



Restoration of the Nuclear Family

Regardless if you are liberal or conservative, although possibly not if you are a progressive, we can all agree that the destruction of the traditional nuclear family has produced societal disaster from violent crime to addiction to income inequality, the devastating effects of social media on our children, mass shootings, and the list of horrors goes on. If we could magically fix just one thing that would do the most to restore America to a paradise of freedom and growth, it would have to be to restore the nuclear family above all else.

There's the simple fact that over 72% of Black, 53% of Latino, 36% of White, and 18% of Asian households are led by a single parent, usually the mother. Over 52% of our children of all races are raised in single parent families. There are countless sociological studies that over and over again have proven the objective fact that a child raised absent a father in particular is almost always retarded in his or her future possibilities and happiness as a result. The rare exceptions are when a grandfather or uncle steps in and fills the missing father's role full-time. Yes, I know that I am offending single mothers everywhere who will scream that their kids are perfect without that no-good SOB they divorced or never married in the first place. They are wrong. More on that in a bit.

What caused the explosion of single-parent families? THAT is a much more complicated question because now we are going to deal with cause and not a correlation. Single-parent families are caused by seemingly unrelated factors. They don't cause themselves, after all. 300,000 years of traditional family units in all cultures proves that. In this case, there are three primary causes:

1. No-fault divorce
2. The Birth Control Pill

3. Government Welfare Payments and Benefits

Quite a list, huh? Let's start with no-fault divorce and really rile those, the majority, that are at present not thinking critically because they have never been taught how. Our public schools originally were designed to produce factory drones and now are used to produce ideological progressive drones. Not much difference really and no critical thinking.

Current culture tries to bend reality to fit perspective and that never works. Therefore, I expect the reaction to my asserting the objective fact that No-fault Divorce has contributed to the destruction of the nuclear family will instantly be that I'm a misogynist and neanderthal, white cisgender male, blah, blah blah. I don't care because objective reality cannot be bent by rejection or anything else. You cannot will a fact to be a fiction, and in the case of no-fault divorce, the case against it in retrospect is clear. It rests on an irrefutable premise: *Once a child is born to a marriage, it is no longer about the parents and their happiness must take a back seat.* The lie we believe as fact and repeated to us over and over again in postmodern culture is that if the mother or father are unhappy in their marriage, the children suffer. Perhaps, but what we never seem to talk about publicly is that children need to suffer a little to grow to healthy adulthood. They will be permanently stunted if the parents divorce. There needs to be a darn good reason and unhappiness of either parent isn't one.

Understand, women traditionally get the better of divorce 90% of the time including gaining custody of the children. They gain substantial portions of assets as well as future pensions. The man in a marriage makes more than the woman for the most part because of career choices fitting gender-reality. Don't buy into that Male Hierarchy nonsense. Women-dominant careers simply pay less than male generally speaking. A nurse makes less than an electrician or plumber. An elementary school teacher makes less than a chemical engineer. A stay-at-home mom makes nothing monetarily. The genders gravitate to careers and choices that fit their own makeup and nothing will ever change that, so most often in divorce the woman wins because she is perceived as the weaker party, if

winning is possible in such a tragedy for everyone involved. The losers every single time in a divorce are the children. It MUST be difficult to end a marriage if its sanctity and durability are to be restored. Otherwise, what does a marriage vow of “for better or worse” really mean if it is easy to walk away? Furthermore, our modern ethos has made the word *abuse* mean more than it ought. We are going to have to debate as a society exactly what abuse in the context of a marriage, particularly when children are involved, really is. Incendiary, I understand. Yet, we are all going to have to strap on our big boy and girl pants and face objective reality beginning with rational, critical thinking as opposed to knee-jerk reactions to a word or phrase like Pavlov’s dogs. If you reacted to my absolutely correct usage of the word *retarded* a couple of paragraphs back, all that I can say is *woof!* We need to be calm and analytical, thinking and reasoning adult human beings. It’s difficult, I know, but we must try to let go of propaganda that has taken on the appearance of fact because it agrees with our cognitive biases. Disagreement is not hate speech, but squelching it is definitely stupidity.

Today, it is generally accepted that a man constantly yelling at his wife or vice versa, casting aspersions, hurling invective, etc are all forms of abuse. They are if one is fragile I suppose, but these examples do not for a single moment justify the breakup of a family. Sorry, they just don’t unless it’s a constant drone of derision 24/7. Going over the top in an argument occasionally is a natural thing to do, not a reason for divorce. The only harm that can be done by being yelled at is hurt feelings. I get it. It’s sad and awful and it requires counseling and many hours of stress to be sure, but when did we get the idea that life can or should be devoid of stress or offense? Does it set a bad example for the kids? Yes, but not worse than an absent father scars them for life. There are tradeoffs in life and this is one of them. A parent in real life doesn’t get to choose quitting because of hurt feelings and if he or she does, the children will ALWAYS pay the price. The past 50 years of accelerating cultural decline and the onset of tribalism has proven the point beyond doubt.

Besides, what even constitutes yelling and or name-calling as abuse or differentiates it from yelling as part of an argument? Hell, I was once dumped by a gorgeous Italian girl that I thought I might have a future with because I never yelled at her. I evidently was not abusive enough in her cultural context. Also, I grew up for the majority of my childhood in an Irish Catholic neighborhood. You want to hear yelling? Hang around an Irish family. It's just a loud expression of love. Polite silence at an Irish, or Italian, or Jewish, or Greek dinner table would just be weird.

The point is, we have to stop raising our children to imagine every disagreement or raised voice directed towards them is some form of abuse or hate. It's just human and they need to deal with it. They will face it all of their own lives and protecting them from real life is a failure of parenting.

Also, brace yourself, infidelity most of the time needs to be forgiven. I know, sucks, but family takes precedence over betrayal and with work and counseling you might be able to rescue your relationship. Regardless, your relationship is less important than the family itself. You must shield the children, not use them as a weapon, suck it up, and forgive. See your clergyman or counselor if you cannot, but regardless your needs are secondary to your duties as a parent. Exception: serial cheating. That is another species entirely from making an awful mistake and sets a terrible example for the children. Who will decide which is which? The judge in divorce court. As an alternative, we could be honest with ourselves and spare everyone.

Addiction must be dealt with as it is present in an enormous number of American homes today, mostly as alcoholism. I know it's no treat to be married to an addict. I experienced that personally in my first marriage. Yes, I am a hypocrite but good decisions and wisdom come from the consequences of bad decisions. Now I get it, but then I didn't and I regret it. I know it is no treat to be the child of one. So get help and pull together but the family must remain intact UNLESS the addiction is manifesting as physical violence against yourself or the children. Physical violence is the automatically justified reason for divorce. The other is if the addict is

completely out of control, as in sleeping under bridges because he/she can't remember where they live. Don't laugh. I've seen it. Who decides what is out of control? The judge in divorce court. Again, best for all involved to handle it in the family the vast majority of the time.

A word on physical violence in a marriage, *it is usually the woman striking the man*. Statistically it is approximately 80% of the time. Yes, I know, not what you would think if your source of information is mainstream. The thing is, a man knows that he is much more likely to hurt or even kill a woman if he strikes her. He also knows that unless she is using a weapon, women generally cannot inflict serious damage.¹ So for the most part, men don't retaliate or initiate.

For the sake of disclosure, I got full custody of my then two children as a result of the divorce thanks to a wise judge and my smart lawyer. My ex later passed away from an overdose when she was 41. She and I were the same age. I am 66. I remain very close to my now adult children and the two added to the brood by my second marriage. I am proud to share that all were raised to understand that in the end, family is all there really is. As a result of that, there is no half-sibling bullshit in our family. All four of them are close, ages 29-45. They are close with me and their mother (no stepmother baloney either when the birth mother is deceased. My second wife is an awesome mother and grandmother).

Reality note to women everywhere: If you get divorced with children and think you are going to remarry and find the man of your dreams, you won't 99% of the time. Oh, you will likely remarry, but the first time your new husband tries to discipline your kids, that will be the end of that. Divorce and or misery is soon to follow. Unless you are superwoman, you will resent and likely openly defend the children over him. And that's the relationship killer. In parenting, the parents must be on the same page and never contradict each other in front of the children. When it happens, the stepdad is metaphorically castrated in the eyes of the kids and chaos is

¹ <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2968709/>

sure to follow. The kids will play off the parents on each other because, let's face it, kids are cruel in their lack of insight or experience. In a second marriage but for the rarest of circumstances, the mother can't help but attack the stepfather. Ladies, for your own happiness and that of the children, stick with the horse you rode in on. You will avoid the most stressful of all emotions because you cannot replay a game that's over: regret. Just saying.

When we made no-fault divorce essentially the law of the land, we instantly converted marriage implicitly from a sacred bond for life to just another long term relationship. Without marriage being a contract religiously and legally that can only be extricated from with great difficulty, we erased what separates it from any other dating relationship. That's fine if you are childless I suppose, but once you procreate, the tie is bound. Therefore, divorce must become as it once was, a difficult nightmare. Just look at the carnage breaking apart the nuclear family has caused.

Before no-fault divorce became pervasive nationally in 1976 (Ronald Reagan signed the first state no-fault divorce law in 1969 and later called it the "greatest mistake of my life"), there was the approval of the Pill in 1961. The Pill destroyed the great barrier that made female chastity not only a societal norm but a necessity. After all, if an unwanted pregnancy happened before we culturally destroyed the family, it was a burden and a disgrace to get pregnant out of marriage. The stigma, as awful as it likely sounds to you if you aren't thinking critically, served a serious purpose: preventing the explosion of single parent families. As we so often do, we kicked over a fence before asking ourselves why it was put up in the first place and loosed the beast of social destruction. Not all fences are built to contain. Most are built to protect.

The Pill resulted in the Sexual Revolution of the 1960s. It was real and I was there. It was fun. We you-know-whatted our brains out because suddenly chicks were easy. We had lots of good times. We thought our sexual freedom was much more evolved than our parents. We were the last generation with even a vestige of knowledge of common decency that once

was taught for children to emulate, particularly our daughters. That's the dark side of feminism. Equal pay for equal work and equal opportunity? Of course. Fool around like a man because you are a liberated woman? Big mistake.

Why? The Pill and Sexual Revolution destroyed compulsory virginity and as a result as was inevitable came sexual comparison between partners and another reason for divorce. Think about it. If neither partner has any or very limited sexual experience, then all sex, like all pizza, is good. Compare your spouse to a memory of a hotter person or the idea that some imaginary ideal (wo)man would make love more masterfully, and watch the dissatisfaction and infidelity begin. Most men prior to the sexual revolution married as virgins themselves as women set the tone for when and if sex was going to happen in any normal dating relationship. When they did get laid, they looked upon that girl as a slut and ended up marrying the "good" girl. You know, the mother of their children. Most men have always taken no for an answer because they were raised to be gentlemen. Most women held their virginity as precious. Yeah, I know, how quaint. Yet, women were much happier.²

Some years ago, I was picking up from school the teenage daughters of a woman that I was dating pretty seriously. Along with them was a friend, and the three of them in the back seat ignored my presence and began discussing and giggling about how to give a blow job and how that wasn't even really sex. Bill Clinton would have been captivated. I was appalled. The girls were 14 and 16. I have shared this story often since in discussing this subject and discovered much to my unhappiness that lots of people have experienced a version of the same exact thing. We are circling the drain of the cultural toilet not least because all sexual barriers are under attack and rapidly heading for total elimination. All that will do is make women even more unhappy. Time to dismount that bronco, ladies.

2

Before we move on, yes, I interrupted the girls' discussion immediately and tried to give a little lesson on being smart and holding yourself precious as a young woman. I might as well have spoken to them in Russian for all they took in the lesson, it was obvious to me. They just giggled and whispered about God only knows what.

Let's be honest with ourselves. We used to get married young because we wanted to get laid, boys and girls both, as we transitioned and became young men and women at our natural sexual peaks. Lust and love are impossible to separate without the passing of time in a relationship, so expecting to know the difference while dating is wishful thinking and naive. Love at first sight is lust and in the past when a young couple got married, pregnancy soon followed, then responsibility, adulthood, and yes, love. And don't put down lust in this context. It is nature's way of continuing the species.

With the easy out of no-fault divorce and the freedom afforded women sexually by the pill, there became no obvious reason to get married any time soon or stay married for that matter. The result has been a birth rate that has fallen below population replacement *except* in the worst, most irresponsible class of the population from which most violent criminals arise. They breed like rabbits and the pill is simply not used by young women raised fatherless by promiscuous mothers who role model a line of f**k-buddies for their daughters to emulate. A girl raised without a father will inevitably look for love from pretty much any man that shows her interest, and absent chastity, will f**k to find it. I have lost count of how many times I have witnessed this firsthand as a result of my incarceration.

This, my progressive and more radically feminist friends, is not an issue of cost before you allege it. The Pill is free from Planned Parenthood and other community organizations. Furthermore, the manufacturers all have free programs for the uninsured.

Are women or men happier as a result of the sexual revolution? Uh, indisputably, no. Women today hit 30, start panicking as their internal

biological imperative clocks go off and they suddenly realize the only men available to them are the leftovers discarded by younger and smarter women who still get it. Then they compare their prospective suitors to a non-existent ideal promoted by social media. Nobody is as handsome or beautiful and perfect as the many filters and tricks of social media make even the worst look and seem. For many women in particular, life becomes a depressing revolving door of sex, hope, and then inevitably, disappointment driven by algorithms.

Men experience it essentially the exact same way in reverse. They just shake it off much easier.

Internet dating has descended into becoming the open hiding place for sexual predators, addicts, and fools. If you've tried it during the past few years, man or woman, you know what I am saying is objectively true. It is an exercise resembling Russian Roulette where a person can't stop pulling the trigger.

What results from all of these unhappily aging women? Why, more single families of course either by IVF or just getting a buddy to be a sperm donor. Don't tell him, skip your pills, and voila, single mother and even worse, raising an only child. Having a child out of wedlock is the ultimate narcissistic act. *Screw society, screw the child's long-term welfare, I need a baby!*

If you are asking yourself if it is okay for a woman of means perhaps to have a fatherless child, consider that these children are usually an only child. What is wrong with that? Sometimes nothing particularly when grandpa or an uncle can step into the role of de facto dad, but if you have ever met an entitled, self-centered, intolerant schmuck, ask him or her if they have siblings and a father at home. The answer 99 times out of 100 will be no, and the rest as they say is history. You will seem psychic in your insight.

Small digression, every now and then a wildly inappropriately young woman will hit on me. I am not Jeffrey Epstein and think it's beyond creepy for men to date women younger than their daughters. Just saying. Anyway, while I am flattered by the come on of a young woman, I ALWAYS retort, smiling, "How old were you when your dad left home?" It never fails. No dad, seek love from daddy figures. Then they get insulted and tell me I'm an a**hole. Oh well. That's the price I pay for ethics, and believe me, it's a struggle not to give in. I am as human as the next person but time and accumulated wisdom have taught me the value of considering the big picture before I indulge my weaknesses. You know, deferred gratification. What a concept. Children learn it, or should, from their fathers. My father was absent, too. I had to learn it the hard way.

Why do I seem to be concentrating the fallout of failed marriage on women? Because like it or not, as James Brown said, *it's a man's world* particularly in dating. A man gets older and for many women, becomes more attractive. A woman gets older and for most men, it is a barrier. They don't have the benefit of a married woman in a lasting true love created by shared purpose. I know lots of married men who are as attracted to their wives as they ever were. Not the mainstream narrative, I understand, but happiness never is in postmodernism. Waiting too long to marry and procreate because a woman is told repeatedly by the mainstream that she must have a fulfilling career above all else has resulted in a record amount of women in therapy and popping antidepressants. Bitterness sets in and once a person becomes bitter, male or female, it is for the rest of their lives. We can all get over anger or even being absolutely furious, but once that transforms to bitterness, the end of happiness is here without the possibility of respite. These poor folks die bitter and usually alone or in relationships so toxic as to be unimaginable to the balanced. This is how divorcees and widows are taken advantage of by predatory men who know how to hide. A person lost in their own emotions is easy to manipulate.

Allow me to be very clear: **We are not going to go back, and I am not advocating a return to Suzie Homemaker.** Those days are dead and not least because in addition to everything else that I have discussed, the

industrial/technological age has eliminated much of the necessary work of women in the home. There were no shortcuts before the late 20th Century. Cleaning was done with washboards and scrub brushes. Everything was made from scratch. Women canned out of necessity. Happily, that's all a thing of the past and it has left women a lot of time on their hands especially once the children go to school full-time. Therefore, the expectation of returning to the past is just plain ridiculous. Idle hands are the devil's workshop. Instead, our future needs to be a time where a woman can take the time she needs to raise her babies to school age, but also have a career so that she doesn't go stir crazy! There is a happy balance in there somewhere and we need to find it. What we are doing now just isn't working.

Allow me to be even clearer; on your deathbed, your last thought is not going to be, "I wish that I could have worked more". More likely, it will be about family and loved ones. The trick is to live that way while you can which means getting your priorities straight.

The third and final nail in the causal coffin of the traditional nuclear family is welfare in all of its forms. By requiring that a "family" be single parent-led to receive the cash benefits through AFDC, particularly in black urban poor neighborhoods and to a lesser extent others of the same socio-economic class of all races, the government hung out the *"Move out of your unhappy home and we will pay you to start your own family and find love"* sign. It was too tempting to millions of young girls. It soon became a lifestyle and the welfare benefits have relegated the family into a secondary support role behind the state. A permanent, envious, and therefore dangerous underclass has resulted.

How did Welfare become a lifestyle? Because raising children alone is a full time job, and a single mother unless she is exceptional will often find herself too exhausted to pursue a career. Therefore, she will settle back into the role of welfare recipient for life. 99% of the time, a person will choose the path of least resistance and never think about whether taking it was a good idea. It's always much later down the road, when age yields

experience and for some people, wisdom. Then they realize the hard road and the right road are always the same thing. That is not a lesson of postmodernism, is it? Dads teach it.

Before the advent of the Welfare State here and elsewhere, in the developed world where most countries are facing similar problems to our own and still in developing countries like Mexico, Brazil, and Kenya as a few examples, the duty to take care of the old or poor fell and falls to the family and family alone. It has worked since the dawn of mankind and is the very reason for family, evolutionarily speaking, in the first place.

It has other benefits, too. Para ejemplo, when I lived and worked in Mexico, I was often honored to be invited to join the family of one of my Mexican friends for either the mid-day meal or supper. I say honored because in Mexico to do business like a Mexican, you must make personal relationships and friendship first before anything else. In Mexico, a handshake is much stronger than a contract once you develop your circle of friends. *Compadre* is more than just a word. It is a title earned through loyalty and friendship.

At these meals, always, there were mom and dad, grandma and grandpa from both sides of the family, often cousins, uncles, and aunts, and of course, the kids. There were no generational differences that were allowed to separate the family. It is a beautiful part of their culture and one of the reasons that one day I would consider retiring there permanently. And if I may say so, Mexican women are beautiful at every age.

It is a joy to sit in a restaurant where perhaps there is a live REAL Mariachi Band (not a couple of guys singing *Guantanamera* by your table for a few bucks in a gringo-Mexican restaurant) playing and everyone is singing along, from toddler to centenarian, and they all know the words! Can you imagine? I digress from fond reminiscence. In Mexico, they are too smart to fool around labeling the generations. They honor them. We could learn a lot

from the Mexicans, no? Another stereotype down the crapper. I get so tired...alright, back on track.³

It also negates race as a factor in family destruction as though our largest demographic of broken homes in America is black people, the very opposite is true in all of Africa. The state and the pill broke it here in the West, not being black or suffering at the hands of some make-believe hierarchy somehow being dumb enough to endanger themselves by undermining the one thing that keeps the peace. The nuclear family is alive and well in sub-Saharan Africa. If you told a Masai tribesman that he ought to play the field, he would look at you like you're nuts.

Before you say it because it is the popular narrative, no, the legacy of slavery did not cause the breakup of the black nuclear family. Slaveowners generally didn't break up families, contrary to myth. The vast majority of slaves were born into two parent families first of all, and prior to 1960, 86% of blacks were born to traditional nuclear families. So let's not get intellectually lazy and once again allow propaganda to masquerade as objective reality.⁴

In Africa, every single tribe has at one time or another been enslaved by another. Every single African is the descendant of a slave, as are all of the human race. ALL of us are descended from slaves at some point. It is the oldest of human institutions. If anything, European slavery was unique in its relative humanity. It was far less cruel than African, Arab, or Asian slavery. The popular narrative is, if I am being kind, lazy. It doesn't take a deep dive into the actual history of slavery in the West to learn the truth. It also has no context.

Further undermining the legacy argument is that 10% of American Blacks today are either first generation or descendants of people who immigrated here after 1865. They came from Africa, the Caribbean, and South

³ *Canciones de mi padre* is a wonderful album by Linda Ronstadt, a Mexicana in case you didn't know, and has a collection of those mariachi songs that I am talking about. It is on all streaming services. Enjoy!

⁴ <https://fee.org/articles/the-history-of-slavery-you-probably-werent-taught-in-school/>

America. They still do, and they are very successful. About half of black students at Harvard are of this sub-classification. They are from mostly high income families and by that I mean by a blind measure. Unlike their American counterparts up until now at the same school, they have the same graduation rate as whites and often are the top of their class. Asians beat everyone. That is a testament to strong nuclear families if anything is.

To mitigate this disaster, we first must admit to ourselves some other objective realities in order to think creatively and critically. First, we are not going to somehow take away the birth control pill. Don't be ridiculous. Second, there are no solutions to any human problem or challenge in any case, only trade-offs. Therefore our path forward must simply be more effective than what we are doing now with less fallout. If someone thinks of a better trade-off down the road, great. Facts should drive policy, not policy creating its own so-called facts as is the case now. There will still be single parents, and there will still be poverty and crime, just a boatload less of all of it.

The enemy of good is perfect.

Here is my fact-driven plan to restore the traditional family and as a byproduct, crater crime and dramatically reduce unhappiness:

1. **End No-Fault Divorce Nationally** - We must if we are to have a chance of making life better. We can make an exception in the law for divorce absent children remaining no-fault. I made the case above and am happy to debate anytime and anywhere. Divorce *has* to be a torture and *for better or worse* has to really mean it. This is not a construct of some mythical male hierarchy but a necessity for human progress, existence and yes, happiness.
2. **Chastity should be promoted governmentally in schools and in all forms of traditional and social media. It must once again become the cultural norm. Promoting a cultural norm is the reason public schools were established in the first place. The**

government has one of its few bright spots in the national campaigns to eliminate smoking, littering, and reduce forest fires. We succeeded in the dramatic reduction of all three of these by promotion, not coercion. We can do it again. We need to hire the best advertising and promotional firms in the country and put on a full-court press which has the added benefit of not requiring any new bureaucracy and is far less wasteful than otherwise would be the case if we left it to some agency like HHS. Plus, let the pros who know what they are doing design the message, not an 80 year old senator who doesn't know even how to use the most basic technology.

3. **End Federal Welfare in all of its forms:** Allow me to be clear. **I am not advocating ending the safety net, just the federal one.** The United States is unlike any other country in the world because of our diversity. There is nothing like it now, and there has never been a country like ours in history. Furthermore, we are supposed to be a federalist republic meaning that the powers of the federal government are limited ONLY to those laid out in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution:

<https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/article-1/section-8/>

Of course, modern politics have blown the crap out of those limitations and all that I am advocating is returning to the founders' original intentions. This is because particularly as it pertains to a social safety net, each of our states is so demographically unique that applying as we do now a one-size-fits-all approach is inefficient, unmanageable, and stupid. Think. Wyoming's population is very different from California's. How could they have the same programs? Plus, since states cannot issue their own money, they are constrained from borrowing from the future to pay for the present. All of the debt we are racking up every second of every day at the federal level is putting a huge burden on people who will never benefit from today's spending. There is just no way to rationally and morally justify that.

The countries in the world where social spending has been effective and beneficial have in common two things: They are small and almost completely heterogeneous. Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland, commonly cited as the best of the best, all have populations less than just one of our major cities. Sweden is the largest of them with 10 million inhabitants which is smaller than greater New York or Los Angeles and they are all Swedes. Different cultures obviously have different needs and different ways things need to be done to accommodate their respective differences. It is much easier to design a plan when everyone thinks generally the same way.

Our states are similar in that they are essentially 50 uniquely different countries. Therefore, each state can both design a much better and customized set of programs as well as pay for them without borrowing from the future who will never benefit in order to pay for the past, as we do now.

States will soon realize that to support the kind of safety net similar to Scandinavian countries requires a high income tax (Swedes tax 50% on middle income earners), high corporate taxes (30% in Sweden), and high property taxes. They also have North Sea oil. That helps a lot. If they are willing to pay the price because their populations, like Sweden's, think the safety net is worth the cost including if they choose single-payer healthcare for that state alone, have at it. We will have 50 experiments in management and design and over time, states will naturally copy the best ideas and chuck the worst, an inescapable byproduct of having to pay for the benefits each year in full. In turn, the welfare state will be much less wasteful and much less intrusive on what traditionally are family responsibilities. Again, not perfect but much better than today's clusterfudge of disaster.

If you are wondering to yourself at this moment why we don't do this now, as logical and reasonable as it is, the answer is simple. It is far easier for special interests to lobby and manipulate in one place instead of 50. Corrupting 535 politicians in Washington is much easier

than the thousands of state senators and representatives. Corrupting one president is easier than 50 governors. Concentrating the mainstream media in a single geographic area makes it easier to dominate than if it is dispersed. Get it? The pigs who feed at the government trough don't like to be made to work very hard. They like to gorge themselves with as little effort as possible.

If we do all three of these things, the traditional nuclear family will reconstitute because of necessity to what it has been since the dawn of civilization in every culture and on every continent, the very foundation of society and its top priority. It will be restored because it will be the only logical alternative to a much reduced federal role. If we recognize that the family is the base upon which all else is built, then we can turn this disaster we now face of crime, violence, sloth, and hopelessness into a memory. Everything we have done has been undoubtedly based upon good intentions of those that first put into motion the destruction. I have no doubt. It simply has not worked as intended. The Road to Hell...

Let's stop digging the hole we have created for ourselves any deeper by recognizing that we made well-intentioned mistakes and undo them. It's as simple, and complex, as that.