



April 2013

The Demise of the American Family

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“God made the parents instruments in His great design of continuing the race of mankind and the occasions of life to their children. As He hath laid on them an obligation to nourish, preserve, and bring up their offspring, so He has laid on them a perpetual obligation of honoring their parents.... From this obligation no state....can absolve children.”

John Locke, Second Treatise on Government. (1)

“The ideal for which the family stands ... is liberty. It is the only ... institution that is at once necessary and voluntary. It is the only check on the state that is bound to renew itself as eternally as the state, and more naturally than the state.”

G.K. Chesterton (2)

“We must remove the children from the crude influence of their families. We must take them over and, to speak frankly, nationalize them. From the first days of their lives they will be under the healthy influence of Communist children’s nurseries and schools. There they will grow up to be real Communists.”

Instructions given at a congress of
Communist Party education officials: 1918. (3)

“We really don’t know how to raise children. If we want to talk about equality of opportunity for children, then the fact that children are raised in families means there’s no equality.... In order to raise children with equality, we must take them away from families and communally raise them.” Mary Jo Bane: Former Assistant Secretary of Administration for Children and Families: US Department of Health and Human Services. She is a professor at the Harvard Kennedy School today. (4)

According to MSNBC anchor Melissa Harris-Perry, a professor of political science at Tulane and host of a weekend political discussion program, children belong to the **“community.”**

“We have never invested as much in public education, because we’ve always had a sort of private notion of children – your kid is yours, and totally your responsibility.” burred Harris-Perry in a video produced for the cable network’s **“Lean Forward”** ad campaign.

“We haven’t had a very collective notion of, ‘These are *our* children...’ [W]e have to break through our kind of private idea that kids belong to their parents ... and recognize that kids belong to whole communities.” (5)

Harris-Perry, it should be noted, is an unabashed proponent of abortion who has proudly and defiantly described herself as someone who has had “a child, an abortion, and a hysterectomy.” (6) She has referred to the unborn child as a “thing” that may eventually “become a person,” and complains that allowing children to be born is fraught with unwanted **“economic consequences”** for society. (7) This is a somewhat circuitous way of referring to them as what the German National Socialists (and other collectivists) called **“useless eaters.”** (8)

One of Harris-Perry’s comrades in MSNBC’s editorial collective, the improbably named Krystall Ball, has found what she considers a suitable use for her daughter: She deployed the four-year-old as a political prop in the campaign to recognize the bizarre and blasphemous state artifact called “same-sex marriage.” Ms. Ball, a co-host of an MSNBC discussion program called “The Cycle,” produced a three-minute video in which she carried out a prompted and pre-scripted conversation with the child about the subject. The vignette ends with Ball informing the pre-school-age child that because she lives in New York State she would be permitted to “marry” another girl if she wants to. (9)

It is **“education”** of this sort that the likes of Melissa Harris-Perry seek to impose on children confiscated from their parents, at the expense of wealth seized from them at gunpoint. Here’s something important to remember: For collectivists, there is no such thing as other people’s property, or other people’s children. Their credo could be **summarized** like this:

“What’s mine is mine, and what is ‘yours’ is actually ‘ours’.”

Harris-Perry, who couples the aggressive ignorance of a spoiled child with the predatory instincts of a Velociraptor, sees children as useful only as raw material for social engineering projects. In this she is utterly typical of the kind of people who now occupy the commanding heights of the government education system.

In an MSNBC program earlier this year, Harris-Perry disparaged the view that the unborn child has a right to life as a **“faith claim ... not associated with science.”** (10)

When dealing with the intangible abstraction called the State, however, Harris-Perry is both devout and militant, earnestly devoted to propagating the bloody gospel of collectivist violence. She wrote:

“I often begin my political science courses with a brief introduction to the idea of ‘the state.’.... The state is the entity that has a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence, force, and coercion. If an individual travels to another country and kills its citizens, we call it terrorism. If the state does it, we call it war. If a man kills his neighbor it is murder; if the state does it, it is the death penalty. If an individual takes his neighbor's money, it is theft; if the state does it, it is taxation.” (11)

This is why, according to Harris-Perry, those who reject the idea that the government as a **“monopoly on legitimacy”** should be treated as seditious conspirators, arrested, prosecuted, and punished. If she had been born at a different time and in a different place, Harris-Perry wouldn't be an extravagantly compensated media slogan-spewer and academic herd-poisoner; she would be feeding the guillotine in Revolutionary Paris, rounding up “Kulaks” for slaughter in the Soviet-dominated Ukraine, or helping cull out Cambodian dissidents on behalf of the Khmer Rouge.

Harris-Perry's repellent views are entirely typical of the self-appointed social engineers who have always sought to destroy the independence of the family. As noted by Chesterton, the family was designed by the Creator; it was created before political government, and is superior to it. This is why disciples of the Babylonian view of society – in which the political state usurps the role of God – have always sought to destroy the family and make children the property of the “community.”

Consider the social blueprint contained in Plato's **“Republic”** in which a caste of exalted “Guardians” would authorize parents to **“bear children to the state”** during a limited period. The objective, according to Plato, would be a society in which **“no parent is to know his own child, nor any child his parent”**; this would bring about a **“community of property and a community of families....”** (12)

As Aristotle pointed out in his critique of Plato's scheme:

“Each citizen will have a thousand sons who will not be his sons individually, but anybody will be equally the son of anybody, and will therefore be neglected by all alike.” (13)

To see how the ideal of a **“community of families”** operates in practice, visit any inner city or rural area where unmarried welfare mothers are raising **“children to the state”**: The result is a blighted, violent sub-population of people who are programmed to consume, rather than produce, and often have little if any respect for property rights and no capacity for self-governance.

All of this, it is reasonable to say, is the fulfillment of a diabolical design. The people who created the current system set out to engineer a population of people who are suitable only to be ruled. The totalitarian schematic devised by Plato, coupled with the revolutionary designs of Marx and Engels (who called for the **“abolition of the family”** in the Communist Manifesto (14), were adopted in 1889 by Britain’s Fabian Society. That group sought to promote revolution through cunning seduction and patient gradualism, rather than by way of overt violence.

In his 1919 book, *New Worlds for Old*, Fabian activist H.G. Wells (better known for his science fiction offerings), laid out the basic premise of **“therapeutic policing.”** H.G. Wells wrote:

“Socialism regards parentage under proper safeguards as 'not only a duty but a service' to the state; that is to say, it proposes to pay for good parentage - in other words, to endow the home.” (15)

By making the mother dependent on subsidies, the State became the surrogate father. And, as Wells pointed out, the State claims the right to raise “its” children, should the natural parents be found unsuitable. This is the tacit but unmistakable threat that accompanies every State official who is permitted to violate the sanctity of the home.

Tragically, by the mid-19th century, the same depraved objectives had already penetrated America’s political and educational institutions.

“Since the 1840s ... American social history could be written as the deliberate dismantling of the home-centered economy, and the consequent decay of the foundations of our liberty,” observes Dr. Alan Carlson. **“[T]his turn against the home was not a natural consequence of industrialization or the emergence of a modern economy. Rather, the change derived from the application of statist ideology and consciously-made political and legal choices.....”**

"The first direct assault on family autonomy grew out of the reform school movement during the 1830s."

According to Dr. Carlson, the influence was particularly strong in New York and Pennsylvania. In 1839, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, acting on assumptions inspired by the reform school movement, invoked the concept of *parens patriae* to justify the state's actions in supplanting parents it found **"unequal to"** or **"unworthy of the task"** of educating children.

In 1882, the Illinois Supreme Court ruled:

"It is the unquestioned right and imperative duty of every enlightened government, in its character of *parens patriae* to protect and provide for the comfort and well-being of its citizens.... The performance of this duty is justly regarded as one of the most important governmental functions, and all constitutional limitations must be so understood and construed so as not to interfere with its proper and legitimate exercise." (Emphasis added.)
The principle of *parens patriae*, properly understood, requires the demolition of all constitutional limitations, rather than their 'redefinition'."

In 1913 – at the same time the British Fabians were building the foundations of that country's welfare state — Dr. Arthur W. Calhoun published *A Social History of The American Family: From Colonial Times to the Present*, which would become an authoritative text for American social-service and welfare workers. Calhoun was remarkably unabashed in promoting a perspective on State supremacy that could have been offered by Marx and Engels when he wrote:

"American history consummates the disappearance of the wider [or extended] familism and the substitution of the parentalism of society.... The new view is that the higher and more obligatory relation is to society rather than to the family; the family goes back to the age of savagery while the state belongs to the age of civilization. The modern individual is a world citizen, served by the world, and home interests can no longer be supreme." (16)

By 1930, the year that President Herbert Hoover convened the **White House Conference on Child Health and Protection**, it was possible for an American president to describe, in public, the individual child as someone **"who belongs to the community almost as much as to the family,"** and a citizen of **"a world predestinedly [sic] moving toward unity."** The latter phrase seems to foretell, by roughly six decades, the claim contained in the United Nations Convention on the

Rights of the Child that government is the primary custodian of all children, with the UN itself at the head of a global system of *parens patriae*. (17)

Whenever a collectivist uses the collective possessive pronoun “**our**,” that term is laden with murderous mischief. When that term is paired with the word “children,” responsible and loving parents should take a quick inventory of their arsenals. It is by no means a coincidence that the same people who make a proprietary claim on “**our**” children in the name of the state want to disarm the American public.

William H. Grigg

REFERENCES

- 1) John Locke, “Concerning Civil Government, Second Essay,” in *Great Books of the Western World*, vol. 35, pp 37-39.
- 2) G.K. Chesterton, *Brave New Family*, pp. 34-35.
- 3) Quoted in Sheldon Richman, *Separating School & State: How to Liberate America’s Families*, pg. xv.
- 4) “The Family: It’s Surviving and Healthy....” *Tulsa World*, August 21, 1977.
- 5) See -- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N3qtpdSQox0&feature=player_embedded
- 6) “Author and Professor Melissa Harris-Perry wows crowd at Planned Parenthood Benefit,” *NewJerseyNewsroom.com*, May 3, 2012.
- 7) See -- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tvaDfnGDZsM>
- 8) See -- <http://www.ushmm.org/museum/exhibit/focus/disabilities/>
- 9) See -- <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Journalism/2013/04/08/MSNBC-Daughter-Gay-Marriage-Political-Prop>
- 10) See -- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tvaDfnGDZsM>
- 11) “Is this the Birth of a Nation?” Melissa Harris-Lacewell (now Perry), *The Nation* magazine, March 22, 2010.
- 12) Plato, *Republic*, V:460; *Great Books...* vol. 7, pg. 362.
- 13) Aristotle, *The Politics*, Book II, 3:35; *Great Books...* vol. 9, pg. 456.
- 14) Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*, pg. 22.
- 15) H.G. Wells, *New Worlds for Old* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919), pg. 22.
- 16) Arthur W. Calhoun, *A Social History of the American Family: From Colonial Times to the Present* (Cleveland, OH: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1919), pp. 162-163.
- 17) For the text of the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child, see: <http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/humanrights/resources/child.asp>
Note that the second paragraph states: “**in the enactment of laws [to protect children], the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration**”; a huge volume of legal scholarly and commentary has been generated to support the proposition that the state, not the parents, is the ultimate authority in defining the “best interests” of children.

I agree with William Grigg's analysis of the current situation.

What is the source of the problem? There is an organized effort to destroy the integrity of the American family and undermine the Christian foundation of our nation.

When did the program begin? The program began shortly after the United States was established in 1789.

Who is responsible for the tragic situation that exists today?

There were several powerful Luciferian organizations in North America when the U.S. was founded in 1789, and there are dozens of similar organizations in the U.S. today.

Do the organizations have names? Yes! If you would like to know the names, I suggest you read my book, **Brotherhood of Darkness**, listen to my talk on the Brotherhood at www.radioliberty.com, or obtain a copy of my DVD (and syllabus) **Agenda 21: The Covert Plan**.

What is the ultimate goal? The Luciferian organizations want to establish a world government, they want to undermine the value of our currency, they want to establish a new financial system, and they want to establish a world religion. Will they succeed? That is up to God, but we must continue our effort to educate people, and lead them into a personal relationship with our Lord because our effort, and the efforts of Joyce Riley, Alex Jones, Steve Quayle, John Loeffler, Chuck Crismier, Butch Paugh, Matt Drudge, and many other ministries, is having a tremendous effect.

How can you confirm that is true? www.prisonplanet.com recently published an article titled "**A Surprising Number of Americans Believe In Conspiracy Theories**" that states:

"Have you ever noticed that whenever the government or the mainstream media wants to demonize a particular point of view they call it a 'conspiracy theory'? The unspoken message is that normal people such as us should never dare to question the official propaganda being put out by 'official sources.'

But what if those 'official sources' are wrong?.... The other day, Public Policy Polling did an opinion poll about 'conspiracy theories.' Just by reading the questions they asked, it is obvious that the goal was to make those that believe in those theories to look foolish. When they released the

results of the poll, they stated that some of the 'conspiracy theories' could only be found in 'the darker corners of the internet'—as if there was something unsavory or evil about them. But is it really 'crazy' to believe that sometimes bad people do bad things? A conspiracy is just 'a secret plan by a group to do something unlawful or harmful'...."

The article revealed that:

"28% of voters believe (a) secretive power elite with a globalist agenda is conspiring to eventually rule the world through an authoritarian world government, or New World Order. A plurality of Romney voters (38%) believe in the New World Order compared to 35% who don't."

What does the survey reveal? 38% of the Republicans who voted for Mitt Romney recognize the fact that there is a conspiracy to establish a world government.

What can you do? You must continue your efforts to reach your relatives and your friends, and lead them to our Lord.

Barbara and I appreciate your loyal support and your faithful prayers.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith