

the Babylonian and Canaanite principle, that in the Delphi cult's own image.

There, from those origins, in the subjugation of the higher level of civilization, by the relatively, morally and intellectually, degenerate Roman culture, we must trace the history leading into the shared logical-positivist delusion of Norbert Wiener, John von Neumann, Walter Pitts, and Marvin Minsky, and also of Bill Joy and Theodore Kaczynski. So, the historian must trace the highlights of the evolving struggle, of republicanism versus the oligarchical model, since Solon's reform at Athens, and since the subsequent revolt of the Ionian city-states against that renewed Babylon, which had been brought forth in the guise of the Achaemenid Empire.

In today's schools, even if a semblance of history is rarely taught in those classrooms, the usually purported source of explanations for anything which happened in history, at any time, or in any place, is still the English and British empiricists' dogma of immutable "human nature." Usually, especially in today's English-speaking classrooms, that is the traditional, modern British definition of human nature, pretty much as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Bernard Mandeville, David Hume, Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill, described it, and, as the doctrine of Kurt Lewin is taught

in the form of the rabid irrationalism of the "sensitivity" cults, in ever more U.S. classrooms today.

In reality, contrary to such simple-minded explanations as those popularized, statistical notions of the empiricists, the most important distinction among cultures and leading currents within cultures, is to be found in the differences among the ways in which each of these defines what it identifies as "human nature." In the sweep of the rise of globally extended European civilization, since ancient Greece, the differences among working definitions of human nature, fall into two general classes, several sub-classes, and, finally, specific types within the bounds of classes and sub-classes. The most important subject-matter of such historiographical studies, is located in the transitions which move a society from one such type, or class of axiomatic definition, to another. The evolution of the conception of human nature within ancient Greece itself, as shown by tracing this evolution from the Homeric epics to Plato, is the most crucial example of those processes of change—e.g., transitions—which bring the underlying principles of history-making—e.g., epistemology and statecraft—into focus.

The modern radical positivist's perverse definition of human nature, is a case in point.

The Unabomber speaks, and Silicon Valley listens

In his Wired magazine article, Bill Joy referenced the following citation from the Unabomber Manifesto, which appeared in Ray Kurzweil's book The Age of Spiritual Machines. While condemning Ted Kaczynski's terrorist acts, Joy wholeheartedly endorsed the section of the Manifesto published below.

First let us postulate that the computer scientists succeed in developing intelligent machines that can do all things better than human beings can do them. In that case presumably all work will be done by vast, highly organized systems of machines and no human effort will be necessary. Either of two cases might occur. The machines might be permitted to make all of their own decisions without human oversight, or else human control over the machines might be retained. If the machines are permitted to make all their own decisions, we can't make any conjectures as to the results, because it is impossible to guess how such machines might behave. . . .

On the other hand, it is possible that human control over the machines may be retained. In that case the average

man may have control over certain private machines of his own, such as his car or his personal computer, but control over large systems of machines will be in the hands of a tiny elite—just as it is today, but with two differences. Due to improved techniques the elite will have greater control over the masses; and because human work will no longer be necessary the masses will be superfluous, a useless burden on the system. If the elite is ruthless they may simply decide to exterminate the mass of humanity. If they are humane they may use propaganda or other psychological or biological techniques to reduce the birth rate until the mass of humanity becomes extinct, leaving the world to the elite. Or, if the elite consists of soft-hearted liberals, they may decide to play the role of good shepherds to the rest of the human race. They will see to it that everyone's physical needs are satisfied, that all children are raised under psychologically hygienic conditions, that everyone has a wholesome hobby to keep him busy, and that anyone who may become dissatisfied undergoes "treatment" to cure his "problem." Of course, life will be so purposeless that people will have to be biologically or psychologically engineered either to remove their need for the power process or make them "sublimate" their drive for power into some harmless hobby. These engineered human beings may be happy in such a society, but they will most certainly not be free. They will have been reduced to the status of domestic animals.