private clone then don't have kids, but do help raise those of other parents when you can. There are too many vacant stares now where wonder should be.

5. No violent or self-destructive behavior — And I mean no slip-ups or excuses. I don't care how much pressure you feel you are under and what the rest of the world is like. The home should be a sanctuary for children. Improve yourself so that you have achieved Zen-like peace and control at all times or give someone else's kids your "good" days.

Now, who still wants to "have" children? ∞

***The Golden Principle** — Nothing will be attempted if all possible objections must first be overcome.*

—from [Another Compendium of Wit and Wisdom](#)

While Mr. DeAmicis' ideas are good as guidelines, I have the impression that he views them as absolute requirements. However, if these requirements were imposed — particularly item number 5 — upon all aspiring parents as prerequisites to having children, then I suspect that there would not be any more children. We are, after all, dealing with real people, not "Zen-like" saints. The Golden Principle applies.

I don't know whether or not Mr. DeAmicis has any first-hand experience at raising children. It might be possible that he doesn't appreciate the practical difficulties. Would any of my readers who are parents care to comment on his recommendations? I'll be happy to print such comments in future editions. —editor


Acknowledgments

- My thanks to [Sir John the Generous](#) for his contribution of computer memory and software.
- My thanks to Shirley, of Urbana, Illinois, for her frequent support of this newsletter.
- My thanks to Sir Donald the Elusive for paying the production costs of this newsletter. —editor



Nation in Distress

Disarm the Police



On the Road with Buffalo Hunter

Buff was traveling in England a while back, and since he didn't have his ol' pick 'em up truck with him he rode the bus a lot. He was waiting at a bus stop one evening when a young English lady approached the bus stop and dropped her parcels on the sidewalk. Buff was giving the lady a careful but discrete appraisal when, without warning, a powerful puff of wind came out of nowhere and blew her skirt right up around her, uh, topside.

The lady pushed her skirt back into place and tried to pretend that nothing had happened, but an icy quality had settled over the silence at the bus stop. Buff thought that some light comment was in order and, forgetting briefly where he was, ventured the comment, "Kind of airy out this evening, ain't it?"

The lady snapped "Ya was expectin' feathers!?!"

Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

What's "police brutality"?

—Rookie

Dear Rookie

Redundant.

Sesame Suite

Hermit: This is Hermit the Frog, reporting from the Maul, where Lovable Furry ol' Groveler has decided to try out a new restaurant. He was attracted by a sign promising "All the shrimp you can eat for \$1!" Let's listen to what happens.

Groveler: Excuse me? Waiter?

Waiter: Yes?

Groveler: May I have some more shrimp?

Waiter: No.

Groveler: But I only had 6, and the sign says all the shrimp you can eat for a dollar!

Waiter: Well 6 shrimp is all you can eat for a dollar!

Hermit: Well, that's all the time we have today. Tune in next week, when Beg Bird visits Omelets r Us.

Frontiersman

Cancellations — 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. You may also cancel by phone, letter, fax, carrier pigeon, or any other method that gets the message to me.

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

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 publications. For that permission, you must go to the original source. I would appreciate receiving a courtesy copy of any doc-

ument 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, 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