

House Committee on Ways and Means

Statement of Bill Wood, Charlotte, North Carolina

A personal submission not on behalf of anyone else and these are my own views.

ROOTS OF THE AMERICAN CULTURE AND COMMUNITY IN DISARRAY

Political leaders, religious leaders, conservatives, families (especially fathers), judges, and interested lawyers, along with the vast majority of Americans who believe in ideals of family and country must understand that open WAR HAS BEEN DECLARED ON THEM AND THIS COUNTRY. And it's coming from many of the institutions that our taxes are funding and supporting! In terms of financial and human costs this war on America has been the most destructive war in America's history.

When Nikita Krushchev banged his shoe on the table and declared, 'We shall destroy you from within' during the infamous "Kitchen Debate" - he knew what he was talking about.

[Comparing the culture of the 50's to that of 1998] violent criminal offenses have exploded upward by 700%. Premarital sex among 18 year olds has jumped from 30% of the population to 70%. Tax rates for a family of four have skyrocketed 500%, consuming a fourth of their income. Divorce rates have quadrupled. Illegitimate births among black Americans has soared - from approximately 23% to more than 68%. Illegitimacy itself has jumped from a nationwide total of 5% to nearly 30% nationwide - a rise of 600%. Cases of sexually transmitted diseases have risen 150%. Teen age pregnancies are up by several thousand percent and teen suicides have risen by 200%. Between 1950 and 1979 - serious crime committed by children under 15 has risen by 11,000%...

Most Americans would agree that our society has changed for the worst over the last 30 years." [i]

While there has been progress in moving people off of the welfare rolls and into work, welfare still exists and many commentators note it exists to promote the breakdown of the family. A myriad of today's social ills can be traced to the breakdown of the family and the undermining of marriage. Some of the testimony about the devastation of American families as a result of today's culture war can be seen in several pieces of testimony I have submitted to the Human Resources Subcommittee:

- US House Testimony on Welfare Reform Reauthorization Proposals, H.R. 4090. April 11, 2002, 109 citations or references - consequences of welfare practices on the family unit, and exploration of the 1996 welfare reform bill's requirements for strengthening families and marriage (<http://waysandmeans.house.gov/legacy.asp?file=legacy/humres/107cong/4-11-02/records/billwood.htm>)
- US House Testimony on Teen Pregnancy prevention PRWORA, Public Law 104-193 (Hearing 107-48). November 15, 2001, 43 citations and references -- effects of fatherlessness and divorce on teen pregnancy. (<http://waysandmeans.house.gov/legacy.asp?file=legacy/humres/107cong/11-15-01/Record/wmwood.htm>)
- US House Testimony on Child support and Fatherhood proposals (Hearing 107-38). June 28, 2001, 83 citations or references - Social consequences of failed divorce and child custody policies (<http://waysandmeans.house.gov/legacy.asp?file=legacy/humres/107cong/6-28-01/record/chillegalfound.htm>) -- Father absence, a byproduct of divorce, illegitimacy, and the erosion of the traditional family, is responsible for; filling our prisons, causing psychological problems, suicide, psychosis, gang activity, rape, physical and sexual child abuse, violence against women, general violence, alcohol and drug abuse, poverty, lower academic achievement, school drop-outs, relationship instability, gender identity confusion, runaways, homelessness, cigarette smoking, and any number of corrosive social disorders.
- US House Testimony on The "Hyde-Woolsey" child support bill, HR 1488 (Hearing 106-107, pages 94-103). March 16, 2000, 75 Citations. – Concerning problems with nearly every state's child support guidelines.

Along with this testimony, I have written legal briefs for the Federal District Court on the unconstitutionality of Ohio's custody laws, a legal brief opposing psychology in the courtroom, and am developing an extensive historical review of the rise of our current "family" law system. During several years of research, a disturbing common thread continues to appear, tracing it back to its origins, it led to one Antonio Gramsci.

THE PERSONAL IS THE POLITICAL

In 1926, an Italian communist named Antonio Gramsci ended up in Mussolini's prison after a return from Russia. While there, he wrote his "prison notebooks" and they laid out a plan for destroying Western faith and culture. His plans included ways to undermine and discourage Westerners through the intentional collapse of the existing social structure from within.

Gramsci advocated not only Marxist class warfare, which was economically focused, but also social and cultural warfare at the same time. His theories and the "slow march through the culture" (or institutions) which he envisioned to destroy the West are enshrined in current American social policy. His theories surrounding "hegemony" and a "counter-hegemony" were designed to destroy Western social structure and overthrow the "West" from within.

Hegemony, as defined by Gramsci is that widely accepted system of values, morals, ethics, and social structure which holds a society together and creates a cohesive people. Western social structures holding society together (i.e. "the hegemony") include: authority, morality, sexual restraint, monogamous marriage, personal responsibility, patriotism, national unity, community, tradition, heredity, education, conservatism, language, Christianity, law, and truth. His theory called for media and communications to slowly co-opt the people with the "counter-hegemony" propaganda message.

"... Hegemony operates culturally and ideologically through the institutions of civil society which characterises mature liberal-democratic, capitalist societies. These institutions include education, the family, the church, the mass media, popular culture, etc." [\[ii\]](#)

Through a systematic attack of these institutions he termed the "slow march through the culture," Gramsci theorized that once these institutions were sufficiently damaged the people would insist on an end to the madness allowing totalitarian control of the Western world. A similar form of these theories was tried before America by the National Socialists (Nazis) headed by Hitler.

Many of the Gramscian Marxist Communist ideals have been implemented in government, education, and law. In practice, women have become the vehicle deceived and used in this quest to tear down and destroy Western culture. This has been done by enlisting their help in ripping apart marriage and the traditional family.

Since economic Marxism was a failure, Gramsci reasoned that the only way to topple... Western institutions was by, what he called, a "long march through the culture." He repackaged Marxism in terms of a... "cultural war"...

"Gramsci hated marriage and the family, the very founding blocks of a civilized society. To him, marriage was a plot, a conspiracy... to perpetuate an evil system that oppressed women and children. It was a dangerous institution, characterized by violence and exploitation, the forerunner of fascism and tyranny. Patriarchy served as the main target of the cultural Marxists. They strove to feminize the family with legions of single and homosexual mothers and 'fathers' who would serve to weaken the structure of civilized society."

...[A]nother cultural Marxist (George Lukacs) brought the Gramscian strategy to the schools... As deputy commissioner in Hungary... his first task was to put radical sex education in the schools... it was the best way to destroy traditional sexual morality, and weaken the family. Hungarian children learned... free love, sexual intercourse, and the archaic nature of middle-class family codes, the obsolete nature of monogamy, and the irrelevance of organized religion which deprived man of pleasure. Children were urged to deride and ignore... parental authority, and precepts of traditional morality. If this sounds familiar, it is because this is what is happening in our public... schools.

...Under the rubric of 'diversity,' its hidden goal is to impose a uniformity of thought and behavior on all Americans. The cultural Marxists, often teachers, university professors and administrators, TV producers, newspaper editor and the like, serve as gatekeepers by keeping all traditional and positive ideas, especially religious ideas, out of the public marketplace.

Herbert Marcuse was largely responsible for bringing cultural Marxism to the United States... He believed that all taboos, especially sexual ones, should be relaxed. "Make love, not war!" was his battle cry that echoed through ivy-covered college campuses all over America. His methodology for rebellion included the deconstruction of the language, the infamous "what does 'is' mean?" which fostered the destruction of the culture. By confusing and obliterating word meanings, he helped cause a breakdown in the social conformity of the nation, especially among the... young of America...

Marcuse said that women should be the cultural proletariat who transformed Western society. They would serve as the catalyst for the new Marxist Revolution. If women could be persuaded to leave their traditional roles as the transmitters of culture, then the traditional culture could not be transmitted to the next generation.

What better way to influence the generations than by subverting the traditional roles of women? The Marxists rightfully reasoned that the undermining of women could deal a deadly blow to the culture.

If women were the target, then the Cultural Marxists scored a bullseye... Women have traded the domestic tranquility of family and the home for the power surge of the boardroom and the sweaty release of casual sex. Divorce court statistics, wife and child abandonment, abortion and even spousal murder can be laid at [the feminists] doorstep to a large degree. [iii]

Careful study and review shows that Gramscian Marxist Communism encompasses today's "feminist" movement. [iv] Feminism's goals are to use women to undermine and destroy the culture by abandoning marriage and by not carrying on the critical task of "transmitting the culture" to the next generation. Today's feminists use women to advance the destruction of women, children, and families while convincing them they are somehow a "victim" of the patriarchal structure. And the patriarchal structure is nothing but Orwellian NewSpeak for the social structures and institutions that have kept Western civilization together long before the social decay we see today.

America's socialists and communists make no pretenses about their goals to promote the destruction of a cohesive society by advancing a welfare state and the complete breakdown of the family. Socialists have openly adopted the "counter hegemony" taught by Gramsci which is designed to destroy Western culture. "[T]he stronger the 'counter-hegemonic' strength of unions and left parties, the stronger the welfare state... When we argue for 'decommodifying' (i.e., taking out of private market provision) such basic human needs as healthcare, childcare, education, and housing, we have in mind a decentralized and more fully accountable welfare state than [sic] exists in Western democracies." [v] This statement comes from one of the MANY American college professors indoctrinating students today. As noted by William Gregg in the New American:

Writing in the Winter 1996 issue of the Marxist journal *Dissent*, Michael Walzer enumerated some of the cultural victories won by the left since the 1960s:

- "The visible impact of feminism."
- "The effects of affirmative action."
- "The emergence of gay rights politics, and ... the attention paid to it in the media."
- "The acceptance of cultural pluralism."
- "The transformation of family life," including "rising divorce rates, changing sexual mores, new household arrangements — and, again, the portrayal of all this in the media."
- "The progress of secularization; the fading of religion in general and Christianity in particular from the public sphere — classrooms, textbooks, legal codes, holidays, and so on."
- "The virtual abolition of capital punishment."
- "The legalization of abortion."
- "The first successes in the effort to regulate and limit the private ownership of guns."

Significantly, Walzer admitted... these victories were imposed upon our society by "liberal elites," rather than... "by the pressure of a mass movement or a majoritarian party." These changes "reflect the leftism or liberalism of lawyers, judges, federal bureaucrats, professors, school teachers, social workers, journalists, television and screen writers — not the population at large," noted Walzer... [T]he left focused on "winning the Gramscian war of position."

Cultural commentator Richard Grenier [notes Gramsci formulated] "the doctrine that those who want to change society must change man's consciousness, and that in order to accomplish this they must first control the institutions by which that consciousness is formed: schools, universities, churches, and, perhaps above all, art and the communications industry. It is these institutions that shape and articulate 'public opinion,' the limits of which few politicians can violate with impunity. Culture, Gramsci felt, is not simply the superstructure of an economic base — the role assigned to it in orthodox Marxism — but is central to a society. His famous battle cry is: capture the culture."

Gramsci recognized that the chief [obstacles] impeding... the triumph of Marxism were... those institutions, customs, and habits identified by Washington and the other Founding Fathers as indispensable to ordered liberty — such as the family, private initiative, self-restraint, and principled individualism. But Gramsci focused particularly on what Washington described as the "indispensable supports" of free society — religion and morality. In order to bring about a revolution, Gramsci wrote, "**The conception of law will have to be freed from every remnant of transcendence and absoluteness, practically from all moralist fanaticism.**" [vi]

Gramsci's Marxist communist philosophy, with its goal and aim to completely destroy "Western" civilization is best summed up in the feminist phrase "THE PERSONAL IS THE POLITICAL!"

FAMILY LAW, CHILD SUPPORT, AND WELFARE FROM MARXISM?

Many people would be shocked to learn that much of the current “family law” system we have today, which is at the heart of so much of our modern social upheaval and America’s “welfare state,” was born in the Soviet Union. Still more shocking would be the revelation that when the Soviet Union discovered its system was a disastrous failure, it instituted serious reforms in the early 1940’s to try to restore the family and the country. The Soviets made these changes when fatherlessness (which included children from divorced fathers) reached around 7 million children and their social welfare structure (day cares, kindergartens, state children’s facilities, etc.) was overburdened. Yet in America, some studies suggest that we are approaching 11 or 12 million such children. All the while, the social and financial costs of welfare and fatherlessness are just now gaining more widespread attention. America’s fatherlessness crisis is primarily by judicial making with the cooperation of the legions of lawyers and bureaucrats who profit from family destruction which rips America apart.

Unfortunately, the Soviet reforms came too late and never brought about the extent of social reconstruction that would have allowed recovery from its self-inflicted social destruction. It was unable to stave off its widely celebrated collapse when the Berlin wall came down. Even though the Soviets tried in vain to restore the social values they had worked so hard to eradicate, America only pays “lip service” to much-needed massive social reform. Serious social reform has been largely absent from political debate. On the other hand, the systematic deconstruction of all of the social values that had made our nation great is being pursued passionately as one of our nation's primary socio-political goals.

“Family law” is one of the key tools of the “counter-hegemony” which is used to advance the social welfare state through the promotion of the social structural collapse of America. The early Soviet system focused on personal happiness and self-centered fulfillment with its roots in class warfare. When it was determined that this type of class warfare directed at the family was a complete failure, the Soviets worked quickly to restore the traditional nuclear family in the 1940’s. Shortly after this, the NAWL (National Association of Women Lawyers) began their push for adopting these failed Soviet policies in America.^[vii] America’s version of “family law” has adopted much of the early Soviet failed version of class warfare, while adopting new and more insidious Gramscian versions with gender, cultural, and social warfare components.

When the Bolsheviks came into power in 1917 they regarded the family... with fierce hatred, and set out... to destroy it... [O]ne of the first decrees of the Soviet Government abolished the term 'illegitimate children... by equalizing the legal status of all children, whether born in wedlock or out of it... The father of a child is forced to contribute to its support, usually paying the mother a third of his salary in the event of a separation... At the same time a law was passed which made divorce [very quick]... at the request of either partner in a marriage...

[Marriage became a game where it] was not... unusual... for a boy of twenty to have had three or four wives, or for a girl of the same age to have had three or four abortions. [T]he peasants... bitterly complained: 'Abortions cover our villages with shame. Formerly we did not even hear of them.'

Many women... found marriage and childbearing a profitable occupation. They formed connections with the sons of well-to-do peasants and then blackmailed the father for the support of the children... The law has created still more confusion because... women can claim support for children born many years ago.

...Both in the villages and in the cities the problem of the unmarried mother has become very acute and provides a severe and annoying test of Communist theories.

...Another new point was that wife and husband would have an equal right to claim support from the other... The woman would have the right to demand support for her child even if she lived with several men during the period of conception; but, in contrast to previous practice, she or the court would choose one man who would be held responsible for the support. Commissar Kursky seemed especially proud of this point because it differed so much from the 'bourgeois customs' of Europe and America.

Another speaker objected to the proposed law on the ground that some women would take advantage of its liberal provisions to form connections with wealthy men and then blackmail them for alimony. ^[viii]

The Federal Government continues to participate by paying the states incentives encouraging them to practice these draconian Soviet style, anti-family, child destroying policies. What a frightening use of our “tax dollars at work” to undermine and destroy the social order of America. Even going so far as to pay incentives on a slightly reformed version of Article 81 of The Russian Family Code. This was promoted in the United States by Irwin Garfinkel as “The Wisconsin Model” for child support and welfare reform. “The Wisconsin Model then became a center-piece for the national child support and welfare reform movement.” ^[ix]

ADOPTING THE FAILED SOVIET ATTEMPT TO DESTROY THE FAMILY

Instead of our constitutionally guaranteed “Republican form of government,” we now have a thoroughly entrenched Marxist Communist judiciary in the civil court system masquerading as “family law.” America’s family law courts are no longer about the law, they represent complete perversions of numerous legal maxims and common law traditions that American law was founded upon. [x] These abandoned maxims represent the “hegemony” of American culture and historical tradition in civil family matters. The reprehensible evil of being rewarded for one’s wrongs, and of punishing the innocent have been firmly entrenched in the state’s family courts.

No-fault divorce, “the child’s best interests,” and other components of family law in America were imported from the worst of the Soviet family law system. For example from a 1975 Louisville Law School review:

“Few members of the American legal community are aware of the fact that the Soviet Union has had, for some period of time, what can be described as a no-fault divorce legal system... [A]t a meeting with a group of Soviet lawyers in 1972, one of them asked, “Is it for a long time that you (California) have that system?” When informed of the January 1, 1970 effective date of the California law she remarked, “I think it is the influence of our law... [T]here are a number of similarities between Soviet and California divorce laws that suggest a “borrowing” or a remarkable coincidence.” (pg 32)

“For the Bolsheviks, with their Marxist disdain for religion, the influence of the ecclesiastical authorities over the family was an outrage. Since the family represented the major institution through which the traditions of the past were transmitted from generation to generation, the new regime had to destroy the old bourgeois notions of the family and the home. There was also a very urgent practical reason for disassociating family relations from the influence of the religious authorities... [T]he first task of the new regime in relation to the family was to break the power of the church and the husband.” (pg 33)

“Birth alone was declared the basis of family ties, and all legal discrimination against illegitimate children was abolished... Early Soviet policy was intended to attack these evils [of “patriarchy”] and to transfer the care, education and maintenance of children from home to society. This would mean the end of the family’s socialization functions, and would remove the child from the conservative atmosphere of the patriarchal family to a setting that could be entirely controlled by the regime.” (pg 34)

The Soviet press reported in the mid-thirties that promiscuity flourished... juvenile delinquency mounted, and statistical studies showed that the major source of delinquents was the broken or inattentive home... Additional public homes for children were established, and propaganda campaigns sought to persuade the public that a strong family was the most communistically inspired one. (pg 38, 39)

There was also the matter of seven to nine million fatherless and homeless children, according to Russian estimates of the early twenties. In derogation of Marxist ideology, the state had been unable to assist single mothers, and there existed almost no children’s homes, nurseries or kindergartens. Because of more pressing tasks and limited personnel and material resources the state had not been able to fulfill the conditions Engels had specified for extrafamilial facilities. (pg 40)

More seriously, anti-family policies were leading to a situation where many children in the first Soviet urban generation simply lacked the kind of socializing experience to fit them intellectually or emotionally to the new society the regime was attempting to build, with its emphasis upon self-discipline and control, perseverance, steadiness, punctuality and accuracy. While the family influence had been undermined, extrafamilial agencies had failed to provide a workable substitute, leaving the child prey to the noxious and deviant influences of “the street.” (pg 41) [xi]

The US [Library of Congress Country Studies](#) on Romania also shows direct parallels noting;

“Family law in socialist Romania was modeled after Soviet family legislation... [I]t sought to undermine the influence of religion on family life. [Previously] the church was the center of community life, and marriage, divorce, and recording of births were matters for religious authorities. Under communism these events became affairs of the state, and legislation designed to wipe out the accumulated traditions and ancient codes was enacted. The communist regime required marriage to be legalized in a civil ceremony at the local registry prior to, or preferably instead of, the customary church wedding.

Because of the more liberal procedures, the divorce rate grew dramatically, tripling by 1960, and the number of abortions also increased rapidly. Concern for population reproduction and future labor supplies prompted the state to revise the Romanian Family Code to foster more stable personal relationships and strengthen the family. At the end of 1966, abortion was virtually outlawed, and a new divorce decree made the dissolution of marriage exceedingly difficult.

INDOCTRINATING LAWYERS AND JUDGES TO DESTROY AMERICA

Gramsci wrote, “**The conception of law will have to be freed from every remnant of transcendence and absoluteness, practically from all moralist fanaticism.**” Law schools across America teach Gramscian “critical theory” as well as other communist ideals. A Westlaw or Lexis search reveals not just dozens, but hundreds and

hundreds of legal articles, law reviews, and other materials on feminism, homosexuality, and various forms of Gramscian class “victimology.”

"The revolutionary forces have to take civil society before they take the state, and therefore have to build a coalition of oppositional groups united under a hegemonic banner which usurps the dominant or prevailing hegemony." [xii]

Today's Gramscian Marxists have numerous “oppositional groups” headed by lawyers and promoted by judges and bureaucrats. They advance such “counter-hegemonic” (culturally corrosive and culturally destructive) positions as homosexuality, abortion, the complete FRAUD of the non-existent “separation of church and state,” the (it only applies to destroying marriage and relationships) Violence Against Women Act, “outcome based education,” and the fictitious “global warming.” They passionately HATE the initiatives that undermine their attempts to destroy America such as Title IX reform, Faith based initiatives, the 300 million for marriage, vouchers and accountability for education reform, and the Ten commandments along with ANY other reference to a moral Judeo-Christian code, and private property rights.

High profile court rulings openly display this Gramscian Marxist theory in practice: the attack on the pledge of allegiance, the ACLU suing Judge Roy Moore over the Ten Commandments, and the recent Lawrence v. Texas pro-homosexual ruling. At the root of all of these rulings and many others is a violation of the judge's oath to uphold the constitution. That constitution says that we have a Republican form of government, NOT a socialist or communist form.

CONCLUSION

Today's Marxist Communists operate in law, government, religion, media, entertainment and education. They use Orwellian NewSpeak with words such as “tolerance” which actually means intolerance of things that prevent the destruction of all social structures and societal “norms”. Gramscians preach the religion of division, class warfare and social warfare while spouting their hatred of anything traditional, conservative, moral, or values centered – their battle cry is “the personal is the political.” They want all of Western culture completely destroyed and centralized government control erected in the place of the structure they seek to tear apart and discard. The fruits of the culture war they have engaged on America can be seen in the corrosive remnants of broken families, broken children, filled prisons, and a host of other ills underwritten by America's taxpayers.

Those who deeply care about this country and our constitution must fearlessly engage in this culture war--; the war for America's heart and soul. It's not too late yet. There is still a critical mass and majority of Americans who are not ready for the horrors of the type of communism or national socialism that Gramscians promote. No form of Marxism or communism (even its most radical form of National Socialism) has ever survived without totalitarian control. If the support were there for these Marxist Communists and National Socialists, history has shown that they would not hesitate to attempt a forceful or violent overthrow of American government.

"If the family trends of recent decades are extended into the future, the result will be not only growing uncertainty within marriage, but the gradual elimination of marriage in favor of casual liaisons oriented to adult selfishness. The problem... is that children will be harmed, adults will probably be no happier, and *the social order could collapse.*" [xiii] “In his book, *The American Sex Revolution*, Harvard sociologist Pitirim Sorokin reviewed the history of societies through the ages, and found that *none survived after they ceased honoring and upholding the institution of marriage between a man and a woman.*” [xiv] Marcus Tullius Cicero, in a speech in the Roman senate recorded by Sallust said;

"A nation can survive its fools and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and he carries his banners openly against the city. But the traitor moves among those within the gates freely, his sly whispers rustling through all alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears no traitor; he speaks in the accents familiar to his victim, and he wears their face and their garments and he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation; he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of a city; he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to be feared. The traitor is the plague."

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Gramsci's “march through the culture” can be turned back once the roots and methods are known. Recognizing the foundations of the current class and culture warfare, promoted in many levels of government, law, religion, media, and

education provides relatively easy answers to solve these problems and to turn back the tide of their corruption and destruction.

- Institute non-coercive national unity and patriotism in public policy. The national unity issue destroys the divisive class warfare while reviving patriotism helps to restore some of the “hegemony” the Marxists so passionately hate.
- Mandate abstinence training in schools for states to receive health funds. Stop allowing the natural inhibitions of children to sexual advances to be torn down by the current trend of pro-sexual education brought to them by their teachers who are also authority figures.
- Conservative politicians should take some of their campaign time and effort to tap into and lobby for more than just money. Conservatives must lobby large businesses to partner with inner city churches and schools to create programs of opportunity in disadvantaged areas. This takes the race baiting and class warfare issue away from the left, and gets socialist government programs out of the involvement in people’s lives. [xv]
- Tie clear mission statements to EVERY government program and agency which include: promoting traditional marriage and family, restoring national pride, reducing divorce, reducing illegitimacy, promoting abstinence, and encouraging strong morals and values. Force a public debate on these issues and it will destroy the liberal Marxist establishment. Ever since welfare reform the liberal establishment has been slowly crumbling. Press the issues and accelerate their demise.
- CAREFULLY identify several congressional staff members who have a proven track record of being pro-family, with proven integrity, and have shown a level of frustration over today’s social problems. Assign them to a special research project to study Gramsci’s version of Marxist communism and how it has been implemented in America. Publish their reports and develop strategies based on those reports. (And if the lefties cry “McCarthy,” let the public debates begin! An honest reading of McCarthy’s record completely vindicates him and exposes them!)
- Press the Judiciary committee to amend Title 18 of the US Code to create provisions stating that no state or federal judge shall have any form of immunity whatsoever for engaging in actions which produce or promote taxpayer fraud. For any such act or acts, they shall be subject to both criminal prosecution and they shall be subject to suit in their personal capacity. Let the judges and lawyers scream about “independence” and then insist that they must interpret “independence” to mean that they should be free to break the law and commit fraud against the taxpayers of the United States.
- If Title 18 cannot be amended, then insert the provisions under Title 42 related to the Public Health and Welfare.
- End taxpayer funding of PBS. Expand libel and slander laws to include distortions, manipulations, or unbalanced reporting in television and cable news programs. Let the trial lawyers have a field day with the liberal media.
- Codify in the USC the mission of senior level bureaucrats and their guiding principles with explicit provisions noting personal liability for not adhering to these provisions. Codify the requirement for annual reports by heads of agencies demonstrating how they have complied with these requirements. For example:
 - Make the HHS Director’s mission something like “to work to restore traditional marriage and family while reducing the number of single-parent and broken families who need to collect welfare or child support.” Make it a mandatory reporting requirement on how this mission is being fulfilled.

[i] King, Jennifer. Who are the Real Radicals? Rightgrrl, December 1998. A brief exposition of Antonio Gramsci <http://www.rightgrrl.com/jennifer1.html>

[ii] Strinati, Dominic (1995), An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture, pg. 168-169. Routledge, London.

[iii] Borst, William, Ph.D. American History. A Nation of Frogs, The Mindszenty Report Vol. XLV-No.1 (January 2003) Cardinal Mindszenty was imprisoned by the Nazi’s and later by the Communists in Hungary. Online version can be seen at http://www.mindszenty.org/report/2003/mr_0103.pdf

[iv] “Marxism and Feminism are one, and that one is Marxism” Heidi Hartmann and Amy Bridges, The unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism. -- opening page of Chapter 1, Toward a Feminist Theory of the State. **Catharine A. MacKinnon**, 1989, First Harvard University Press (paperback in 1991)

“Sexuality is to feminism what work is to Marxism...” -- Toward a Feminist Theory of the State. **Catharine A.**

MacKinnon, 1989, First Harvard University Press. Page 3

Feminism, Socialism, and Communism are one in the same, and Socialist/Communist government is the goal of feminism. -- Toward a Feminist Theory of the State. **Catharine A. MacKinnon**, 1989, First Harvard University Press. Page 10

"Our culture, including all that we are taught in schools and universities, is so infused with patriarchal thinking that it must be torn up root and branch if genuine change is to occur. Everything must go - even the allegedly universal disciplines of logic, mathematics, and science, and the intellectual values of objectivity, clarity, and precision on which the former depend." A quote from Daphne Patai and Noretta Koertge, "Professing Feminism: Cautionary Tales from the Strange World of Women's Studies" (New York, Basic Books, 1994), p. 116

[v] Schwartz, Joseph. Toward a Democratic Socialism: Theory, Strategy, and Vision. Joseph Schwartz, a member of the National Executive Committee of the Democratic Socialists of America, teaches political science at Temple University.

[vi] Grigg, William. Toward the Total State. **The New American Vol. 15, No. 14. July 5, 1999.**
http://www.thenewamerican.com/tna/1999/07-05-99/vo15no14_total.htm

[vii] Selma Moidel Smith, A Century of Achievement: The Centennial of the National Association of Women Lawyers, pg 10. (1999); See also ABA's Family Law Quarterly, 33 Fam. L.Q. 501, 510-511. Family Law and American Culture – Women Lawyers in Family Law, Section B. *The Crusade for No-Fault Divorce*. (Fall, 1999)

[viii] The Atlantic Monthly; July 1926; The Russian Effort to Abolish Marriage; Volume 138, No. 1; page 108-114.

[ix] **The Child Support Guideline Problem**, Roger F. Gay, MSc and Gregory J. Palumbo, Ph.D. May 6, 1998.

[x] *Jus ex injuria non oritur*. 4 Bin 639 -- A right cannot arise from a wrong; *Lex nemini operatur iniquum; nemini facit injuriam*. Jenk. Cent. 22.—The law works injustice to no one; does injury to no one; *Lex deficere non potest in justitia exhibenda*. Co. Lit. 197.—The law cannot be defective in dispensing justice; *Lex non deficit in justitia exhibenda*. Jenk. Cent. 31.— The law is not defective in justice; *Commodum ex injurie sue non habere debet*. Jenk. Cent. 161. -- No man ought to derive any benefit of his own wrong; *Lex non favet delicatorum votis*. 9 Co. 58.—The law favours not the vows of the squeamish; *Nemo punitur sine injuria, facto, seu defalto*. 2 Inst. 287.—No one is to be punished unless for some injury, deed, or default; *Legis constructio non facit injuriam*. Co. Lit. 183.—The construction of law does no injury; *Nemo punitur sine injuria facto, seu defalto*. 2 Co. Inst. 287. -- No one is punished unless for some wrong act or default

[xi] No-Fault Divorce: Born In The Soviet Union? University of Louisville School of Law, Journal Of Family Law. Vol. 14, No. 1 (1975). ppg. 32-41

[xii] Strinati, Dominic (1995), An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture, pg. 169. Routledge, London.

[xiii] David Popenoe, "Modern Marriage: Revisiting the Cultural Script," Promises to Keep, 1996, p. 248.

[xiv] Linda Bowles. Damage for the Children. June 13, 2000. Worldnet Daily online.

[xv] A similar program which has been very successful is DAPCEP (the Detroit Area Pre-College Engineering Program <http://www.dapcep.org/>). The difference is that a program to undermine Gramsci should have BOTH parent's involvement as its centerpiece. While it would be ideal if they were married, requiring BOTH parents is a start in the right direction.