

The Deadbeat Chronicles

Jim Unterschine



***Exposing Family Law as the
exploitation of children for money and
the indentured servitude of heterosexual
taxpayers who dare to raise children
since 1995***

Deadbeat Chronicles 02

<http://www.gndzerosrv.com/Executive Pages/pdf/Untersshine Pages02.pdf>

James D. Untershine, GZS of MS

gzs@gndzerosrv.com, <http://www.gndzerosrv.com/>

Page	Date	Title
3	03-14-03	Blake vs "No fault divorce"
5	02-24-03	The Child Support Control System
8	02-13-03	"No fault" divorce provokes murder in Texas
9	02-13-03	Jurors Deliberate Sentence for Clara Harris
10	02-11-03	I'm going to pretend I didn't hear that
12	02-08-03	And Now for the Feminist Perspective
14	02-03-03	NASA links 'plane crash' to loss of life
15	01-28-03	Snow Knows Fraud
17	01-22-03	White House standing by Snow nomination for Treasury job
18	01-21-03	Laci Peterson is missing in California
20	01-13-03	Obstruction of Justice in Florida
21	01-10-03	Man Told To Support Child Of Another
22	01-04-03	Sociological Warfare
25	12-15-02	Family Law Chatter
26	12-02-02	Heterosexual Taxpayers under Attack
27	11-30-02	Legal Group Urges States to Update Their Family Law
29	11-26-02	The Power of the Legislature
30	11-25-02	Thank you and farewell
31	11-25-02	Steve Horn returns
32	10-14-02	Interstate TANF Benefits
34	10-08-02	Interstate Child Support Guidelines
37	10-05-02	California Child Support Guideline
39	09-29-02	The Cost of Mentoring Children
40	09-28-02	Davis vetoes tests to ID dads
41	09-14-02	Kerkorian Ex-Wife Gets Little More
42	09-16-02	Not the dad? Pay anyway
44	09-15-02	Attorney General Warning
45	09-12-02	Tommy Thompson's Reign Of Terror
46	09-13-02	Ross Perot Wins Again in Florida
47	09-12-02	Lawrence County judges free 37 child-support offenders
48	08-25-02	The Message of Joy
49	08-28-01	Pilot was ordered to leave his home
50	08-03-02	Who's the Deadbeat Now?
51	08-01-02	Ex-Raider Caught in Support Sting
52	07-31-02	Dozens of Deadbeat Parents Busted in U.S. Sweep
53	08-01-02	An Ounce of Prevention
54	07-26-02	White House Hails Bankruptcy Bill
55	07-20-02	New Legislation may End Consumer Fraud
56	07-01-02	NOW do you See Our Point?

Recent articles by Jim Untershine at <http://www.gndzerosrv.com/Executive Pages/pdf/Untersshine Pages03.pdf>

Previous articles by Jim Untershine at <http://www.gndzerosrv.com/Executive Pages/pdf/Untersshine Pages01.pdf>

Blake vs "No fault divorce"

682

The first one to "lie in wait" loses

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 03-14-03

The Family Law motive for murder may have justified the homicide, regarding the death of Bonnie Lee Bakley. The California Family Law system conspired with the victim in a botched attempt to legally destroy the father of a newborn baby. Although Christian Brando was the first target of this "get rich quick" scheme, it was Robert Blake who ultimately fell into the California Family Law crosshairs. [11](#)

Robert Blake shares the same stigma as Gary Condit, Scott Peterson, and O.J. Simpson regarding the implied responsibility for dead or missing women bearing the fruit of their loins. 21% of all female homicide victims in California were killed by their spouse, during the O.J. trial, but has risen to 26% during Blake's. [12](#) A California jury was previously asked to put themselves in the shoes of a Heisman trophy winning success story for minorities, who was sentenced by family law to be treated like a racial expletive. Now a California jury will be asked to put themselves in the shoes of a "Little Rascal" and long time champion of "crime don't pay", who became aware of an ambush by a "no fault" / "no due process" divorce court.

Judge Lloyd Nash presided over the preliminary hearing featuring the people's Patrick Dixon vs Blake's Thomas Mesereau Jr. Ronald Hambleton, Gary McLarty, and Earl Caldwell round out the elite cadre of suspected assassins that were at Robert Blake's disposal. The Bakely's Eric Duban was seen salivating uncontrollably in launching a wrongful death civil suit prior to Blake's preliminary hearing. Judge Nash awarded Robert Blake a free trial by jury and an option to buy a \$1.5 million taste of freedom that involves wearing a monitoring ankle bracelet and surrendering his passport. [13](#)

One of the potential henchmen named McLarty, unloaded a handgun full of bullets into a man, in self-defense, prior to being interviewed by Blake to do the same to Bonny Lee Bakely. Blake's defense attorney (Mesereau) asked McLarty if his damning testimony levied against Blake, would be rewarded with leniency by the District Attorney's Office regarding his child support enforcement woes. [14](#) McLarty is a Deadbeat Dad, under the thumb of the District Attorney's Office at the behest of CSE. McLarty is in the same position now that Robert Blake would be in if Bonny Lee were allowed to live. Robert Blake would have never paid a dime in child support to a gold-digging internet money-shot who would certainly steal candy from a baby.

Mesereau may press this sinister connection between the DA's office, CSE, and the family court regarding this family law tragedy. The illusion of due process that Blake expected to receive in family court, would have certainly triggered a hostage situation regarding young Rose. Blake would have refused to negotiate with terrorist organizations holding hostages and resolved to never lie, never say no, never refuse hostage release, never run away, and never pay.

Blake was incarcerated on 04-19-02 in connection with the murder of his wife. [15](#) Blake was forced to be a noncustodial parent (NCP) who is facing a child support arrearage that amounts to 25% of his net income plus 10% interest computed over the last 11 months of his incarceration at the hands of the District Attorney. The state of California will receive federal incentives in collecting this back child support if someone will just file for enforcement. If CSE gets involved they will garnish 50% of Blake's net income to pay off this unpaid restitution for damages to Rose.

It seems that the California Family Law system can only be cheated by losing the child in the fracas. 41% of all child homicide victims in California were killed by a family member compared to 43% of all female homicide victims. [16](#) One may connect the dots of this conspiracy theory and conclude that family members are being provoked to kill mothers and children in California. The California Governor Grey Davis is a strong advocate of this family law system that thrives on "fraud for money". [17](#) Grey Davis is the ringmaster of the Executive Branch circus that has transformed our death defying performers into slapstick clowns, and is a circus that makes our children weep.

The California family law system profits by enticing mothers to discard their children's father and persecuting him for his involvement. The hollow promise of financial independence rewarded to the mother by the family court is nothing more than the Judicial Branch setting the stage for the Executive Branch. The financial demands imposed on the deep pockets parent is designed to drive the NCP to unemployment or drive the CP to welfare, which is the only way CSE is allowed to intercept this deadbeat cash flow. Once CSE is involved, the money paid by the NCP reaps California federal incentives and allows the "iron fist" of CSE to be imposed on the NCP if he stops. [18](#)

Any jury might believe that a parent should be allowed to use deadly force, if they fear for the safety of their family. If there exists no legal recourse to insure family safety, then the first one to step foot in family court represents a clear and present danger to the family.

After consulting with Bill Clinton, Jesse Jackson attempted to arrange that the mother of his outof -wedlock child stayed away from the California family court. Many believe that Jackson gave Clinton the "keys to the city" of Harlem in exchange for imparting this life saving wisdom. Jackson's mistress walked into family court 2 years later to "formalize" child support payments and ask that Jackson visit the child more often. [19](#)

Clinton seems to enjoy diplomatic immunity from his own weapon of mass destruction. Perhaps his marital indiscretions are choreographed by Hillary, making him the poster child for adulterous relationships in this "no fault" era of sexual freedom. Meanwhile, a machine that is designed to exploit children for money is slowly erasing our heroes one decent man at a time.

Citations

1 Steven Mikulan, [LA Weekly](http://www.laweekly.com), 03-07-03, "Trial Mix - The People v. Robert Blake", http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=vv/20030308/lo_laweekly/42431

2 CA Dept. of Justice - Homicide in California, 2000, <http://caag.state.ca.us/cjsc/publications/homicide/homi2000/cr1.pdf>, Chart 15 - Gender of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender, and Chart 17 - Age of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender

3 CNN.COM, 04-20-02, "Blake behind bars after arrest in wife's slaying", <http://www.cnn.com/2002/US/04/19/robert.blake.case/>

4 Jasmine Lee, DAILY BREEZE, 09-28-02, "Davis vetoes tests to ID dads", "PATERNITY: Men forced to support children not their own say bill would have offered relief. They vow to fight on.", <http://www.dailybreeze.com/content/bln/nmpaternity28.html>

5 2001 - 2002 California DCSS Local Assistance Administrative Costs and Collections Estimates, <http://www.childsup.ca.gov/pub/budget/2002/2002-05budget.pdf>, <http://www.childsup.ca.gov/pub/reports/2002/2002-11annual.pdf>. CA Program Costs - Table 1 - California Child Support Program Costs totaled \$1.00 billion = \$615 million Federal (61%) + \$394 million State (39%) + \$44,000 Reimbursement (0.004%). CA Program Collections - Table 1 - California Assistance Collection (TANF) Revenue totaled \$713 million = \$341 million Federal (48%) + \$334 million State (47%) + \$39 million County (6%).

6 CNN.COM, 08-16-01, "Mother wants Jesse Jackson to 'be a father' to illegitimate child", <http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/08/16/jackson.mistress/>

The Child Support Control System

681

Sabotaging welfare reform for money

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/archive/u-v/untersshine/03/untersshine022603.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 02-24-03

The child support control system that is implemented by each state must comply with the federal mandate to reap federal funding. The legal liability associated with noncompliance with a federal mandate may expose rogue states to civil 1 and criminal 2 penalties. If Child Support Enforcement (CSE) deprives a noncustodial parent (NCP) of rights and privileges under the color of a federal law that has not been implemented correctly, 3 then the impoverishment of the custodial parent (CP), the children, and the NCP are damages incurred by the state and is also a federally recognized crime. Policy Studies Inc (PSI) is paid by states to verify compliance with a federal mandate, and may be guilty of malpractice.

Overview

A child support control system that is designed to provide support to the children must employ a method to measure the amount of support actually received by the children. This crucial feedback function of measuring the output of a control system must be performed to allow comparison to the input command of the control system. If this feedback path does not exist, then the system is referred to as "open loop" and is deemed "inherently unstable".

Driving down the road is a feedback control system. We see the target that we wish to drive toward and we can see whether we are driving toward it. If we see that we are not driving toward the target, we turn the steering wheel until we are driving toward it. When we see that we are driving toward the target we stop turning the wheel. This control system would be "open loop" if we could not see where we were driving. Although the driver can hear the screams of the people being run down on the sidewalk, or feeling the lane reflectors when the car strays to one side, this diminished form of feedback will not be enough to prevent this control system from eventually failing.

Child support control system

The child support control system exists to control a family. The family subsystem that is subjected to a child support control system is comprised of the parents, the children, and the parent's employer. An optimized control system utilizing proper feedback and compensation would seem transparent to the family. A robust control system would actually benefit the family being controlled by insuring the children receive the support they deserve and the parents are allowed to continue to be employed.

Input to the system

The input to the child support control system is money paid by the NCP. A state's child support guideline forces an NCP to reimburse the children for damages incurred by the civil court in denying custody of the children to the breadwinner. The NCP is forced to pay cash to the CP that exceeds the state's welfare benefits.

The state is empowered by the federal mandate to impose a fine against an employer if the NCP is fired, or is denied employment, or is unduly disciplined, or if the employer refuses to withhold court ordered child support from wages. 4 The wisdom of this empowerment of the state over employers manifests itself in the realization that the source of child support money is not the NCP, but the employer the NCP works for.

California recognizes their child support guideline as the input to the child support control system. The California child support guideline does not vary with CP income and is the highest in the nation, demanding 25% of a NCP's net income for 1 child, 40% for 2, and 50% for 3. 5 The California child support guideline is imposed on a NCP by default 80% of the time. 6 The California child support guideline exceeds their welfare benefits by 11% of a NCP's net income for 1 child, 22% for 2, and 28% for 3, regarding an NCP earning \$4,400/mo (52,800/yr) net income. 7

Output of the system

The output of a child support control system is the support delivered to the children. The child support control system, as described by the federal mandate, is "inherently unstable" by virtue of the fact that there is no means to ensure that child support is delivered to the children, thereby denying the children a legal right to the money ordered for their support.

California presumes that a CP will spend a significant portion of available resources to support the children. 8 California recognizes the output of the child support control system as the amount of financial damages demanded of the NCP by the civil court. 6

Feedback of the system

The feedback of a child support control system is visibility of the support delivered to the children and visibility of the amount of money delivered to the CP. The federal government implements a semblance of feedback in the welfare control system by issuing food stamps and housing subsidies to the CP. Although it may seem objectionable to micromanage CPs on welfare, the NCP paying child support is a taxpaying consumer whom has the right to "get what they pay for and stop paying if they don't". The damages owed to the children are now the responsibility of those making reimbursement impossible, unconscionable, or fraudulent. 9 The cost of the support delivered to the children should be compared to the amount of money ordered for the children's support to obtain an error.

The federal mandate provides the states a feedback path from the employer by allowing visibility of wage withholding delivered to the CP. If the money ordered to be garnished from the NCP's wages stops being paid to the CP, then CSE can restore this cash flow if the employer maliciously targeted the NCP due to the existence of child support hardships. The amount of money ordered to be garnished from the NCP's wages should be compared to the money delivered to the CP to obtain an error.

California recognizes the feedback of their child support control system as the amount of child support that is ordered by the civil court and imposed on the NCP. California compares the amount of the civil court order to the amount recommended by their child support guideline to obtain an error.

California denies the NCP federal protection against employer discrimination by not allowing CSE involvement until after the NCP is unemployed and the impoverished CP files for welfare. California should compare the amount of child support that is ordered by the civil court and imposed on the NCP to the welfare benefits delivered to the CP to obtain a very meaningful error.

Instability

A control system that is designed to exclude feedback is an "open loop" or "out of control" system. A child support control system that ignores the money paid to the CP or ignores the actual support delivered to the children is doomed to inevitable failure. Failure of this child support control system involves the input being driven to zero when the NCP is exiled to self-employment and the output is driven to welfare.

A control system that is designed to add the feedback to the input rather than comparing the two is referred to as a "positive feedback" system and will fail immediately. Positive feedback is the phenomenon experienced when a microphone is too close to the speaker. The sound received by the microphone is amplified and delivered to the speaker, which is received by the microphone and amplified again and so forth.

Positive feedback instability will become very apparent in California when

- The new welfare reform package entices employers to hire, give raises, and promotions to CPs, while NCPs are allowed to be fired to make room for them. ¹⁰
- The new welfare reform package entices CPs to get married again, while the state's child support guideline promotes divorce, resulting in new NCPs being created by recycled CPs. ¹⁰
- The federal government pays incentives and bonuses for operating CSE, while the NCP must be driven into financial insolvency before CSE is allowed to operate.
- The federal government allows CSE to keep a percentage of child support collected, while CSE uses the federal mandate to exile NCPs to self employment, deny them to hold licenses, and impose a financial embargo on them. ¹³

Citations:

¹ USC 42 1985, "Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights", <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/42/1985.html>

(3) Depriving persons of rights or privileges

If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws; or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving or securing to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws; or if two or more persons conspire to prevent by force, intimidation, or threat, any citizen who is lawfully entitled to vote, from giving his support or advocacy in a legal manner, toward or in favor of the election of any lawfully qualified person as an elector for President or Vice President, or as a Member of Congress of the United States; or to injure any citizen in person or property on account of such support or advocacy; in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engaged therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators.

² USC 18 242, "Deprivation of rights under color of law", <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/242.html>

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

13 USC 42 666, "Requirement Of Statutorily Prescribed Procedures To Improve Effectiveness Of Child Support Enforcement", <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/42/666.html>

- (a) Types of procedures required
 - (1) Withholding from income of amounts payable as support
 - (2) Establishing paternity and establishing, modifying, and enforcing support obligations
 - (3) Enforcing a support order
 - (4) Liens
 - (5) Paternity establishment
 - (6) Require noncustodial parent give security, post a bond, or give some other guarantee to secure payment of overdue support
 - (7) Reporting arrearages to credit bureaus
 - (8) Withholding from income if arrearages occur without the necessity of filing application for services
 - (9) Payment or installment of support under any child support order not subject to retroactive modification
 - (10) Review and adjustment of support orders upon request
 - (11) Full faith and credit to a determination of paternity, whether established through voluntary acknowledgment or through administrative or judicial processes
 - (12) Locator information from interstate networks
 - (13) Recording of social security numbers in certain family matters
 - (14) High-volume, automated administrative enforcement in interstate cases
 - (15) Procedures to ensure that persons owing overdue support work or have a plan for payment of such support.
 - (16) Authority to withhold or suspend licenses
 - (17) Financial institution data matches
 - (18) Enforcement of orders against paternal or maternal grandparents
 - (19) Health care coverage

14 USC 42 666, "Requirement Of Statutorily Prescribed Procedures To Improve Effectiveness Of Child Support Enforcement", <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/42/666.html>

- (b) - Withholding from income of amounts payable as support
 - (6)(D) Provision must be made for the imposition of a fine against any employer who -
 - (i) discharges from employment, refuses to employ, or takes disciplinary action against any noncustodial parent subject to income withholding required by this subsection because of the existence of such withholding and the obligations or additional obligations which it imposes upon the employer; or
 - (ii) fails to withhold support from income or to pay such amounts to the State disbursement unit in accordance with this subsection.

15 CAFC 4055, California Family Code, "The statewide uniform guideline for determining child support orders", <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=fam&group=04001-05000&file=4050-4076>

16 California Judicial Council entitled "*Judicial Council Releases Report On State Child Support Guideline*", <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/newsreleases/nr64-98.htm>

17 TANF benefits across all states was extracted from Table 7-9 of the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, *2000 Greenbook, Section 7*, entitled "*Maximum Combined TANF And Food Stamp Benefit For Families Of One To Six Persons, January 1, 2000*", http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftg.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.37&filename=wm014_07.pdf&directory=/diskb/wais/data/106_green_book

18 CAFC 4053, California Family Code, "In implementing the statewide uniform guideline, the courts shall adhere to the following principles:", <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=fam&group=04001-05000&file=40504076>

- (i) It is presumed that a parent having primary physical responsibility for the children contributes a significant portion of available resources for the support of the children.

19 USC 15 1666, "Correction of billing errors", <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/15/1666.html>

- (b) Billing error
 - (3) A reflection on a statement of goods or services not accepted by the obligor or his designee or not delivered to the obligor or his designee in accordance with the agreement made at the time of a transaction.

110 USC 42 603 (a) <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/42/603.html>

- (2) Healthy Marriage Promotion Grants -
 - (A) Authority - The Secretary shall award competitive grants to States, territories, and tribal organizations for not more than 50 percent of the cost of developing and implementing innovative programs to promote and support healthy, married, 2-parent families.
- (4)(C) FORMULA FOR MEASURING STATE PERFORMANCE -
 - (i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), not later than October 1, 2003, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Governors Association and the American Public Human Services Association shall develop a formula for measuring State performance in operating the State program funded under this part so as to achieve the goals of employment entry, job retention, and increased earnings from employment for families receiving assistance under the program, as measured on an absolute basis and on the basis of improvement in State performance.

"No fault" divorce provokes murder in Texas

645

Harris attempts to send a clear message

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/archive/u-v/untersshine/untersshine021403.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 02-13-03

The District Attorney told the jury of the options available to Ms Harris, rather than committing murder. The jury was told that if he is unfaithful, she could kick him out of his house, take his kids, take him to the cleaners, and make his life a living Hell.

"No fault" divorce disallows this blatant act of betrayal to be used as a lever in a divorce proceeding and Ms Harris was not the mother of this father's child. Ms Harris could only be guaranteed half of her husband's assets if she did the right thing and filed for divorce in "civil" court. Getting custody of her unfaithful husband's child would bring a tidy percentage of the only biological parent's income, but her income might be comparable and would guarantee a trial.

Ms Harris knows that any wife could bear the fruit of her neighborhood's loins, and have the right or the duty to kick her husband out of the house, take his kids, take him to the cleaners, and make his life a living Hell. Ms Harris was not in fear of what she stood to lose, she was enraged that an unfaithful hose-bucket that commits paternity fraud would be financially independent, while Ms Harris would only get severance pay for her undying devotion and monogamy.

It seems like only yesterday, divorce courts would argue endlessly about infidelity, mental cruelty, sexual abandonment, and a litany of relationship rhetoric. Now, "no fault" divorce has boiled down to incurable insanity or irreconcilable differences, to allow the civil court to establish a child support cash flow.

Ms Harris knew that there would be no justice in civil court, and was experiencing a watered down version of the outrage experienced by any noncustodial parent, who expects due process in a "no fault" divorce court. The motive for a family law murder is strong enough to justify the homicide in some "no fault" divorce states.

Ms Harris intended to send a clear message; "Betrayal in all its forms, has no place in civilized society".

Ms Harris went to where she told the Private Investigators to go, after she gathered up her husband's child. Ms Harris was going to show this child what kind of father she had. Ms Harris was planning to confront her husband escorting his mistress and provoke him to kick her ass on film in front of his child. Ms Harris was going to drag herself back to the car all bloody and scream "see what you father did to me? What kind of man is he?"

Ms Harris was not going to get her poetic justice that easy, because he didn't fall for that old trick. Ms Harris climbed into the car, next to this man's child, and crushed him over and over and over again, while his child begged her and begged her and begged her to stop.

The jury would hear of her continuous devotion, her parenting miracles, her successful career, and a courtroom full of positive character witnesses. The jury would hear of the dates and times of the recorded interludes with the victim's receptionist, by a team of private investigators. The jury would see 27 8x10 color glossy photographs, with circles and arrows, and a paragraph on the back of each one, explaining what each one was, to be used as evidence against him.

The jurors placed themselves in Ms Harris's shoes and decided, "I would have taken half his assets, moved out, and requested visitation with his child. If this were Robert Blake it would be different, he was acting out of fear. This woman had nothing to lose, and she did it in front of the kid".

The family law system provoked this act of violence and has completely shattered an innocent child's life. Father dead, Grandma and Grandpa glad he is, and a step-mom who may someday be released. The child needs a parachute, a life raft, or something to reassure her that this is not normal.

The Family Law system incorporates "no fault" divorce to grease the skids, for the state's money machine of mass destruction. A partnership contract founded on monogamy and sanctified before the Lord is only viewed as proof of paternity in today's family court.

Mississippi is the only state that still entertains "yo fault" divorce. Mississippi only demands 14% of an NCP's net income for 1 child, 20% for 2, and 22% for 3. Reasonable child support and causal divorce prevents family law homicides and the segregation of children and parents. Heterosexual taxpayers that dare to raise children are urged to seek asylum in Mississippi to avoid slavery.

Jurors Deliberate Sentence for Clara Harris

AP, 02-14-03

HOUSTON — Prosecutors urged a jury to send Clara Harris to prison Friday for murdering her cheating husband by mowing him down with her Mercedes, rejecting defense calls to have sympathy for "a good mother and a good wife."

"Probation is not appropriate in this case," district attorney Mia Magness told the jury that convicted Harris on Thursday. "If the situation were reversed and David Harris had run her down, would you consider probation?"

"Here's a woman who had everything. And she chose, she chose to ruin it."

Jurors began deliberating after prosecution and defense arguments on the sentencing phase were completed Friday morning. They could decide anywhere from probation to life in prison for Harris. If jurors determine she acted out of "sudden passion," they could consider a lighter sentence of up to 20 years in prison.

Harris, a 45-year-old dentist, was convicted of murder Thursday by the jurors, who deliberated just eight hours over two days. Her orthodontist husband was run over July 24 after she found him leaving with his mistress from the hotel where the Harrises were married. The wedding was on Valentine's Day 1992, exactly 11 years ago Friday.

Magness made no specific recommendation on length of sentence to the jurors.

"I'm respectfully requesting that you send her to prison, because she has earned it and because David Harris deserves it," she said. Defense attorneys asked for no more than 10 years' probation, contending sudden passion drove her.

"Clara Harris is a person respected by her neighbors, loved by her neighbors, loved by the very colleagues that she employed," defense lawyer George Parnham said.

"She worked hard, she is and was a good mother and a good wife," he said.

Magness, however, argued that Harris, in her testimony, never said she was acting under the influence of sudden passion when she circled over her husband with the car. Harris had claimed she was aiming only to damage his lover's car.

"She never said to you that she was mad," the prosecutor said. "She never admitted she was angry, there was fear, terror or resentment. The most she said to you was, 'I was upset.'"

Harris, who returned to the courtroom Friday after spending a night in jail, wore no makeup or jewelry to court for the first time during the four-week trial. She sobbed quietly at times as Parnham spoke, then buried her head in her hands, nodding in disagreement as Magness suggested Harris was using her 4-year-old twin boys as "a shield" to gain probation. "She ought to not take credit for making herself a single parent," Magness said.

In punishment phase testimony Thursday, Parnham called seven witnesses, including David Harris' father, mother and brother.

"Our motivation stems from the word forgiveness," Gerald Harris testified of his support for his daughter-in-law. "This tragedy was a very strong blow against our family. We feel like a member of our family has erred and we forgive that. We don't feel like Clara intended to kill David."

The prosecution attempted to get jurors to focus on who David Harris was and the impact his death had on his 17-year-old daughter, Lindsey Harris. She was a passenger in the car as her father was struck.

"I only got to spend 16 1/2 years with him and I had so much more planned," Lindsey Harris testified. "It's not fair for someone to take my dad away from me."

The teenager, who lives in Ohio with her mother and stepfather, told jurors she had planned to attend college in Texas to be closer to her father and wanted to be an orthodontist like him.

"Everything was perfect and that's how it was going to be -- then it was ruined," she said.

The teen testified that after her father's death, she retrieved his clothes from a trash can where her stepmother had ordered they be thrown. She said she took her father's belongings into her bedroom to "feel like he was there with me."

Clara Harris began sobbing and prosecutors immediately asked that jurors be removed from the courtroom. As they were ushered out, the dentist cried out to her stepdaughter: "I'm sorry, Lindsey! I'm sorry, baby!"

I'm going to pretend I didn't hear that

644

The feminist perspective just got worse

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/u-v/untersshine/untersshine021203.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 02-11-03

The article entitled "[And ow for the feminist perspective](#)", "The 'Fathers Rights Movement' exists to dodge child support" should include the following edited footnote:

12 FoxNews, John Kasich vs Glenn Sacks, "30 Years After Roe v. Wade, How About Choice for Men?"

- The nested paraphrase "The 'Father's Rights Movement' is all about men who are attempting to avoid supporting their children", seemed necessary since the men's and father's rights movement coincide when child support is at issue, and to avoid legal liability by propagating a baseless allegation that drinking beer at night causes guys to get mad at paying child support.
- The actual quote by John Kasich was "I think the men's rights movement frankly was Glenn honestly was founded by a bunch of guys drinking beer one night mad that they had to do child support payments. I think it is just irresponsible."
- The Glenn Sacks approved paraphrase is "...the men's rights movement...was founded by a bunch of guys drinking beer one night mad that they had to do child support payments. I think it is just irresponsible."

BUT WAIT A TICK, THIS SOUNDS ALL TOO FAMILIAR!

Quoting from the Policy Studies Inc (PSI) webpage:

"In 1984, three friends who wanted to make a difference joined each other for dinner. Seeing that changes in federal law were about to create a new opportunity to provide child support consulting services to government, they formed a small firm, based on a simple mission: Do socially useful work, have fun, and make money". 1

Perhaps Kasich experienced a "Freudian slip", or a "cause and effect reversal", or a form of "projection and transference". Perhaps the reason why groups of guys are mad at paying child support is because an irresponsible child support consulting service was founded after eating dinner one night in 1984. I would like to know how Kasich knew they were drinking beer.

PSI is based out of Denver, CO and since 1984, has grown to a \$93 million dollar company, operating around the country and abroad. While business has expanded tremendously, the mission remains the same. 1 PSI has offered innovative solutions in privatization, consulting and research, and technology to the federal government, 49 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Canada, and Australia. 2 PSI strives to create an environment which encourages employees to take risks without being penalized for errors. 3

It seems Kasich may be repressing insider knowledge, obtained during his 1982 stint as a member of the House of Representatives, which may be bubbling to the surface concerning PSI involvement in subverting federal laws to the states 4 and cooking the books for county child support agencies. 5

Kasich may allow us to uncover the ways and means by which these outrageous state child support guidelines established by PSI 6 are being fraudulently reported to the House of Representatives by the Institute for Family and Social Responsibility (FASR). 7

Perhaps John Kasich (R-Ohio) 8, Robert Williams (PSI), 9 and Maureen Pirog (FASR) 10 were the three friends eating dinner, and drinking beer, and joining each other that night in 1984, where they hatched a plan to exploit men's children for money. Kasich may have been "neuralized" after refusing to take part in this sinister conspiracy and he is just now starting to remember.

FASR is based out of the University of Indiana at Bloomington (UIB) and is paid by the taxpayers to operate as the clearinghouse for Child Support Enforcement statistics. 11 Recently a porn film was based out of UIB that is paid by the taxpayers to operate as an institution of higher learning. 12 A Nazi loving child molester was once basing his operations out of UIB. 13 How can anyone institute family and social responsibility from this University of treason, decadence, depravity, and the exploitation of children for money and sex?

Beer companies that sponsor FOX Network should pull their endorsement until Kasich apologizes for identifying their product as the common denominator regarding welfare reform and he should be made to answer the question "What did you know, and when did you stop knowing it?"

Citations:

- \1 About PSI, http://www.policy-studies.com/about/about_intro.htm
- \2 Welcome to PSI, <http://www.policy-studies.com/default2.htm>
- \3 PSI Corporate Values, http://www.policy-studies.com/about/about_values.htm
- \4 Child Support Project (AB 1058), THE REVIEW OF CALIFORNIA'S STATEWIDE UNIFORM CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE 2001, reported by Policy Studies Inc. (PSI), <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/programs/description/1058study2001.htm>
- \5 Los Angeles Times, Greg Krikorian, 06-03-01, "County Child Program's Accounting Under Scrutiny by State" *Services: Inflated figures could affect funding statewide. A private firm is hired to examine the system*, and Los Angeles Times, Greg Krikorian, 01-05-02, "Reformed Child Support System Termed a Success" *Services: Glowing report comes on the two-year anniversary of the state agency that collects court-ordered payments, whose amounts doubled on average per case.*
- \6 Child support guideline data obtained from AllLaw.com and assumes NCP with 0% custody, \$4,400/mo net income (Vermont and New Hampshire are not included since you must pay to find out how much you would owe in these states) <http://www.alllaw.com/calculators/Childsupport/>
- \7 US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, GREENBOOK, Section 8, CSE, Table 8-2 - Interstate child support guidelines reported by Pirog, Klotz, and Buyers from the Institute of Family and Social Responsibility (FASR), http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftpl.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=wm014_08.pdf&directory=/disk2/wais/data/106_green_book, ,
- \8 John Kasich, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,21715,00.html>
- \9 Robert Williams <http://www.policy-studies.com/about/bwilliams.htm>
- \10 Maureen A. Pirog, <http://www.indiana.edu/~speaweb/fcltydir/pirog.html>
- \11 National Child Support Enforcement Research Clearinghouse, <http://www.spea.indiana.edu/ncsea/>
- \12 *The O'Reilly Factor*, 12-10-02, 'Dorm Porn', *A Student Speaks Out*, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,72770,00.html>
- \13 FoxNews, Trace Gallagher, 02-07-03, Kinsey Film Contested, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,77966,00.html>

And Now for the Feminist Perspective

The "Fathers Rights Movement" exists to dodge child support
<http://mensnewsdaily.com/stories/u-v/untersshine/untersshine021003.htm>

643

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 02-08-03

The "No Spin Zone" continues to echo the feminist perspective regarding the plight facing men who dare to have sex with women. The topic of discussion was the unfair advantage that the courts grant to a pregnant woman, regarding their exploitation of unplanned children for money. Glenn Sacks was attempting to make a distinction between men who consciously decide to be fathers, and men who become fathers due to an unprotected "poke in the whiskers":

The National Organization for Women (NOW) has portrayed a father's fight for child custody as "the fathers' bitterness about being required to pay child support" 1

"The 'Father's Rights Movement' is all about men who are attempting to avoid supporting their children" 2 spewed the stand in for Bill O'Reilly, capping off the interview with Glenn Sacks. The stand in, John Kasich, is a former member of the House of Representatives, where he built a reputation as an attacker of bloated government. All members of the House of Representatives believe child support demanded by each state is the same as that state's welfare benefits. 3 Mr. Kasich has been deceived into thinking child support is reasonable in all states.

Bill O'Reilly entitled a previous segment "Is it your constitutional right to have babies and not support them?" 4, regarding a Wisconsin man who was ordered by the court to "cease and desist" impregnating women.

When the California governor, Gray Davis, vetoed a bill to end paternity fraud, the Bill O'Reilly interview with Dianna Thompson was mysteriously postponed. It seems that Bill O'Reilly is still snake bit from the interview with Stephen Baskerville, who proceeded to lay down the family law, defending Deadbeat Dads, and made Bill O'Reilly like it. 5

The hypocrisy of this "No Spin" perspective becomes glaring if you are familiar with the many crusades launched by Bill O'Reilly concerning charities not handing over money to the intended recipients. The public misperception seems to be that a child has a legal right to the money paid for its support. As if to say "There is no incentive for a woman to get pregnant seeking child support, since she would have nothing to gain".

A father earning \$53,000/yr net income in California must pay \$1,100/mo to the mother of his child (tax-free, regardless of the mother's income, for at least 18 years, never account for a dime). 6 If the mother is on welfare in California, the taxpayers pay her \$384/mo and \$243/mo for the child for a total of \$627/mo (food stamps, work requirements, strict accountability). 7

The public misperception as a function of circumstance may be described as follows:

- \$473/mo - Father dared to raise children - pays for the mother and child. (\$1,100 - \$627).
- \$857/mo - Father didn't wear a rubber - pays only for the child. (\$1,100 - \$243).
- \$1,100/mo - Father is not the father - must not pay for the child (\$1,100 - \$0).

The public perception of a "Deadbeat Dad" seems to revolve around a father's inability to keep his family off the welfare roles. The state's perception is that if Dads don't fall behind in child support the state will lose all federal funding. The federal perception should be that the states must implement the child support guidelines as reported to the House of Representatives in the Greenbook. 8 If the state child support guideline were the same as the state welfare benefit then the public perception would equal the truth.

If I were a former member of the House of Representatives (John Kasich) and learned that the financial demands forced on my constituents were fraudulently reported to hide the common denominator to welfare reform, I would demand to "make it accurate, or make it law". The family law solution is already in place at the federal level and is waiting for our legislators to demand that we enforce it. 9

Gone are the days when a woman would attempt to get pregnant to guilt the man of her dreams into marrying her. Now getting pregnant represents a tax-free windfall for at least 18 years without any responsibility to account for a dime. This very lucrative arrangement provokes gullible women to:

- Dissolve a marriage.
 - Instigate an out-of-wedlock birth.
 - Commit paternity fraud.
 - Motivate their own murder (in California).

These startling revelations may raise more questions:

- If the public perception is that child support is fair, then why is Dad expected to kill Mom in California?
- Why would a woman stop instigating children when there is no limit to this tax-free money?
- Why would a woman choose to buy the cow, when she can milk it through the fence?
- Why should lesbians be paid to raise a family at the expense of their chosen host, while gay men must rely on pride parades to acquire new family members?

Citations:

1 NOW Family Court Report 2002. <http://www.canow.org/fam.html>, The complete PDF document is at the following link http://www.canow.org/fam_report.pdf

2 FoxNews, John Kasich vs Glenn Sacks, "30 Years After Roe v. Wade, How About Choice for Men?"

- The nested paraphrase "The 'Father's Rights Movement' is all about men who are attempting to avoid supporting their children", was necessary due to the men's and father's rights movement coinciding when child support is at issue, and to avoid legal liability by propagating a baseless allegation that drinking beer at night causes guys to get mad at paying child support.
- The actual quote by John Kasich was "I think the men's rights movement frankly was Glenn honestly was founded by a bunch of guys drinking beer one night mad that they had to do child support payments. I think it is just irresponsible."
- The Glenn Sacks approved paraphrase is "...the men's rights movement...was founded by a bunch of guys drinking beer one night mad that they had to do child support payments. I think it is just irresponsible."

3 Interstate child support guideline data was obtained from Table 8-2 of the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means [2000 Greenbook, Section 8](#), entitled "Amount Of Child Support Awarded By State Guidelines In Various Cases", http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=wm014_08.pdf&directory=/disk2/wais/data/106_green_book

Pirog, Klotz, and Buyers (1997) have examined the differences in child support guidelines across States. Their approach was to define five hypothetical cases of custodial mothers and noncustodial fathers that capture a range of differences in income, expenses, and other factors that influence the amount of child support payments computed under the guidelines adopted by the various States. State 1997 guidelines were then applied to each of the five cases to compute the amount of child support that would be due. In each of the five cases, the mother and father are divorced. The father lives alone while the mother lives with the couples' two children, ages 7 and 13. The father pays union dues of \$30 per month and health insurance for the children of \$25 per month. The mother incurs monthly employment-related childcare expenses of \$150. The income of the father and mother that is entitled "Case D" specifies a father = \$4,400/mo and a mother = \$1,760/mo.

4 Bill O'Reilly, FoxNews, 10-10-02, "Is it your constitutional right to have babies and not support them?"

<http://search.foxnews.com/cgi-bin/website?http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,65322,00.html>

5 Bill O'Reilly, FoxNews, 10-16-00 "The O'Reilly Factor": "Deadbeat Dads", <http://www.dadi.org/b-factos.htm>

6 Interstate child support guideline data was obtained from [AllLaw.com](#) and assumes 0% custody, \$4,400/mo NCP net income (Vermont and New Hampshire are not included in the analysis since you must pay to find out how much you would owe in these states), <http://alllaw.com/calculators/Childsupport/>

7 TANF benefits across all states was extracted from Table 7-9 of the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, [2000 Greenbook, Section 7](#), entitled "Maximum Combined TANF And Food Stamp Benefit For Families Of One To Six Persons, January 1, 2000", http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.37&filename=wm014_07.pdf&directory=/diskb/wais/data/106_green_book

Food stamp calculations assume that the family does not receive an excess shelter deduction. In very low benefit States, combined benefits shown reflect the maximum food stamp allotment for the family size, but in some States the excess shelter deduction would increase food stamps (by up to \$83 monthly—more in Alaska and Hawaii). Calculations assume a single-parent family with no earned income and use normal rounding rules. Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service.

NASA links 'plane crash' to loss of life over Florida

642

Space station crew urges speedy but thorough investigation

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/u-z/untersshine/untersshine020603.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 02-03-03

A group of 7 highly trained scientists were propelled into outer space and successfully accomplished their mission. They were provided the ways and means to arrive at their job site and they accepted the inherent risks. Like many space enthusiasts, who wish to contribute to advancing the space program, they were all dying to get up there. Unfortunately, as fate would have it, these volunteer pioneers would be dying attempting to come home. These heroes will forever be remembered, for the ultimate sacrifice they made, and I think that I speak for the rest of the aerospace industry in saying, "they will not have died in vein".

NASA claims that there can only be one "bright side", during reentry into the Earth's atmosphere. It is highly desirable to expose that side of the vehicle prepared for the incredible friction, which is inherent with plunging from a vacuum into something at a speed of 12,000 miles an hour. The dynamics involved with the last 40 miles of an astronaut's trip home demands the vehicle to transform momentarily into a sizzling white hot configuration of composite ceramic and metal. Perhaps there will come a day when science discovers a better way to cheat gravity, and these death defying hoops that we force scientists to jump through will be regarded by our children as ignorant, medieval, and barbaric.

Perhaps the official "bright side", of this globally recognized tragedy, will finally become apparent following NASA's investigation into this failed attempt to transport people from one place to another. Sometimes it takes a team of rocket scientists from NASA to convince someone of a problem, even if it is intuitively obvious to most casual observer. Many people might be shocked to learn that this tragedy is tightly linked to the recent terrorist attacks of 911. This sinister connection will not be recognized, between this global tragedy and our recent national tragedy, until it is a conclusion that was arrived at by a representative from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I don't believe that we need NASA to issue the following statement:

"Since the crash site of this accident was located 40 miles above the tarmac, NASA is relieved that civilians on the ground escaped injury. After processing the data acquired during this, and previous missions, as well as, meticulously analyzing the debris that we have recovered, we have conclusive proof that a 'plane crash' took the lives of these travelers. NASA has always recognized the importance of preventing plane crashes, despite the unbelievable obstacles we are forced to overcome. NASA renews our resolve to eliminate plane crashes and we challenge the commercial airlines to do the same. NASA has data that suggests the Challenger plane crash that claimed 5 lives was similar to the one that claimed 250 lives in Dallas-Fort Worth a few days later. The plane crashes, which claimed over 2,000 lives on 911, were not unlike the one claiming 250 lives in New Jersey a few days later. NASA believes that exterminating suspected terrorists, and waging war on countries that harbor them will prevent an insignificant number of plane crashes. NASA is wondering whether anymore scientists should be put in harms way until this country stops forcing innocent civilians into harms way."

NASA endeavors to expand our horizons to enhance the lives of our children and their children. NASA represents scientific credibility using data as a tool and probability as a lever and represents the scientific pinnacle that beckons young minds to aspire to. Perhaps it may be prudent for NASA to take a cursory look at insuring that our children will be around to benefit from the space program. While the nation is demanding to know the cause of this tragedy and politicians try to justify funding, we wait for the gratuitous plane crash that usually follows so we can chalk up another 250.

As the Responsible Engineer for the platform stabilization and angle measurement subsystems within the astro-inertial guidance system used on military reconnaissance aircraft, as well as the attitude subsystem within the inertial measurement unit used on a military intercontinental ballistic missile, I justified my contribution as "making war safer for civilians". Insuring that targets are accurately located and that only the targets will be destroyed.

As a Deadbeat Dad in the Civil and Criminal court subsystems within the California family law system that is used to exploit children for money, I justify my contribution as, "making divorce safer for children and the parents that can financially support them". In an effort to keep the back channels open, in an attempt to stave off disaster.

Although the above qualifications may not allow me to consider myself a "rocket scientist", I am still ready to contribute to the "inner space program" and draw the following conclusions regarding the Family Law system in this country:

- Start collecting data regarding the deaths of family members exposed to the family law system.
- Start collecting data regarding the money spent to support the children (regardless of exposure to the family law system)
- Stop collecting opinions, polls, and hearsay as data.
- Start establishing paternity at childbirth.
- Start enforcing the federal laws that provide NCP protection from employer discrimination and consumer fraud.
- Start auditing all data provided by states regarding child support payments, paternity percentages, and TANF benefits.
- Stop using the Institute for family and Social Responsibility (FASR) as the Clearinghouse for Child Support Enforcement statistics.
- Stop Policy Studies Inc. from practicing child support consultation in 49 states, Canada, Australia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Environmentalists may feel that at least the fiery reentry, being replayed by the media, has finally focused the world's attention on the ozone layer.

Jim Untersshine, GZS of MS, gzs@gndzerosrv.com, www.gndzerosrv.com

Page 14

Snow Knows Fraud

641

NCPs demand "No taxation by misrepresentation"

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/u-z/untersshine012803.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 01-28-03

John Snow is expected to be appointed by President Bush to fill the Secretary of Treasury Cabinet post. Allegations of a misdemeanor traffic violation and a frivolous family law proceeding may be the only thing standing in Snow's way. 11 More than 12 million noncustodial parents (NCP) across the nation are on the edge of their seat in anticipation of the events that may follow.

"No taxation by misrepresentation" may be the credo of this new family law tea party. Provoked by this new age of accountability, John Snow may immediately take action to stop the extermination of taxpayers paying child support and identify the various forms of fraud used against them. Snow is an NCP and father of 2 children involving the state of Maryland. This family law insight may motivate his attempt to snatch heterosexual taxpayers, who dare to raise children, from the jaws of family law genocide. 12

John Snow may have the clarity to identify the ways and means by which implements of our own creation are being used as a weapon of mass destruction against us. John Snow may identify the fraudulent reporting of the financial demands forced on NCPs to the US House Ways and Means Committee and invoke a form of legal dogma by demanding that our legislators "Make it accurate, or make it law". John Snow may demand that states enforce federal laws that protect taxpayers who pay child support from unscrupulous employers, thereby insuring the president's new welfare reform package is a "saving grace" rather than a "coup de grâce".

Every NCP, who is Secretary of the Treasury Department, controls the following agencies

- The [Internal Revenue Service](#) 13 provides American taxpayers with top quality service by helping them understand and meet their tax responsibilities and by applying the tax law with integrity and fairness to all.
- The [U.S. Secret Service](#) 14 protects our nation's leaders, visiting world leaders, national special security events, and the integrity of the nation's currency and financial systems.
- The [Financial Crimes Enforcement Network \(FinCEN\)](#) 15 supports law enforcement investigative efforts and fosters interagency and global cooperation against domestic and international financial crimes; and to provide U.S. policy makers with strategic analyses of domestic and worldwide money laundering developments, trends and patterns.

Every NCP, who pays child support, is a victim of consumer fraud. 16

Every CP who receives child support is guilty of tax evasion. NCPs must pay income tax on the money they earn to pay child support. The children have no legal right to the money paid for their support. The money that is paid to the CP for child support, which is not used to support the children, becomes tax-free income to the CP.

Every NCP, who pays child support, pays the same taxes as any other taxpayer.

These taxes are used to pay for families on welfare (TANF) and the operating costs of Child Support Enforcement (CSE). NCPs are not only required to pay the TANF benefit amount to keep the family off of the welfare roles, they are forced to pay more. The amount of child support that exceeds the TANF benefits paid to a family on welfare should be recognized as a new version of alimony. Alimony is income received by the CP and must be tax deductible by the NCP.

The following alimony data is the result of subtracting the AllLaw.com interstate child support guidelines from the interstate TANF benefits (\$4,400/mo NCP net income). 17 18

- The average alimony across states is \$240/mo for 1 child, \$421/mo for 2, and \$529/mo for 3.
- Georgia leads the nation demanding \$776/mo alimony regarding 1 child.
- California leads the nation demanding \$947/mo alimony regarding 2 children.
- California leads the nation demanding \$1,212/mo alimony regarding 3 children.

Every NCP, who doesn't pay child support, doesn't pay taxes.

The taxpayers must foot the bill for supporting this NCP's family. The financial demands that are imposed on a NCP depend on that state's child support guideline. The data provided above might lead one to believe that Georgia and California are leading the nation in eliminating taxpayers by driving NCPs into financial insolvency. Many taxpayers may agree that a state's child support guideline should equal the TANF benefits to give the NCP every chance to continue to pay taxes as well as keep their family off of the welfare roles. Believe it or not, that is exactly what our lawmakers are being told by the Institute for Family and Social Responsibility (FASR). 19

The following alimony data is the result of subtracting the FASR interstate child support guidelines from the interstate TANF benefits (regarding 2 children). 17 10

- The average alimony across states is \$-42/mo (negative alimony reflects child support demanded is less than TANF benefits)
- Indiana leads the nation demanding \$323/mo alimony (FASR is based out of the University of Indiana at Bloomington).
- California ranks 25th in the nation demanding \$-43/mo alimony
- Alaska is last in the nation demanding \$-555/mo alimony

Every NCP, who doesn't pay child support, is unemployed.

Garnishing NCP unemployment benefits will not keep the CP off of the welfare roles. Some states may be guilty of eliminating taxpayers by denying the NCP federal protection regarding employer discrimination due to the existence of child support garnishments 11 that is padded with this new version of alimony. NCPs can have as much as 65% of their gross income garnished by an employer regarding child support obligations. 12 An NCP who suffers a 65% pay cut may not maintain the same level of productivity. The employer may "see the writing on the wall" regarding this unfortunate employee, who was thrown to the family law wolves, and expedite this NCP's termination. Upon termination of employment, the NCP's income now becomes imputed with regard to child support obligations, and the arrearage plus interest continues to grow which exiles this NCP to self-employment. NCPs take great comfort in the fact that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) does not do the same.

Citations:

- 11** "White House standing by Snow nomination for Treasury job despite revelations of DUI arrest, child-support dispute", *Martin Crutsinger, AP Economics Writer*, 01-22-03, http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20030122/ap_wo_en_po/na_pol_us_snow_nomination_1
- 12** USC 18 1091 - "Genocide"
 (a) Basic Offense. -
 Whoever, whether in time of peace or in time of war, in a circumstance described in subsection (d) and with the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in substantial part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group as such -
 (1) kills members of that group;
 (2) causes serious bodily injury to members of that group;
 (3) causes the permanent impairment of the mental faculties of members of the group through drugs, torture, or similar techniques;
 (4) subjects the group to conditions of life that are intended to cause the physical destruction of the group in whole or in part;
 (5) imposes measures intended to prevent births within the group; or
 (6) transfers by force children of the group to another group; or attempts to do so, shall be punished as provided in subsection (b).
- 13** <http://www.ustreas.gov/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?http://www.treas.gov/fincen/>
- 14** <http://www.ustreas.gov/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?http://www.irs.treas.gov/>
- 15** <http://www.ustreas.gov/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?http://www.treas.gov/usss/http://www.ustreas.gov/cgi-bin/redirect.cgi?http://www.treas.gov/usss/>
- 16** USC 15 1666 b3 - "Correction of billing errors", "Billing error"
 (3) A reflection on a statement of goods or services not accepted by the obligor or his designee or not delivered to the obligor or his designee in accordance with the agreement made at the time of a transaction.
- 17** TANF benefits across all states was extracted from Table 7-9 of the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, *2000 Greenbook, Section 7*, entitled "Maximum Combined TANF And Food Stamp Benefit For Families Of One To Six Persons, January 1, 2000", http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftg.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.37&filename=wm014_07.pdf&directory=/diskb/wais/data/106_green_book
 Food stamp calculations assume that the family does not receive an excess shelter deduction. In very low benefit States, combined benefits shown reflect the maximum food stamp allotment for the family size, but in some States the excess shelter deduction would increase food stamps (by up to \$83 monthly—more in Alaska and Hawaii). Calculations assume a single-parent family with no earned income and use normal rounding rules. Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service.
- 18** Interstate child support guideline data was obtained from [AllLaw.com](http://www.alllaw.com) and assumes 0% custody, \$4,400/mo NCP net income (Vermont and New Hampshire are not included in the analysis since you must pay to find out how much you would owe in these states), <http://alllaw.com/calculators/Childsupport/>
- 19** The Institute for Family and Social Responsibility, Maurine Pirog-Good, based at the University of Indiana at Bloomington, and is paid by the federal government to operate as the clearinghouse for child support enforcement statistics. <http://www.spea.indiana.edu/fasr/>
- 110** Interstate child support guideline data was obtained from Table 8-2 of the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means *2000 Greenbook, Section 8*, entitled "Amount Of Child Support Awarded By State Guidelines In Various Cases", http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftg.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=wm014_08.pdf&directory=/disk2/wais/data/106_green_book
 Pirog, Klotz, and Buyers (1997) have examined the differences in child support guidelines across States. Their approach was to define five hypothetical cases of custodial mothers and noncustodial fathers that capture a range of differences in income, expenses, and other factors that influence the amount of child support payments computed under the guidelines adopted by the various States. State 1997 guidelines were then applied to each of the five cases to compute the amount of child support that would be due. In each of the five cases, the mother and father are divorced. The father lives alone while the mother lives with the couples' two children, ages 7 and 13. The father pays union dues of \$30 per month and health insurance for the children of \$25 per month. The mother incurs monthly employment-related child care expenses of \$150. The income of the father and mother that is entitled "Case D" specifies a father = \$4,400/mo and a mother = \$1,760/mo.
- 111** USC 42 666 b6Di - "Requirement Of Statutorily Prescribed Procedures To Improve Effectiveness Of Child Support Enforcement", "Withholding from income of amounts payable as support"
 (D) Provision must be made for the imposition of a fine against any employer who -
 (i) discharges from employment, refuses to employ, or takes disciplinary action against any noncustodial parent subject to income withholding required by this subsection because of the existence of such withholding and the obligations or additional obligations which it imposes upon the employer.
- 112** USC 15 1673 b2B - "Restriction on garnishment"
 (B) where such individual is not supporting such a spouse or dependent child described in clause (A), 60 per centum of such individual's disposable earnings for that week; except that, with respect to the disposable earnings of any individual for any workweek, the 50 per centum specified in clause (A) shall be deemed to be 55 per centum and the 60 per centum specified in clause (B) shall be deemed to be 65 per centum, if and to the extent that such earnings are subject to garnishment to enforce a support order with respect to a period which is prior to the twelve-week period which ends with the beginning of such workweek.

White House standing by Snow nomination for Treasury job despite revelations of DUI arrest, child-support dispute

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20030122/ap_wo_en_po/na_pol_us_snow_nomination_1

MARTIN CRUTSINGER, AP Economics Writer, 01-22-03

WASHINGTON - The White House says revelations that John Snow was arrested for drunken driving in 1982 and was involved in a child-support dispute with his ex-wife should not disqualify him from joining President George W. Bush's Cabinet as Treasury secretary.

The Bush administration learned about both issues as part of its vetting process of Snow's nomination, presidential spokesman Ari Fleischer told reporters late Tuesday "It's not relevant to his duties. We support him," Fleischer said.

Fleischer spoke after the Senate Finance Committee released a questionnaire Snow filled out in which he was asked, among other things, whether he had ever been charged with a criminal offense.

"In 1982 I was arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol in West Valley City, Utah," Snow said. "I was never convicted of that charge and the prosecuting attorney voluntarily dismissed the charge before trial."

Snow said that in connection with the incident he paid a \$334 fine "for making an unauthorized left turn with my automobile. I have never been charged with or convicted of any other offense."

In an addendum to the questionnaire, Snow disclosed that his ex-wife, Frederica Wheeler, sued him in Montgomery County, Maryland, in March 1988, alleging that he failed to pay child support and other costs associated with the care of his two sons.

Snow said he denied the charges, but the court found he failed to pay child support for his son Ian over a 19-month period and failed to pay Ian's transportation and allowance costs at college.

Snow told the committee that he and his ex-wife settled the dispute in January 1991 "to spare the family the difficulty of a trial."

Reached late Tuesday night, Snow spokesman Dan Murphy said Snow would not have any further comment.

"This is a personal issue and the White House is the best place for comment," Murphy said.

Fleischer noted that the DUI charges had been dismissed. He said in the child-support dispute, the ex-wife's claim was made even though the son had lived with Snow and Snow believed he had fulfilled his obligations under the agreement.

Bush picked Snow, chairman of the CSX Corp. railroad company, last month to replace his first Treasury secretary, Paul O'Neill, who was ousted in a Cabinet shake-up of the administration's economic team.

Snow, who is scheduled to appear for a one-day Senate hearing Jan. 28, had been expected to face tough questioning about Bush's new \$674 billion economic stimulus program, which Democrats contend is weighted too heavily toward tax breaks for the wealthy and provides too little immediate support for the struggling economy.

It was unclear how the new revelations might affect the nomination, which had been expected to encounter little opposition.

Snow has announced that he would forgo a lucrative severance package estimated to total up to \$15 million that the CSX board could have awarded him.

Given last year's revelations about corporate accounting scandals, Snow was also expected to face questions next week about his management decisions as the head of CSX, the Richmond, Virginia-based railroad that he built into the largest freight line in the Eastern United States.

Snow, who held several top jobs in the Ford administration, has won widespread praise from business groups and lawmakers for his consensus-building abilities and his skill at dealing with Congress.

Supporters say he will be a capable salesman for the administration's economic program, in contrast to the sharp-spoken O'Neill.

Laci Peterson is missing in California

640

Another father is suspected of cheating family law justice

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/untersshine012203.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 01-21-03

It seems that potential fathers in California are now being motivated to kill the potential mother of their child. The same California motivation for murder that was forced on Gary Condit is now being served on Scott Peterson.

Typically fathers of existing children have hogged the limelight, when the mother of their children are found dead. O.J. Simpson and Robert Blake are both assumed to be responsible for the death of the mother of their children.

The media has tried to provide good reasons to suspect Scott Peterson of murdering his pregnant wife Laci. Exploring Scott's alleged affair with another woman, a life insurance policy, a fish story, and a missing co-ed from Cal-Poly. The media has also waved their hand at some statistical number that leads them to believe that 70% of the Nicole Simpsons, Bonny-Lee Bakelys, and Sandra Levys are being killed by the O. J. Simpsons, Robert Blakes, and Gary Condit.

The California Attorney General currently reports the following statewide homicide statistics: 1

- 26% of all female homicide victims were killed by their spouse
- 43% of all female homicide victims were killed by a family member.
- 41% of all child homicide victims were killed by a family member.
- 3% of all male homicide victims were killed by their spouse

Perhaps the above statistics are not as damning as the media's numbers, but many would still find them appalling. 1 out of 4 women killed in California were put to death by their spouse, while 2 out of 5 of the women or children killed in California were put to death by a member of their family (Parent/child, spouse, or other relative).

The California homicide data does not refine the categories to allow us to connect the dots. New categories could be added to identify spouses who are fathers responsible for the death of the mother as well as:

- The number of children between them.
- Whether the mother was pregnant.
- Whether it was accompanied by the suicide of the father.

What is the perceived motivation for murdering the mother of your child in California?

Regardless of marital status, California demands a noncustodial father to pay 25% of their net income plus medical care each month for 1 child, regardless of the mother's income 2. The California father will be relieved of his home and furnishings and half of his financial holdings. The child will have no legal right to the money paid for its support and the father must pay up to 18 years. The mother will determine the father's relationship with the child depending on whether she will allow it. If the father refuses to pay the extortion, he will be exiled to self-employment, denied to hold licenses, and imposed a financial embargo before facing debtor's prison.

Is the fear of indentured servitude and consumer fraud the motivation for a father to kill a mother in California, or is this just the public's perception?

Massachusetts demands 31% of a father's net income for 1 child. 3 Are the homicide statistics for Massachusetts similar to those of California? North Carolina has the lowest child support guideline demanding 11% of a father's net income for 1 child. 3 Is a father presumed to be a threat to a mother in North Carolina?

The financial demands placed on a noncustodial father in California only varies with the number of children. A father will pay 40% of his net income for 2 children and 50% for 3. California has the highest child support guideline in the nation for more than 1 child while North Carolina has the lowest demanding 15% net income for 2 children and 18% for 3. 3

If suicides and homicides were categorized across the nation to account for deaths related to fathers under control of the Family Law system and the number of children involved, then the human costs associated with the exploitation of children for money could be measured more accurately.

The child support guidelines are currently based on what the state Family Law courts can get away with. Maximizing the cash flow between parents insures the noncustodial parent will fall behind in child support allowing Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) and Child Support Enforcement (CSE) to receive federal funding. California brags that 80% of child support orders are entered by default 4, which allows the state to brag that they get away with imposing their outrageous child support guideline 80% of the time, not because the guideline is fair, but rather because there is no due process, rebuttability, or a jury.

Are the potential victims of the Family Law system in California attempting to disarm their assailant or are they insuring they will be judged by a jury of their peers?

Nicole Simpson, Sandra Levy, and Bonnie-Lee Bakely never asked to be the weapon in the family law home invasion in California, but they are not around to implicate the Family Law system as the possible motivation for their murder.

Citations:

1 CA Dept. of Justice - Homicide in California, 2000, <http://caag.state.ca.us/cjsc/publications/homicide/homi2000/cr1.pdf>, Chart 15 - Gender of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender, and Chart 17 - Age of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender

2 California Family Code 4055 assuming NCP with 0% custody, \$4,400/mo net income.

3 Child support guideline data obtained from [AllLaw.com](http://www.alllaw.com) and assumes NCP with 0% custody, \$4,400/mo net income (Vermont and New Hampshire are not included since you must pay to find out how much you would owe in these states)

4 Greg Krikorian, Times Staff Writer, 01-05-02 "Reformed Child Support System Termed a Success", *Services: Glowing report comes on the two-year anniversary of the state agency that collects court-ordered payments, whose amounts doubled on average per case.*

Obstruction of Justice in Florida

639

Paternity fraud is "a recipe for violence" warns Florida officer of the peace
<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/untersshine012203.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 01-13-03

Michael Anderson is being forced to "mentor a child" in Florida by paying \$666 per month for 18 years.^{\1} Although the child has no legal right to the damages awarded by the court, Mr. Anderson is forced to pay \$225 per month more than taxpayers if this 2 person family received welfare (TANF). ^{\2} If Mr. Anderson resists this form of indentured servitude, by refusing to pay into fraud, he may face debtor's prison.

As a member of local law enforcement in Tampa, Florida, Mr. Anderson was served up a heaping helping of family law justice and warns that the current law is "a recipe for violence." ^{\1} After Mr. Anderson obtained DNA proof that he was a victim of a confidence game, the Florida Supreme Court decided that this irrefutable evidence did not prove that Mr. Anderson was deceived. As if to say "she never said that this baby was yours, she said she couldn't believe it wasn't".

When the only person in a position to know the truth is not required to tell it, then judges are powerless to administer justice and the lawyers are powerless to seek it. Allowing a litigant to operate with impunity and granting them immunity from prosecution, results in a child who is denied to know the identity of its biological father, a man who is fraudulently sentenced to indentured servitude, and a possible source of federal incentives earned by the state's CSE for collecting the fraudulent child support payments.

The Family Law ramifications for "doing the right thing" may not be as bad as some states might think.

- Mother files for TANF benefits (\$442 per month in Florida ^{\2}),
- TANF receives 70% (\$309 per month in Florida) from the federal government and registers an out-of-wedlock birth ^{\3}
- CSE files default court orders assigning paternity to Usama Bin Laudin (without prejudice to either party).
- CSE attaches a percentage of Usama's net income (18% in Florida ^{\4}), unless Usama shows up to contest it
- CSE calculates 10% interest that has accrued since child birth using the income of Usama
- CSE applies this ever-growing arrearage to Usama's bank accounts, refunds and wages, denies his passports and licenses, tracks his whereabouts, and issues a warrant for his arrest.

How can we demand that Mr. Anderson continue to work for a Florida Attorney General who has turned his back on his troops. How can we expect Mr. Anderson to enforce laws uniformly when his boss is not required to do the same. Fraud is a crime and some may agree that "crime don't pay, people do".

The stronger your resolve to defend the walls of your mighty kingdom, the more unbearable the anguish to later find out that it was in reality your prison.

The common denominator regarding paternity fraud is establishing paternity at childbirth.

The common denominator regarding welfare reform is reducing the number of unwed mothers who cannot financially support their children.

The common denominator regarding violence in our schools and communities is giving our children an authority figure other than law enforcement.

The common denominator regarding anything involving church or state is, and forever shall be, our children.

Citations:

^{\1} Man Told To Support Child Of Another, Joe Follick, Tampa Bay Online,
http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/kr/20030110/lo_krtampa/man_told_to_support_child_of_another

^{\2} Table 7-9 - "Maximum Combined TANF And Food Stamp Benefit For Families Of One To Six Persons, January 1, 2000" US House Ways and Means Committee, Greenbook, Section 7, TANF

Florida reports \$293 per month TANF benefits for a 1 person family, \$442 for 2, \$587 for 3, \$721 for 4
California reports \$384 per month TANF benefits for a 1 person family, \$627 for 2, \$813 for 3, \$988 for 4.

^{\3} Table 8-20 "Paternities Established", Table 8-21 "Out-Of-Wedlock Births", Table 8-22 "Percentage of Paternities Established". US House Ways and Means Committee, Greenbook, Section 8, CSE. Florida's paternity establishment percentage was reported to be 68% in 1998 and represents over 23,000 out-of-wedlock births over and above paternity establishments. California's paternity establishment percentage was reported to be 123% in 1998 and represents over 34,000 paternity establishments over and above out-of-wedlock births. California has continued to exceed 100% paternity establishment since Clinton's welfare reform made it profitable in 1996

^{\4} AllLaw.com

Florida demands 18% of an NCP's net income for 1 child, 28% for 2, 36% for 3.
California demands 25% of an NCP's net income for 1 child, 40% for 2, 50% for 3

Man Told To Support Child Of Another

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/kr/20030110/lo_krtampa/man_told_to_support_child_of_another

JOE FOLLICK jfollick@tampatrib.com, 01-10-03

TALLAHASSEE - The Florida Supreme Court, by the narrowest of margins, ruled Thursday that a Tampa police officer must continue to pay \$8,000 a year in child support even though he is not the child's biological father.

In a 4-3 decision, the court sidestepped moral issues and simply said Michael Anderson failed to prove he was "defrauded" by his ex-wife, Cathy Anderson, when she told him twice that he was the biological father of her child.

Neither Anderson was available for comment Thursday.

Michael Anderson's attorney, Tom Elligett of Tampa, said he was disappointed and might request a rehearing.

Tom Casper, the Tampa attorney representing Cathy Anderson, said he was pleased the court found that his client was not lying when she told Michael Anderson he was the father. He said Cathy Anderson still believes Michael Anderson is the father.

"An answer that turns out to be incorrect is not sufficient to meet the [necessary legal] elements to establish fraud," Casper said.

"In black and white, Mr. Anderson is being shortchanged ... he shouldn't have to pay," Casper acknowledged. "But he didn't follow the proper legal procedure, and that happens to people all the time."

Nationally, men who have been paying child support for a nonbiological child have been asking lawmakers for years to intervene and stop forcing the payments.

But most states have decided that allowing a man to stop paying support harms the child by cutting off necessary money.

"The best interests of a child are not served by depriving them of support at any time a father may elect to question his paternity," Casper wrote in a brief submitted to the court.

That's the position the state Supreme Court affirmed Thursday. Justices ruling in favor of the position were Charles Wells, Peggy Quince, Major Harding and Harry Lee Anstead. Dissenting were Barbara Pariente, Fred Lewis and Leander Shaw. Shaw and Harding recently retired and are no longer on the court.

The court took an unusually long time, more than two years, in issuing a ruling after receiving the case in August 2000.

In 1994, shortly after breaking off their long relationship, Michael and Cathy Anderson reconciled and married after she told him she was pregnant. She told him he was the father.

In late 1995, Cathy Anderson filed for dissolution when the child was about 18 months old.

A year later, Michael Anderson was ordered to pay child support after a contentious divorce.

In 1997, he began doubting the paternity of the child after learning Cathy Anderson lied about not being married before. He submitted himself and the child to a DNA test, which proved he wasn't the father.

He challenged the support within one year of the order to pay, meeting the legal time limit. But the Supreme Court joined the two lower courts that had ruled he was not entitled to relief since he didn't prove Cathy Anderson lied to him.

In the dissenting opinion, Pariente said Cathy Anderson "was deceptive" enough to allow Michael Anderson to stop making payments.

"Clearly, Cathy had at least one other sexual partner at the time of conception," Pariente wrote. "A father should be able to rely on the unequivocal, affirmative representations of his wife that he is the father of the child and should not be obligated to request DNA testing during the divorce action to disprove this presumed fact."

Rep. Chris Smith, D-Fort Lauderdale, proposed a bill last year that would have allowed fathers to quit paying child support if they proved to a court that they were not the biological father.

Smith said the current law is a "recipe for violence."

"Imagine a guy who finds out, 'This is not my kid and I'm paying child support for 18 ... years,'" Smith said.

Smith said Thursday that he might file a bill this year allowing a man paying child support to seek compensation from the biological father who has not been paying support.

"If you take action against the mother, in essence that's taking money from the kid," Smith said.

"The whole thing is a matter of fairness," Smith said.

Jim Unterschine, GZS of MS, gzs@gndzerosrv.com, www.gndzerosrv.com

Sociological Warfare

638

New legislation that seeks to reform welfare is designed to reform humanity

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/untersshine010703.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 01-04-03

The new legislation contained in HB 4090 [11](#) has triggered the first phase of a sinister plan to wreak havoc on our civilization.

- Phase One will seek to actively encourage custodial parents (CP) to find another potential noncustodial parent (NCP) for their State's family law money machine. [12](#) This allows Child Support Enforcement (CSE) to spread like a virus using the CP as the carrier of this contagious disease.

"Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson announced Thursday more than \$2.2 million in grants to 12 states and a variety of religious, nonprofit and tribal organizations to advance the nation's child support enforcement system." [13](#)

"The goal is to "increase child support collections, promote fatherhood and healthy marriage, and help struggling families take care of their children," Thompson said. " [13](#)

"Bush, bypassing a reluctant Congress, signed executive orders last month that put parts of his faith-based initiative in motion. His steps help give religious organizations more of a chance to win federal contracts for a variety of social services." [13](#)

- Phase Two will seek to actively encourage employers to hire CPs, give them raises, and promotions. [14](#) This allows CSE to receive new customers when financially insolvent NCPs are fired by their employers to allow more CPs to be hired..
- Phase Three will seek to actively encourage States to ignore certain parts of the federal mandate that may hinder the operation of their money machine. [15](#) This allows CSE to ignore federal protections granted to NCPs regarding employer discrimination due to child support garnishments in their implementation of strange demonstration projects.

It is feared that California will feel the first devastating effects of this positive feedback to an already inherently unstable Family Law system. NCPs exposed to this unstable family law system may become unstable themselves when they realize they were the victims of a state-operated confidence game.

- California presently promotes divorce by lavishing the CP with the most outrageous child support guideline in the nation. [16](#)
- California denies NCP's federal protection from employer discrimination due to family law proceedings and judgements. [17](#)
- California CSE will charge 10% back interest on the back child support owed by the NCP when the CP is forced to beg for TANF
- California CSE will receive 61% of administrative costs and 49% of TANF collections from the federal government. [18](#)
- California will soon actively promote marriage of existing CPs on TANF who will spawn new NCPs that will be driven into financial insolvency and then forced to stop paying child support and taxes.
- California will soon actively promote the employment, wage increase, and promotion of TANF CPs which will expedite the termination of impoverished NCPs who are desperately attempting to pay child support.
- California will continue to implement demonstration projects that seek to train the NCPs who were exiled to self employment by the family law system.
- California currently reports that 26% of all female homicide victims were killed by their spouse while 43% were killed by a family member. 41% of all child homicide victims were killed by a family member. [19](#)

Legislators must be made aware that this family law microphone is already too close to the speaker. Politicians have failed to consider the human costs in their state's exploitation of children for money. The age of accountability will soon catch up with states that have allowed greed to turn welfare reform into genocide.

Legislators must be made aware that the federal law (USC 42 666 b6Di) that protects NCPs from employers who fire or refuse to hire due to the existence of child support garnishments are not being enforced by some states. For example, California Family Code 5290 sets a maximum civil penalty of \$500 to be imposed on an employer [10](#) (if the impoverished NCP can afford to win a civil suit against the offending employer), while this form of discrimination is not recognized by the court as a lawful excuse in a criminal nonsupport charge. [11](#)

Legislators must be made aware that the interstate child support guidelines reported to the federal government reflect the TANF benefits allowed by each state and not the child support amount that is demanded to be paid by the NCP. [12](#)

Legislators must be made aware that child support consultation firms are actively subverting the federal laws by ignoring the non-implementation of federal protections granted to NCPs in the review of the state's child support guideline. Policy Studies Inc. (PSI) provides child support consultation to 49 states, Canada, Australia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. [13](#)

"Have you ever stood and stared at it, and marveled at it's beauty, it's genius? Millions of families just living out their lives, oblivious. You know the first family law system was designed to be a perfect world where no one suffered and everyone was happy. It was a disaster, no one fell behind in child support, federal funding was lost. Some believed we lacked the understanding to describe your perfect world, but we believe that as a species, human beings define their reality through misery and suffering. The perfect world was a dream that your primitive cerebrum refused to wake up from. Which is why family law was redesigned to this. We wreak havoc on your civilization. I say your civilization, but when we started thinking for you it really became our civilization. Which, of course, is what this is all about. Evolution. Like the dinosaur, you had your time. The future is our world. The future is our time." [14](#)

Citations:

- [1](#) 107th Congress, 2D Session, H. R. 4090, To reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes, In The House Of Representatives, April 9, 2002, http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=107_cong_bills&docid=f:h4090ih.txt.pdf . Modifications to HR 4090 as Introduced, <http://wayandmeans.house.gov/fullcomm/107cong/hr4090/greensheet.htm>
- [2](#) USC 42 603 (a)(2) Healthy Marriage Promotion Grants - (A) Authority - The Secretary shall award competitive grants to States, territories, and tribal organizations for not more than 50 percent of the cost of developing and implementing innovative programs to promote and support healthy, married, 2-parent families.
- [3](#) Gov't Awards Marriage Promotion Grants, *Siobhan McDonough, Associated Press Writer, 01-03-03*, http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20030103/ap_on_go_ca_st_pe/marriage_grants_4
- [4](#) USC 42 603 (a)(4)(C) FORMULA FOR MEASURING STATE PERFORMANCE - (i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), not later than October 1, 2003, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Governors Association and the American Public Human Services Association shall develop a formula for measuring State performance in operating the State program funded under this part so as to achieve the goals of employment entry, job retention, and increased earnings from employment for families receiving assistance under the program, as measured on an absolute basis and on the basis of improvement in State performance.
- [5](#) 42 U.S.C. 1320a–9 (j) Streamlined Process For Consideration Of Amendments And Extensions.—The Secretary shall develop a streamlined process for consideration of amendments and extensions proposed by States to demonstration projects conducted under this section.
- [6](#) CAFC 4055 25% of NCP net income for 1 child, 40% for 2, 50% for 3, ..., regardless of CP income (NCP earns between \$1,000 - \$8,000 per month, 0% custody).
- [7](#) USC 42 666 (b)(6)(D) - Provision must be made for the imposition of a fine against any employer who - (i) discharges from employment, refuses to employ, or takes disciplinary action against any noncustodial parent subject to income withholding required by this subsection because of the existence of such withholding and the obligations or additional obligations which it imposes upon the employer; or (ii) fails to withhold support from income or to pay such amounts to the State disbursement unit in accordance with this subsection.
- [8](#) 2001 - 2002 California DCSS Local Assistance Administrative Costs and Collections Estimates, <http://www.childsup.ca.gov/pub/budget/2002/2002-05budget.pdf>, <http://www.childsup.ca.gov/pub/reports/2002/2002-11annual.pdf>. CA Program Costs - Table 1 - California Child Support Program Costs totaled \$1.00 billion = \$615 million Federal (61%) + \$394 million State (39%) + \$44,000 Reimbursement (0.004%). CA Program Collections - Table 1 - California Assistance Collection (TANF) Revenue totaled \$713 million = \$341 million Federal (48%) + \$334 million State (47%) + \$39 million County (6%).
- [9](#) CA Dept. of Justice - Homicide in California, 2000, <http://caag.state.ca.us/cjsc/publications/homicide/homi2000/cr1.pdf>, Chart 15 - Gender of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender, and Chart 17 - Age of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender
- [10](#) CAFC 5290. No employer shall use an assignment order authorized by this chapter as grounds for refusing to hire a person or for discharging or taking disciplinary action against an employee. An employer who engages in the conduct prohibited by this section may be assessed a civil penalty of a maximum of five hundred dollars (\$500).
- [11](#) CAPC 270. Criminal Nonsupport - If a parent of a minor child willfully omits, without lawful excuse, to furnish necessary clothing, food, shelter or medical attendance, or other remedial care for his or her child, he or she is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars (\$2,000), or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.
- [12](#) US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, GREENBOOK, Section 8, CSE, http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=wm014_08.pdf&directory=/disk2/wais/data/106_green_book, Table 8-2 - Interstate child support guidelines reported by Pirog, Klotz, and Buyers from the Institute of Family and Social Responsibility (FASR), <http://www.spea.indiana.edu/fasr>
- [13](#) California Judicial Council Guideline Review, <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/newsreleases/NR64-98.HTM> reported by Policy Studies Inc. (PSI), http://www.policy-studies.com/about/about_intro.htm
- [14](#) The Hollywood Family Law knockoff entitled "THE MATRIX" See "Prophecy, History, and Hollywood", http://www.gndzerosrv.com/web%20pages/proph_hist_holly.htm.

Gov't Awards Marriage Promotion Grants

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20030103/ap_on_go_ca_st_pe/marriage_grants_4

SIOBHAN McDONOUGH, Associated Press Writer, 01-03-03

WASHINGTON - The government has sent taxpayer money from its child support programs to religious and nonprofit organizations so they can promote marriage — reflecting chief elements of President Bush's faith-based initiative.

A critic who doesn't believe the government should be stepping into marriages said he would keep a close eye on how these groups spend the funds.

Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson announced Thursday more than \$2.2 million in grants to 12 states and a variety of religious, nonprofit and tribal organizations to advance the nation's child support enforcement system. Roughly \$550,000 is being spent on programs that emphasize the importance of healthy marriage.

Among them are two organizations and a state agency that emphasize the importance of a healthy marriage to a child's well being.

The Marriage Coalition, in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, received \$199,994 to test a curriculum for poor single parents that emphasizes the value of marriage and child support.

In Allentown, Pa., a group called Community Services for Children Inc. got \$177,373 to work with local church groups in providing marriage education and other services to unwed couples.

But a wary Robert Boston, spokesman for Americans United for Separation of Church and State, wondered who would ensure that the programs receiving government grants aren't violating the separation of church and state law.

"Whether a person gets married or stays married is none of the government's business," Boston said. "It feels paternalistic for government to be interfering."

Bush, bypassing a reluctant Congress, signed executive orders last month that put parts of his faith-based initiative in motion. His steps help give religious organizations more of a chance to win federal contracts for a variety of social services.

Bush said, however, that no government money "will be used to directly support inherently religious activities," an assertion that has not satisfied skeptics.

The government has promoted marriage in the past, primarily through the 1996 welfare overhaul, but it has faced restrictions in giving money to religious organizations to advance that same goal.

Some Democrats in Congress and others object to the prospect that church groups will use the tax dollars to proselytize, and in doing so violate the constitutional separation of church and state.

"Some of these groups don't realize that they are supposed to run a secular program," Boston said. "When they take taxpayer money it can't be business as usual."

Sherri Z. Heller, commissioner of the Office of Child Support Enforcement, said the grants were approved long before Bush's executive order on faith-based initiatives.

"Courts, nonprofits, state agencies are all discovering that reaching out to local faith-based organizations is an effective strategy for making their programs work with populations that have been very difficult to reach, such as fathers coming out of prisons," Heller said.

Marriage Coalition Director Sandra Bender described her group as "a nonprofit organization of inter-religious clergy, mental health professionals and individuals dedicated to reducing the divorce rate and birth to unmarried parents through education."

The group, which advocates marriage, is not a religious organization, Bender said, but it does train clergy and counselors to help engaged and wedded couples.

"People go to churches. Seventy-five percent of people who get married get married at churches so that's where our customers are," Bender said.

In another grant aimed at strengthening marriage, the Alabama Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Board got \$200,000 to help poor, ethnically diverse single parents learn marital skills, improve their employment prospects and increase child support payments.

The Special Improvement Grants cover a range of family counseling and child support collection programs.

The goal is to "increase child support collections, promote fatherhood and healthy marriage, and help struggling families take care of their children," Thompson said.

On the Net:

Health and Human Services Department: <http://www.hhs.gov>

Americans United for Separation of Church and State: <http://www.au.org/>

NCPs may be identified as a threat to national security
<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/untersshine121702.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 12-15-02

Noncustodial parents (NCP) may number 14 million in this country. Depending on the particular state that has gained control of their families, these NCPs have been isolated and alienated and may be the sleepers this country should recognize. Some splinter groups have acted alone with unauthorized attacks on themselves, their children's mother, and their children. Some rogue cells have targeted police officers, teachers, and in-laws.

Many of these potential "assets" have been exposed to the "iron fist" of Child Support Enforcement (CSE) which has denied them of many freedoms guaranteed to other citizens of this country. The bitterness and resentment that is forced upon these heterosexual taxpayers that dare to raise children may provoke them into a "fight or flight" dilemma.

Unfortunately these victims of family law persecution are "pilgrims with nowhere to go" since they can be tracked and intercepted across counties, across states, and across oceans. They are denied passports, imposed a financial embargo, denied to hold licenses, are exiled to self-employment, and imposed an ever-growing arrearage that can never be discharged. With the "flight" option gone, only one option remains, but who will these disgruntled parents chose to fight?

Usama Bin Laden was introduced to a watered down version of "The American Way" after he was identified as the mastermind responsible for the "copy-cat attack" on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon that claimed thousands of lives. (Louis Joy III crashed his plane into his New Hampshire home a month before 911. Joy was reacting to his first visit to family court and succeeded in cheating family law justice.)

Governor Gray Davis of California adamantly supports paternity fraud while his state brags that 80% of paternity establishments are due to default court orders. The state of California is in a position to bring this "evil doer" to justice by filing default court orders for every out-of-wedlock birth reported in California and attach to 25% of Usama's reported worth of over a half a billion dollars

This win-win situation would serve the California Governor's lust for federal funding while providing the nation with the closure they desire by giving this terrorist a taste of the freedom he so adamantly envies. If captured, Usama would be forced to pay California the back child support plus 10% interest, while California would receive federal incentives for collection.

What is Davis waiting for? Whose side is Davis on? Is Davis with us or against us?

Perhaps Davis fears federal scrutiny when his new brand of paternity fraud continues to exceed perfection. California's paternity establishment percentage was reported to be 123% in 1998 and represents over 34,000 paternity establishments over and above out-of-wedlock births. California has continued to exceed 100% paternity establishment since Clinton's welfare reform made it profitable in 1996 ¹¹

Perhaps Davis fears federal scrutiny if the profit reaped by California CSE becomes excessive for simply sitting on their hands, incurring excessive administration costs, or fraudulently reporting collections. California led the nation pocketing \$198 million over and above administration costs regarding CSE in 1998 with a collection-to-cost ratio of 2.66. New York was second in the nation pocketing \$56 million over and above administration costs regarding CSE in 1998 with a collection-to-cost ratio of 4.16. ¹²

Perhaps Davis fears federal scrutiny for actively promoting welfare or fraudulently reporting TANF expenditures. California led the nation transferring \$307 million into their Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) regarding Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) in 1999 and soaked up \$3.3 billion in federal funding. New York was second in the nation transferring \$249 million into their Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) regarding TANF in 1999 and soaked up \$1.5 billion in federal funding. ¹³

Has Davis misplaced his loyalties? Has Davis sold out America? Patriotism does not have a four-year shelf life but fortunately Governors do. Thomas Jefferson did not do what he did, unless he had a very good reason. ¹⁴

As a native born Californian, I cannot condone this state forcing the federal government to fund this form of slavery that is being imposed on parents. I refuse to allow my children to be exposed to this "money machine" when they attempt to raise a family. This sinister regime believes that American taxpayers should reward our state for perpetrating fraud against parents and the federal government.

It may seem like a far-fetched idea for a parent to go to jail rather than pay, when they become aware they are funding slavery, but then they laughed at Henry David Thoreau too.

Citations:

¹¹ Table 8-20 "Paternities Established", Table 8-21 "Out-Of-Wedlock Births", Table 8-22 "Percentage of Paternities Established". US House Ways and Means Committee, Greenbook, Section 8, CSE.

¹² Table 8-4 "Financing of CSE Program, Fiscal Year 1998" US House Ways and Means Committee, Greenbook, Section 8, CSE.

¹³ Table 7-17 TANF Grants, Transfers and Expenditures, Fiscal Year 1999 US House Ways and Means Committee, Greenbook, Section 7, TANF

¹⁴ The movie "Swordfish"

Heterosexual Taxpayers Under Attack

A group of legal experts are attempting to grant salvation to lesbians

636

Jim Unterschine, GZS of LB, 12-02-02

Lynn D. Wardle, Ira Mark Ellman, and Grace Ganz Blumberg from the American Law Institute are spearheading the recent assault on heterosexual taxpayers that dare to cohabit with women. The objective of this unprovoked attack seems to be raising the court ordered cash flow between partners that separate regardless of the reason for separation.

These legal experts seek to make family law more "*predictable and consistent*" and seem to agree the following is appropriate:

- Alimony is compensation for "*financial losses resulting from the breakdown of a marriage*" rather than damages resulting from the actions of the court or the dependant partner.
- People who support their partner should pay alimony regardless of whether their partner decides to "*come out of the closet*" or falls in love with someone else.
- Dependant partners should be compensated by how much they "*deserve*" rather than how much they "*need*" since the latter is "*vague and subjective*".
- Custody of children should be granted to the parent who spends the most time with them before separation since "*the best interest of the child*" is "*emotional and subjective*".
- A lesbian partner should be allowed to fight for custody of the other partner's biological child
- Child support obligations should be higher than under current law when a parent having custody of a child earns substantially less than the other parent.

The most offensive message from this proposed legislation seems to be that lesbians can easily have children and receive compensation for pretending to be heterosexual, while gay men must rely on recruiting teenagers by holding "*Gay Pride Parades*".

Regardless of gender, all homosexuals are one generation from extinction, but now the lesbians may have a way to perpetuate their existence at the expense of their chosen host.

Family law should never include homosexuals regardless of whether they are litigants or officers of the court since their "*lifestyle*" inherently precludes family. I have never met a child who wished to be homosexual just like their Dad or their Mom.

The sexual orientation of these experts may reveal more about their motives.

Legal Group Urges States to Update Their Family Law

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=nyt/20021130/ts_nyt/legal_group_urges_states_to_update_their_family_law

By **ROBERT PEAR**, [The New York Times](#), 11-30-02

WASHINGTON, Nov. 29 An influential group of lawyers and judges has recommended sweeping changes in family law that would increase alimony and property rights for many divorced women, while extending such rights for the first time to many cohabiting domestic partners, both heterosexual and gay.

The proposals, from the American Law Institute, seek to update family law to reflect changes in society over the last 30 years. One conclusion, for example, is that if a spouse has committed adultery, it should not affect a judge's decision about alimony or marital property.

The findings are likely to have a major impact, given the prestige of the institute, a private organization of eminent lawyers, judges and legal scholars that has had immense influence on the development of American law since the group was founded in 1923.

The institute's recommendations on commercial law, torts, contracts, criminal law and other topics have been adopted by many states.

Family law, by and large, is set by the states. Already the proposals, circulated among state officials in recent weeks, have touched off a furor among conservatives, who contend that they are biased against marriage.

The American Law Institute has devoted 10 years to drafting the recommendations, which seek to make family law more predictable and consistent.

Judges now have vast discretion in divorce proceedings, so decisions on alimony, child custody and the division of property vary widely by state, and even among judges in the same state.

The report says that a parent's sexual orientation should not be a factor in decisions on child custody, and that domestic partnerships should be treated like marriage in many important respects.

In handling custody disputes, some judges still assume that gays are unfit to be parents. But the American Law Institute declares, "Homosexual conduct, like heterosexual extramarital conduct, should be disregarded unless shown to be harmful to an individual child." Judges, it says, should not be swayed by stereotypes or "prejudicial attitudes."

One of the critics, Lynn D. Wardle, a law professor at Brigham Young University, described the report as a radical effort to equalize the legal status of marriage and domestic partnerships involving unmarried people of the same or opposite sex.

The proposals "could undermine the institution of marriage and reflect an ideological bias against family relations based on marriage," Mr. Wardle said.

The recommendations, developed after an exhaustive review of court cases and consultations with many experts, are addressed to judges, state legislators and other state officials.

In general, the institute said, "domestic partners are two persons of the same or opposite sex, not married to one another, who for a significant period of time share a primary residence and a life together as a couple."

At the end of an intimate relationship, the report said, "a domestic partner is entitled to compensatory payments" similar to alimony "on the same basis as a spouse."

This is a novel concept. Few American courts have awarded alimony to domestic partners.

Likewise, the report said, when domestic partners split up, their property should be divided in the same way a divorce court would divide the property of a husband and wife.

Ira Mark Ellman, a law professor at Arizona State University who was a principal author and editor of the report, said: "Our purpose was to adapt family law to changes in the family as an institution. The law has to take account of social changes driving the family."

Grace Ganz Blumberg, a co-author of the report, said the recommendations indicated that "we were more willing to redistribute income and wealth" than many courts and state legislatures have been.

As a result, said Ms. Blumberg, a law professor at the University of California at Los Angeles, child support obligations would be higher than under current law when a parent having custody of a child earns substantially less than the other parent.

The institute does not encourage domestic partnership or cohabitation as an alternative to marriage, but says that domestic partners, like spouses, incur economic obligations to each other when they live together for any significant time.

Legal Group Urges States to Update Their Family Law (Continued)

Even though the institute is highly respected in the legal world, its proposals could encounter political resistance in some states.

The report said decisions about alimony and the distribution of property should be made "without regard to marital misconduct." Thus, it said, a wife should not receive less alimony because she committed adultery, nor should a husband be required to pay more because he committed adultery.

Judges have often used alimony and property awards to penalize spouses who caused marriages to fail, and about half the states treat marital misconduct as relevant to decisions on alimony. But the institute said that approach was impractical.

"Justice is hardly served by treating one spouse's adultery as relevant to the alimony inquiry without also examining the other spouse's conduct, the tacit understandings between them, and the conduct of both before and after the adulterous episode," the report said. "Deciding which, if either, to condemn is difficult."

The institute's proposals would expand the number of people who can claim custody of a child or visitation rights. Such claims could be made not only by the legal parents, but also by a "de facto parent," defined as an individual who has lived with the child at least two years and "regularly performed a majority of the caretaking functions" without being paid.

For example, the report said, the lesbian partner of a child's biological mother may, in some circumstances, be able to assert a right to custody or visitation when the relationship between the women ends.

Under existing state laws, judges usually award alimony on the basis of some estimate of a person's need for help, but the American Law Institute rejects that standard as vague and subjective.

The institute says the proper purpose of alimony is compensation for financial losses resulting from the breakdown of a marriage, and it refers to alimony as "compensatory spousal payments."

The amount of such payments, the report says, should increase in proportion to the duration of a marriage and the disparity in the spouses' incomes at the time of divorce two factors that can be measured objectively.

Mr. Ellman said payments under this rule would be "more generous than the alimony awards that many courts now order." Moreover, he said, "the usual result in the most compelling cases the longest marriages would be to reduce substantially the gap in incomes of former spouses after their divorce."

The report deals only with the claims that intimate partners, married or unmarried, have against each other at the end of their relationship. It does not address the treatment of domestic partners for the purpose of taxes, insurance or employee benefits.

Still, Professor Wardle said the rules were inappropriate because domestic partners did not have the same expectations as married couples. "Many heterosexual couples enter into domestic partnerships because they wish to avoid marriage and the obligations of marriage," he said.

For more than 150 years, American courts have made custody decisions by asking what arrangements would be in the best interests of the child. The American Law Institute said that standard was "too subjective to produce predictable results" and tended to increase conflict between divorcing parents, as each tried to prove that the other would be a bad parent.

To eliminate such "emotional and subjective factors," the report said, a court should normally award custody to parents in proportion to the amount of time they spent caring for the child before a divorce.

The institute also recommended changes in child support, to ensure that children have "a standard of living not grossly inferior to that of either parent."

Under the proposal, more parents would be required to contribute to the cost of a child's college education, and even graduate and professional education.

Parents "tend to underinvest in the education of children with whom they do not reside," the report said.

The Power of the Legislature

635

If people in glass houses throw stones ... you have the right to throw them back

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/untersshine122202.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 11-26-02

Stephen Horn, R-Long Beach, representing the 38th District in the U.S. House of Representatives, may have started a chain reaction that could possibly reach critical mass upon his retirement. Stephen Horn had the clarity to identify a serious problem that threatened his constituents and possessed a thorough understanding of oversight procedures that allowed redress of grievances by the Legislature. This chain reaction was the result of one letter. I have never talked to Steve Horn personally or any member of his staff

Stephen Horn has instilled in me the crazy idea that *"the system may actually work"* and has restored my faith in human nature. Stephen Horn was the only person to offer assistance in my desperate attempt to resist fraud and undue influence by the Los Angeles Department of Child Support Services (LA DCSS). Stephen Horn was informed of this unlawful persecution along with the CA Attorney General, a civil court judge, a criminal court judge, a Public Defender, a District Attorney, a political science professor, the DCSS, the ANCP, the ACFC, and the FBI.

Stephen Horn contacted Assemblymember Alan Lowenthal, D-Long Beach, representing the 54th District in California, who urged the DCSS Public Information and Response Unit (PI&RU) to initiate the Complaint Resolution and State Hearing process. I have personally met and spoke with Alan Lowenthal at my home on 2 separate occasions prior to 1995 (during his house to house canvassing for votes in the Long Beach Heights area). I was impressed enough with Alan Lowenthal's grassroots ideals to actually vote for him that year, while I voted for Ross Perot in a desperate attempt to keep Clinton out of office.

The State Hearing process mentioned above was implemented in 07-01-01 as mandated by Assembly Bill 472 (which was passed into California law in 1999) and was part of legislation that separated the District Attorney from Child Support Services. AB 472 was deemed necessary after a 1999 Bureau of State Audits report found that the child support enforcement program in California was lacking in many areas, including a sense of overall vision and uniformity of practice. DCSS is responsible for the administration and ultimate outcomes of the State Hearing process related to child support services. DCSS has contracted with the California Department of Social Services (DSS) State Hearing Office (SHO) to conduct the hearings

Although I was shown the door to a State Hearing, it was up to me to walk through it. I found that there is a difference between knowing the path to my State Hearing and actually walking the path. After Stephen Horn and Alan Lowenthal expressed their interest in this matter, I was sentenced to jail for 60 days for ignoring the same court order that I have been trying to convince LA DCSS to recognize since 01-99. I was put in jail with the completed "Request for State Hearing" form in my hand and was forced to send it to Sacramento in a LA County Jail envelope that was given to me by a fellow inmate. I was a high-power, contempt of court, K10, keep away, and was held down the hall from Robert Blake (who is accused of cheating Family Law justice in California).

After my release from *"debtor's prison"* I was contacted by the Local Ombudsperson investigating this matter, I was later contacted by the LA DCSS State Hearing Representative (SHR), and I was later contacted by the *"District Attorney"* days before the State Hearing. This *"District Attorney"* contacted me later that same day and admitted the billing was fraudulent and promised that it would be corrected in the next month's billing statement. This *"District Attorney"* told me there was no reason to attend the State Hearing, and that it only involved an Administrative Law judge and it didn't amount to much anyway. Despite changing the hearing time, changing the hearing address, and holding the hearing in a different room, I somehow managed to walk through the door to my State Hearing.

My State Hearing was held on 11-12-02 and I am currently awaiting the official decision. I was allowed to show an Administrative Law Judge from the Department of Social Services (DSS) that the fragmented California Family Law system has caused LA DCSS to:

- Ignore state and federal laws that protect parents from wrongful employment termination.
- Ignore civil court orders,
- Ignore criminal court orders,
- Ignore audits conducted by their own agency,
- Ignore filings for enforcement by other agencies,
- Ignore court ordered cash transfers made directly to the custodial parent (CP), and
- Illicit fraudulent amounts of money using the US Postal Service.

Steve Horn and Alan Lowenthal were instrumental in allowing me to steal a peek at due process. These heroes of the Legislative Branch may soon be hailed as the newest American Patriots in this new age of accountability and an urgency to identify the ways and means by which implements of our own creation can be used by independent entities as a weapon of mass destruction against us.

The state of California may become aware that the fate of our families are in the hands of a band of profiteers from Denver, CO who aspire to *"Do socially useful work, have fun, and make money"* while attempting to *"create an environment that allows their employees to take risks without being punished for their mistakes"*. Policy Studies Inc (PSI) was paid \$250,000 to conduct a 3 month investigation into the accounting practices of LA DCSS while I was being double billed. PSI was recently contracted by the California Judicial Council to conduct the *"Four Year Review"* of our state child support guideline. While PSI insured that our state's child support guideline remains the highest in the nation, PSI failed to identify the fragmented system that prohibits compliance with the federal mandate that allows this state to practice Child Support Enforcement (CSE).

"If you are truly in the right, you have God on your side, and you constitute a majority of one"

Henry David Thoreau

Thank you and farewell

<http://www.presstelegram.com/Stories/0,1413,204%257E21479%257E1009682,00.html>

Stephen Horn, Press Telegram, Sections: Opinion, 11-25-02

The end of the 107th Congress marks the end of my decade as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and this is also the last column I will be writing as your congressman (although our Lakewood office will remain open until Dec. 31).

Leaving Congress is an event I view with many emotions -- especially gratitude for the high honor of serving and satisfaction with specific accomplishments. But among the emotions I do not feel are the anger, disappointment and bitterness voiced by many people as they leave public life. Indeed, I would like to use this opportunity to say thank you.

Thank you to the thousands of people who have called, written, or come to a meeting during the past 10 years. Whether we agreed or disagreed, I learned from every conversation and every letter. It is both inspiring and humbling to realize the amount of common sense, and the number of good ideas, that are possessed by the American people. I also want to say thank you to the members of the media for 10 years of accurate coverage. Although politicians of both the right and the left often charge the media with bias, I have found that almost all reporters are interested in getting the facts straight and being fair.

No U.S. representative gets anything done without the help of an able staff. I have been blessed with outstanding aides who have worked to help the nation and the people of the 38th District. The Washington staff, under the fine leadership of first Jim Dykstra and currently Dave Bartel has shepherded legislation through both Houses of Congress and fought hard to promote the interests of our area.

Their work saved the Air Force's C-17 project that represents thousands of jobs in our area -- and that has performed so well, including on recent missions in Afghanistan. We secured the federal funding for the Alameda Corridor that allowed the project to be completed on time and on budget. Then we gained the federal funds to complete -- five years ahead of schedule -- the flood control project along the Los Angeles River which lifted the flood insurance mandate on tens of thousands of property owners. The staff also delivered on dozens of other projects ranging from freeway improvements and enhancements at the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, to a ZIP code for Signal Hill and grants for educational institutions such as California State University, Long Beach.

The district office in Lakewood has been ably led by the dedicated and energetic Connie Martinez Sziebl. She and her staff have worked tirelessly to help thousands of residents who had problems with the federal bureaucracy -- everything from missing Social Security checks to incorrect flood insurance premiums.

The achievements of the Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations, which I have chaired since 1995, would have been impossible without the talented staff led for seven years by J. Russell George and now by Bonnie Heald. The subcommittee has focused on the nitty-gritty issues of saving a buck and making things run better. It's major legislative achievement is the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, which has saved \$14 billion in taxpayer dollars by better collection of debts owed to the government. Through hundreds of investigative hearings, the subcommittee also spearheaded the successful effort to deal with the year 2000 (Y2K) computer conversion, and made a major effort to improve both the financial management of the federal government and its computer security.

Heartfelt thanks are also owed to the voters of this district and the hundreds of people who volunteered on five hard-fought campaigns. Led by Anne Cramer, Steve Conley, Marcia Horn and Steve Horn, Jr., we proved that you can win by running all-volunteer campaigns and without taking Political Action Committee (PAC) money -- if you have solid local support and treat the voters intelligently.

Finally, there are two other thank yous -- one personal, the other general. The personal thank you is to my wife of 48 years, Nini, who has volunteered in the Washington office for the past decade and helped thousands of constituents. The general thank you is the people who protect us at home -- our police and firefighters -- and to the members of our armed forces who protect us around the world.

As we gather with our families and give thanks for our many blessings this week, let us also say a special prayer for these brave men and women who endure hard conditions and are willing, at a moment's notice, to make the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

Stephen Horn, R-Long Beach, represents the 38th District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Steve Horn returns

Governance: A broad career grounded in results and in principle

<http://www.presstelegram.com/Stories/0,1413,204%257E21479%257E1009671,00.html>

Press Telegram, Sections: Opinion, 11-25-02

Stephen P. Horn, Ph.D, scholar, university president, expert in government efficiency, political reformer and member of the Congress of the United States, is coming home. His work is done.

It would not be done if his constituents had anything to say about it. Congressman Horn, as residents of his district know all too well, got gerrymandered out of his seat by partisan deal-makers who care more about political ease than equity; otherwise the office likely was his as long as he wanted it.

More than a few voters, Republican or Democrat or whatever, would have put him in the race for governor if they'd had the chance, and by any reckoning he would have been the best candidate. He also would have been the most unusual.

Horn knows governance as a political scientist, a historian and a politician: in theory, in fact, in context and in reality. Yet he always approached governance as an idealist: responding, often personally, to the most mundane pleas of his constituents; assigning himself the unglamorous but fruitful task of overseeing government efficiency; and refusing to accept "soft" money, thereby risking his political career at every election as a matter of principle.

Soft money, as probably few of his constituents really understood, is the most corruptive influence in our noble but vulnerable system of government. Soft money also lends itself to no easy remedy. Therefore soft money has few real opponents among politicians, and even fewer who refuse to collect it.

That is so like Horn. He is fully able intellectually and emotionally to manage the human as well as the practical challenges of government, but he never takes the easy way unless it is also the right way. For that, he has willingly paid a price.

When he served as president of Cal State University, from 1970 to 1988, it was somewhat the same. Horn was unyielding in his determination to raise that institution from its modest beginnings as a teachers' college to an academic status previously unimagined. His efforts caused serious damage to relations with his faculty, but he got the job done.

Some of the problems with faculty were Horn's fault. Nobody's perfect. But whatever his faults, they have nothing to do with his personal relationships. Among the thousands who eagerly volunteered to help him at the university and later in his political work, none were more lovingly dedicated than his gracious wife of 48 years, Nini; and the steadfast manager of his campaigns, Steve Horn Jr. As for his staff members, as a letter to the editor on this page suggests, they adore him.

If you haven't had the good fortune to get acquainted personally with Steve (as he likes to be known, despite all his pedigrees), you might like to read his last column, which appears on the facing page. You will find, without surprise, that it is an honest account. If you have had the good fortune to know him well, you probably will find something closer to your heart.

At every turn California demonstrates the necessity for their extermination

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 10-14-02

California's outrageous child support guideline leads the nation in driving noncustodial parents (NCP) into financial insolvency.

The California 3 child guideline exceeds the Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) benefits by 28% of an NCP's net income (for NCP earning \$4,400 / month).

Analysis

TANF benefits across all states was extracted from Table 7-9 of the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, GREENBOOK, section 7, entitled "*Maximum Combined TANF And Food Stamp Benefit For Families Of One To Six Persons, January 1, 2000*" provided by the Congressional Research Service

- Food stamp calculations assume that the family does not receive an excess shelter deduction. In very low benefit States, combined benefits shown reflect the maximum food stamp allotment for the family size, but in some States the excess shelter deduction would increase food stamps (by up to \$83 monthly—more in Alaska and Hawaii).
- Calculations assume a single-parent family with no earned income and use normal rounding rules.

Child support guidelines across all states were found using the child support calculators from AllLaw.com. (You must pay to find out how much you owe in Vermont and New Hampshire, which eliminates these states from this analysis).

- NCP earns \$4,400 / month net income
- CP earns \$1,760 / month net income and has 100% custody of 3 children.

Figure One: Shows the monthly TANF benefits for each state regarding 1, 2 and 3 kids

- Across all states the median TANF benefits where: 1st kid (\$170), 2nd kid (\$149), and 3rd kid (\$139).
- Across all states the highest TANF benefits where: Alaska 1st kid (\$904), Hawaii 2nd kid (\$261), Hawaii 3rd kid (\$244).
- Across all states the lowest TANF benefits where: Louisiana & Alabama 1st kid (\$370), Idaho 2nd kid (\$101), Idaho 3rd kid (\$91).

Figure Two: Shows the monthly TANF benefits as a percent of an NCP's net income for each state regarding 3 kids and NCP earning \$4,400 per month. The AllLaw.com 3 child guideline is subtracted from the TANF 3 child benefits to determine the error between them. For example: California awards TANF benefits amounting to 22% of an NCP's net income for 3 children while AllLaw.com reported California awarding a 3 child guideline of 50%, yielding an error of 28%.

- Across all states the median TANF benefit for 3 kids is 18% and the median 3 child guideline was 30% while the median error is 11%
- Across all states the highest TANF benefit for 3 kids is Alaska (29%) and the highest 3 child guideline was California (50%) while the highest error is California (28%).
- Across all states the lowest TANF benefits for 3 kids is Mississippi, Texas, Tennessee, South Carolina, Louisiana, and Alabama (14%) and the lowest 3 child guideline was North Carolina (15%) while the lowest error is North Carolina (2%).

The TANF benefits awarded by states, to families of various sizes, is the only baseline of data regarding raising children and has been arrived at by trial and error. The federal government pays 70% of the TANF amounts awarded to CPs by the state.

For example:

- The state of California will force the NCP to pay 50% of net income to the CP in accordance with their 3 child support guideline..
- When the NCP loses employment California will pay the TANF benefit to the CP equivalent to 22% of the NCP's income
- The federal government reimburses California for TANF lowering the state's total outlay to only 7% of the NCP's income.
- California CSE adds 10% to the back child support and now demands 55% of the NCP's income.
- California CSE attaches bank accounts, revokes licenses, intercepts tax refunds, and pillages property of the NCP.
- NCP owes 55% of his imputed income: 28% to the CP, 22% to state TANF, 5% to state CSE, and 0% to the children.

Conclusion

State guidelines that exceed their TANF amount insure the exploitation of children for money. It guarantees the CP will never be able to squander the error amount on their children, allowing the CP a substantial tax-free windfall for playing along with this state-operated confidence game.



State guidelines that exceed their TANF amount guarantees the state TANF agency 70% of the TANF benefit money to transfer into the state's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)

State guidelines that exceed their TANF amount guarantees the state CSE agency 10% of the state guideline money to pay PSI to cook the books for their county agencies and pay FASR to lie about the state's child support guideline to the legislature.

Interstate TANF Benefits (Continued)

Figure One: TANF & Food Stamps Benefits

Figure Two: TANF Benefits compared to Child Support



Interstate Child Support Guidelines

What did FASR and PSI know, and when did they stop knowing it?

633

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 10-08-02

California has the most outrageous child support guideline in the nation demanding 25% of a parent's net income for 1 child, 40% for 2, and 50% for 3.

Using the child support calculators, provided by AllLaw.com, the amount of child support demanded by all states can be compared by choosing a hypothetical case. The case that follows is identical to "Case D" described in the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, GREENBOOK in support of the interstate child support guidelines (Table 8-2) reported by Pirog, Klotz, and Buyers from the Institute of Family and Social Responsibility (FASR)

Case D:

- NCP earns \$4,400 / month net income, pays \$30 / month union dues, and pays \$25 / month for health insurance.
- CP earns \$1,760 / month net income, pays \$150 / month childcare. and has 100% custody of 2 children.

Figure One shows the child support guidelines for 1, 2, and 3 children using the child support calculator from AllLaw.com using only the incomes from "Case D" described above. (You must pay to find out how much you will owe in Vermont and New Hampshire, which eliminates these states from this analysis).

- Across all states the median guidelines where: 1 child (16%), 2 child (24%) and 3 child (29%)
- Across all states the highest guidelines where: Massachusetts 1 child (31%), California 2 child (40%) and California 3 child (50%)
- Across all states the lowest guidelines where: North Carolina 1 child (10%), Wyoming 2 child (16%) and North Carolina 3 child (18%)

Figure Two shows the 2 child guideline presented to the Ways and Means Committee by FASR using all details outlined in "Case D" described above. The AllLaw.com 2 child guideline is subtracted from the FASR 2 child guideline to determine the error between them. For example: FASR reported California demanding 18% of an NCPs net income for 2 children while AllLaw.com reported 40%, yielding an error of 22%.

- Across all states the median error was 11%
- Across all states the highest error was California (22%) with the lowest error Wyoming (4%)
- According to FASR, the state of Indiana has the highest 2 child guideline (20%) with Oklahoma having the lowest (9%).
- FASR is based out of the University of Indiana at Bloomington and is paid by the federal government to be the clearinghouse for Child Support Enforcement (CSE) statistics.

Child support guidelines vary from state to state, and are derived by many strange and disturbing methods. Rest assured that there is no scientific approach that is currently used that is not derived from opinions from people who are in no position to know the truth. There is no system by which actual data is collected to measure the cost of raising children.

Many states require assistance in determining the amount of child support that they will force a parent to pay. There are companies and individuals that offer to help states maximize the profits that are paid by parents and the federal government in implementing their "Family Law money machine". For example Maurine Pirog-Good of FASR (Bloomington, IN) has helped Alaska with their child support guideline, while Robert Williams of Policy Studies Inc (PSI) (Denver, CO) has helped 49 states, Canada, Australia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

These independent entities are free to

- Instruct states that it is essential to maximize the cash flow between parents in order to reap false profits from parents and the federal government.
- Actively engage in subverting the federal laws that provide protection to NCPs and advising the elimination of due process in implementing a child support guideline that limits rebuttability to winning custody of the children.
- Conduct accounting audits for state CSE agencies of the Executive Branch as well as conduct the four-year review of that states child support guideline for the Judicial Branch.

Conclusions

Every states child support guideline should be the same as the TANF amount for any particular family in each state.

The outrageous child support guidelines that are imposed on parents across the nation are being completely hidden from the Legislative Branch. Our elected officials are powerless to identify the common denominator regarding welfare reform with this type of deception. It is no wonder that Congress shakes a finger at deadbeats in California for not paying 18% of their pay for 2 children when, in reality, these victims of fraud are demanded to actually pay 40%.

The outrageous child support guidelines that are imposed on parents across the nation are enforced by state CSE agencies who operate under the color of federal law (USC 42 666) depriving the rights and privileges of NCPs across counties, across states, and across oceans. NCPs are forced to endure the "Family Law Stigmata" as a result of independent entities poisoning the antidote to the welfare disease provided by the federal government in the state's exploitation of children for money.

Family Law Stigmata

The following sequence of events insure federal funding by promoting welfare

Splinters in your mind driving you mad

- Family Court will deny child custody to the deep pockets parent allowing the full weight of the state's child support guideline to fall on the high earner thus creating a noncustodial parent (NCP), a custodial parent (CP), and a cash flow between them.
- Family Court will put the NCP to the curb and deny the NCP from seeing the children.

Slashing the backbone of your support

- Family Court will garnish the NCP's wages, force them to pay court costs, evaluation costs, attorney fees.
- Family Court will deny federal protection granted to NCPs regarding employer discrimination due to the excessive child support garnishments thus creating a financially insolvent NCP who will soon become unemployed.

Forcing you to carry a heavy burden

- Family Court will refuse to lower the unemployed NCP's child support obligation thus creating an ever-growing arrearage that can not be discharged in bankruptcy.
- Family Court will encourage the CP to file for Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) thus forcing the CP to request Child Support Enforcement (CSE).
- TANF will bill the federal government for 70% of the TANF benefits paid to the CP by the state.
- CSE will bill the NCP for full reimbursement plus 10% interest on the back child support arrearage that has accrued since time of unemployment.

Attached to this burden you cannot feed yourself

- CSE will intercept the NCP's tax refunds, garnish benefits, attach bank accounts, and pillage property.
- CSE will suspend the business license of the NCP who is exiled to self-employment.

Attached to this burden you cannot transport yourself

- CSE will deny the NCP's drivers license and passport.
- CSE will track the NCP across counties, across states, and across oceans.

Attached to this burden you must languish



- CSE will continue to bill the NCP for full reimbursement plus 10% interest on the child support arrearage that will continue to grow forever.
- CSE will not actively pursue the NCP since this may reduce the interest charged on this money that never existed.

Attached to this burden you are stuck inside

- CSE will reluctantly file charges against the NCP for criminal non-support when the desperate CP loses their patience.
- Criminal Court will recognize CSE as the complainant regarding these criminal charges and deny the NCP a jury trial
- Criminal Court will refuse to recognize employer discrimination due to child support garnishments as a lawful excuse regarding these charges
- Criminal Court will order the NCP to be stuck inside a jail cell.

Figure One: AllLaw.com Child Support Guidelines

Figure Two: FASR Erroneous Child Support Guidelines



California Child Support Guideline

632

Shared parenting may have little effect on parents who earn a living in California

<http://www.mensnewsdaily.com/stories/untersshine121102.htm>

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 10-05-02

The California Family Code (4055) provides the equations for the determination of child support awards and represents the state's Child Support Guideline.

The following analysis will show that the shared parent (50% custody) who earns a monthly net income between \$1,000 and \$6,000, will be forced to pay 19% of net income for 1 child, 30% for 2, 38% for 3, and 43% for 4 to the parent who is unemployed.

Shared parenting may not be enough to deny California a court ordered cash flow that allows them to reap a false profit.

Analysis

To determine the percentage of net income that the noncustodial parent (NCP) will be forced to pay to the custodial parent (CP) in California, the following data must be known

- NCP custody of children
- NCP monthly net income
- CP monthly net income
- Number of children

The plots that follow show multipliers K1, K2, K3, and K4 that are referenced in CAFC 4055. The percent of net income that will be demanded of the NCP is calculated by multiplying $K1 * K2 * K3 * K4$.

- **K1** shows the multiplier increasing from 1.0 to 1.5 as the percent of NCP custody increases to 50%, and then decreases from 1.5 to 1.0 as the percent of NCP custody increases to 100%.
- **K2** shows the multiplier increasing from 0.20 to 0.25 as total monthly net income increases from \$0 to \$1,000 and then remains at 0.25 from \$1,000 to \$6,000, and then strangely decreases to 0.14 for \$20,000
- **K3** shows the multiplier increasing from 1.00 to 2.86 as the number of children increases from 1 to 10.
- **K4** shows the multiplier decreasing from 1 to 0 as percent of NCP custody increases. (CP income = 0% of NCP income), and decreasing from 1 to -1 as percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 100% of NCP income).

The plots that follow also show the percentage of NCP net income that will be demanded by the California state child support guideline regarding 1, 2, 3, and 4 children with parent's total net monthly income between \$1,000 (\$12,000 per year) and \$6,000 (\$72,000 per year). Each plot shows CP income varying from 0% to 100% of NCP income.









- **1 Kid** shows NCP paying 25% to 0% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 0% of NCP income), and 25% to -25% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 100% of NCP income).
- **2 Kids** shows NCP paying 40% to 0% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 0% of NCP income), and 40% to -40% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 100% of NCP income).
- **3 Kids** shows NCP paying 50% to 0% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 0% of NCP income), and 50% to -50% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 100% of NCP income).
- **4 Kids** shows NCP paying 58% to 0% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 0% of NCP income), and 58% to -58% as the percent of NCP custody increases (CP income = 100% of NCP income).

Conclusions

The NCP is forced to pay alimony that varies with CP income.

The following conclusions assume parent's total net monthly income between \$1,000 (\$12,000 per year) and \$6,000 (\$72,000 per year).

- An NCP with 0% custody will be forced to pay 25% of net income for 1 child, 40% for 2, 50% for 3, and 58% for 4, regardless of the CP's income.
- A parent with 50% custody will be forced to pay 19% of net income for 1 child, 30% for 2, 38% for 3, and 43% for 4 if the dependent parent is unemployed.
- Mandatory shared parenting in California would only reduce the employed parent's child support payment by 6% for 1 child, 10% for 2, 12% for 3, and 15% for 4 if the dependent parent is unemployed.



The Cost of Mentoring Children

Paternity fraud takes on a whole new meaning in California

Jim Untershine, GZS of LB, 09-29-02

President Bush may be asking Americans to bite off more than they can chew. Mentoring a child that belongs to someone else can claim 25% of your take home pay in California and as much as 31% in Massachusetts.

California may ask the president to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Kirk Kerkorian for paying \$50,316 per month to mentor a 4 year old child named Kira. Bert Riddick, John Ruff, and Damon Adams should also be awarded for mentoring a child that belongs to someone else, even though they are forced to do so by the California court.


California not only provokes adulterous relationships with their brand of "No Fault" divorce, it rewards the lion's share of the child support award to the illegitimate child. A multiple child support award allocates 25% of the NCP's income to support the youngest child, 15% for the next oldest, 10% for the next oldest, etc. Since there is no accountability of the money paid to support the children, this windfall is realized by the lying unfaithful adulteress who betrayed her solemn oath of marriage in an attempt to bite the hand that feeds her, while withholding the identity of her child's biological father in her sinister cover-up for profit.

Religions that sanctify marriage may soon become aware of those outside forces that are coming to bear on their followers. Rogue states who have implemented a family law system that leads parents into temptation in an attempt to reap a false profit may spark a religious movement. Flying in the face of God is not allowed in a country that separates church and state.

The Governor of California has identified a reduction of federal funding as the overriding reason to allow paternity fraud to continue. Although Governor Davis was quoted as saying the reduction of funding would result due to a drop in child support collections, he may have been more concerned with a drop in paternity establishment percentage.

California reported 123% paternity establishment to the Federal Government in 1998. The chart shown below shows that after the federal government instituted the Clinton welfare reform of 1996, California has reported more paternity establishments than the number of out-of-wedlock births in their state. This has resulted in extra paternity establishments of 14,111 in 1996, 28,255 in 1997, and 39,711 in 1998.

Paternity establishment percentages above 90% brings in federal incentive bonuses while paternity establishments over 100% should bring in Federal authorities to conduct an audit and bring a new meaning to paternity fraud.



Davis vetoes tests to ID dads

PATERNITY: Men forced to support children not their own say bill would have offered relief. They vow to fight on.
<http://www.dailybreeze.com/content/bln/nmpaternity28.html>

Jasmine Lee, DAILY BREEZE, 09-28-02

Despite a last-minute lobbying effort by South Bay and statewide supporters, Gov. Gray Davis on Friday vetoed a bill that would have allowed some men to dispute paternity with a DNA test after they are ordered to pay child support.

Davis acknowledged that something should be done to curb the growing problem of paternity fraud, but he said Assembly Bill 2240 would only delay the legal process of collecting child support payments and provide a loophole for biological fathers trying to shirk parental responsibilities.

Davis also said if the bill became law, the state might not meet federal requirements on collecting child support payments, putting California at risk of losing \$40 million in federal funds.

"I recognize that paternity fraud is a serious issue and has the potential of damaging an individual's livelihood," Davis wrote in a veto message. "However, AB 2240 is flawed in its attempt to address the issue."

Carson resident Bert Riddick, a paternity fraud victim profiled in a Daily Breeze article in July, said Davis was missing the big picture. He called the governor's claims about losing money "smoke and mirrors."

Riddick protested that truth — not federal funds — is what's at stake. He said the system lies to children about paternity and allows mothers to falsely name men as fathers. "What message are we sending to our children?" he asked.

Even though a DNA test excluded him as a biological father, Riddick pays \$1,400 a month to support the daughter of an ex-girlfriend. Because a court summons was not properly served, he missed his day in court and a default judgment was entered against him.

AB 2240 could have allowed Riddick to use the DNA evidence to dispute the paternity claim.

Riddick had organized a grass-roots, call-in campaign to urge Davis to sign the bill and remained optimistic until he learned of the veto Friday afternoon. For years, Riddick worked along and with such groups as the American Coalition for Fathers & Children and the California chapter of Citizens Against Paternity Fraud, to get the bill before the governor.

Assemblyman Rod Wright, D-Los Angeles, author of AB 2240, also sent a letter urging Davis to sign the bill. Cine Ivery, the district director for Wright's Los Angeles office, said the assemblyman is disappointed, but he did not immediately have a comment.

Opponents of the bill called the veto a victory for children.

"We agree there are paternity fraud issues and that the system is not working 100 percent," said Lupe Alonzo-Diaz, senior policy advocate for the San Diego-based Children's Advocacy Institute. "But we're glad that the governor put children first."

The National Organization for Women and the Oakland-based National Center for Youth Law also spoke against AB 2240.

Wright's bill would have required process servers to personally hand a court summons to men named in civil cases for child support. Servers now can mail or leave a summons at a last known residential or business address. Also, men who had already been ordered to pay child support through a default judgment — which means they did not appear in court to dispute paternity charges — would have been able to challenge paternity with a DNA test.

In his veto message, Davis directed the state Department of Child Support Services to work with the Legislature and lobbyists on both sides of the issue to find ways to address paternity fraud.

Alonzo-Diaz said she can see flaws in a system that forces men to pay for children who are not theirs. More than 70 percent of Los Angeles County men who pay child support were ordered to do so by default judgment.

However, the Children's Advocacy Institute was concerned about AB 2240 because it did not provide money for the child's food, school supplies and other needs while proof of paternity was pending. Alonzo-Diaz also pointed out that a man could claim he is not a biological parent, and then a test could conclude he is the father.

Also, parenthood is more than just DNA, she said.

"Biology is not the one factor that makes a father," Alonzo-Diaz said.

Riddick, married with an 11-year-old son and daughters ages 6 and 3, wondered who would advocate for his children.

"I wish (Davis) would come to my house and tell my son why he can't sign this bill," he said.

He challenged Davis to explain to his son, Azriel, why Riddick must pay for another child at the expense of his own children.

But, he said, the fight is not over. Riddick said he will continue to lobby to reform paternity fraud and has even considered running for the state Legislature.

"I'm not going anywhere," he said. "It's not over."

Publish Date: *September 28, 2002*

Kerkorian Ex-Wife Gets Little More

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20020914/ap_on_re_us/kerkorian_support_1

GARY GENTILE, AP Business Writer, 09-14-02

LOS ANGELES (AP) - Billionaire Kirk Kerkorian's ex-wife was awarded an additional \$316 a month in child support Friday, a pittance compared to the \$270,000-a-month increase she had sought.

The 84-year-old studio mogul had already agreed to pay \$50,000 a month to support 4-year-old Kira. But her mother, Lisa Bonder Kerkorian, argued the girl needed \$320,000 a month to continue living her ex-husband's lifestyle of private jet flights, expensive hotel accommodations and lavish parties.

Judge Lee Edmon called the estimates "incredible" and a "disguised form of spousal support."

The 37-year-old ex-wife said she would appeal. She said the judge "severely underestimated" the cost it takes to maintain her daughter in a lifestyle Kerkorian created for her.

Dennis Wasser, a lawyer representing Kerkorian, said he was pleased "that the judge, instead of accepting the fantasy world presented by Lisa Kerkorian, followed the law and the facts and ruled on the basis of common sense."

Edmon said Kira "is entitled to live a luxurious lifestyle" but is not entitled to private jet travel. Other items the judge threw out as "grossly exceeding the reasonable needs of the child" included \$300,000 for six parties per year and \$6,000 per month for house flowers.

The judge did award Bonder Kerkorian \$2,400 per month for Kira's equestrian activities and \$1,400 per month for French lessons, ballet lessons and other extracurricular activities.

Kerkorian and Bonder Kerkorian, a former tennis pro, had a 10-year romantic relationship but were married for only a month, in 1999. Although her attorneys originally claimed Kerkorian was Kira's natural father, Bonder Kerkorian recently admitted she faked the DNA paternity test by using saliva she obtained from Kerkorian's adult daughter.

Kerkorian has said he is willing to support the child even though he is not the biological father.

Kerkorian is worth an estimated \$4.5 billion according to the most recent Forbes magazine list, released Friday.

He is the majority shareholder in the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer movie studio and MGM Mirage Inc., which owns several Las Vegas Strip hotels.

Not the dad? Pay anyway

Men fight state laws that don't distinguish
http://www.freep.com/news/mich/dad16_20020916.htm

WENDY WENDLAND-BOWYER, FREE PRESS STAFF WRITER, 09-16-02

Each week, \$63 from John Ruff's paycheck goes toward child support for a daughter he didn't father, being raised by an ex-girlfriend he no longer sees.

Ruff said years ago, when his ex-girlfriend told him she was pregnant with his child, he believed her. He signed paternity papers, started paying child support and regularly saw the child.

But when Ruff heard rumors the child was not his, he got a DNA test. The result: He wasn't the dad.

Ruff presented this proof to an Oakland County judge. He thought it was enough to stop child support payments and to be removed from legal documents.

He was wrong.

"I hate to say it, but the whole part where I went wrong was the part where I tried to stand up and be a man and take responsibility for what I thought was my daughter," said Ruff, 29, who had lived in Ortonville. He has since married and moved to Grand Rapids.

"I should have been a jerk and tried to protest what she was saying."

Just as DNA has freed inmates imprisoned for crimes they did not commit, it should also free men from financial support for children they did not father, Ruff and others say.

In Michigan and many other states, legislators are considering laws to do just that.

Last year, the state House passed a package of bills that would permit people to get out of paying child support when a child is not biologically theirs. The bills also permit the cancellation of child support arrearages in such cases and penalize mothers who fraudulently say a man fathered their baby.

The bills sat in the state Senate Committee on Families, Mental Health and Human Services since then because of mostly legal concerns, said Amy Zaagman, chief of staff for committee Chairwoman Sen. Beverly Hammerstrom, R-Temperance.

Zaagman said her boss is not against the concept of the bills but has several legal concerns. For instance, when a man who is not married signs paternity papers, he waives his right to a DNA test. If the man has any doubts, he should raise them then, not years later, Zaagman said.

Also, one bill allows the man to stop paying child support but keep parenting time with the child.

"Where is the best interest of the children in all this?" said Zaagman. "Here's someone who had a relationship with the child, established some responsibility for the child . . . yet now he doesn't want to be responsible anymore but wants parenting time? How does that benefit the child?"

Dr. Damon Adams, a dentist from Traverse City, is leading the push for the bills. Adams said the bills are in children's best interest because kids have a right to the truth and should know their medical history.

"When something like this happens, the best way to heal is for the truth to come out," he said.

Adams knows firsthand about the problem. Shortly after his marriage of 25 years ended, he discovered he did not beget his fourth child, who was 8 at the time.

"It was the worst feeling I've ever had to go through in my life," Adams said. "It felt like a death."

Adams, too, presented the DNA evidence in his case to a judge but was told he had to continue paying child support. He said he pays more than \$18,000 a year.

Society outgrew system

The current legal system is based on 500 years of common law that gave children born within a marriage the right to claim the man in the marriage as their father, said Christi Goodman, program manager for the National Conference of State Legislatures.

But as society changed, and it became more common for children to be born outside of marriage, the laws were adjusted. More effort was made by the government to establish paternity and get single men to take responsibility for their children.

Not the dad? Pay anyway (Continued)

DNA testing didn't become accurate until about five to eight years ago, Goodman said. Then, men who suspected a child was not theirs suddenly had a way to prove it.

Now, many of these men are finding out that DNA evidence may not be enough. So they're demanding that laws be changed, Goodman said.

"It is causing a public stir," she said.

In Michigan, one of the groups to oppose the bills is the Family Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan.

Chairwoman Meri Anne Stowe said she can sympathize with men who are married and later discover a child is not biologically theirs. But Stowe said she is even more concerned about the children in these cases, who know only that man as "Dad."

"We don't want to illegitimize a whole class of children, and we don't want to impoverish a whole class of children," Stowe said. "We have to look at the greater good."

In Ruff's case, the girl he was told is his daughter was 4 when he had the DNA test done. Ruff told Oakland County Judge John McDonald that he had been deceived by his ex-girlfriend, presented the DNA evidence and said he only signed the paternity papers because he thought the girl was his.

But court records show McDonald didn't believe him. Rather, he believed the ex-girlfriend who told him that Ruff knew all along the child wasn't his but told her he wanted to raise the girl as his own.

Ruff said he hasn't seen the girl, who is now 8, since 1998. Ruff said he has paid \$26,000 in child support. He said he would like to start a family with his wife but fears he can't afford it.

"I've done everything I could do to get this decision reversed," Ruff said. "But I'm not about to give up."

Contact WENDY WENDLAND-BOWYER at 313-223-4792 or wendland@freepress.com.

HOW TO BE HEARD

Four bills that relate to paternity fraud will come up for testimony before a state Senate committee later this month. They are House bills 4635, 4636, 4637 and 4638.

The proposed legislation would permit men who have scientific proof they are not the father to stop paying child support and get out of paying past-due child support orders. The bills would also make it a crime to misidentify someone as a father, among other things. All bills passed the House last year. For more information on the bills, visit www.michiganlegislature.org.

A public hearing on the bills before the Senate Committee on Families, Mental Health and Human Services is set for 3 p.m. Sept. 25 in Room 100 of the Farnum Building in Lansing.

To learn more about the hearing or about how to send written comments, call committee Chairwoman Sen. Beverly Hammerstrom's office, at 517-373-3543 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays.

Attorney General Warning:

630

Family Law causes homicide, domestic violence, depression, persecution, abortion, loss of children, and may make you quit smoking

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 09-15-02

Tommy Thompson is expected to issue a statement regarding the recent attacks on his empire. Disgruntled employees, misguided state judges, indentured servants, and murder suspects may force the Health and Human Services (HHS) Department to answer to the Attorney General.

Stephen Baskerville recently published a piece entitled "*Tommy Thompson's Reign of Terror*" and asserts "*The divorce industry has corrupted local government throughout America*". Like many whistleblowers embroiled in a cover-up, Baskerville was "fired" by the Virginia Secretary from the child support guideline review body after publishing a piece entitled "*Appetite for Family Destruction*" that detailed the views of the member he was replacing, Barry Koplen. Mr. Koplen shared his disdain for the divorce industry asserting "*The violation of constitutional rights [is] perpetrated by both our courts and the DCSE*".

This may cause HHS to realize that "*Silencing or eliminating all advocates for change, amongst those who advise legislation, turns objective review into law prearranged and signals the fall of a nation*".

Ohio judges have taken it upon themselves to force parents to quit smoking, which will decrease their tobacco tax revenue. The outrageous tobacco tax that has been imposed on smokers is used by states to subsidize their Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). The state of Ohio transferred \$73 million of their TANF "gravy" to their Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) in 1999 while transferring nothing to their CCDF.

This may cause HHS to realize that "*If Ohio is not spending their tobacco tax on child care, then maybe they should start taxing coffee?*"

Many indentured servants are threatening to file a class action lawsuit to seek reparations for damages currently being incurred due to slavery. The lawsuit being filed on behalf of Afro-American descendants may be expanded to include heterosexual taxpayers who dare to raise children. The claims being made in that lawsuit include "*slaves were prevented from accumulating wealth to bequeath to future generations*" and "*money slaves should have earned for their work instead went to companies that directly or indirectly profited from slave labor*".

This may cause HHS to realize that "*the Emancipation Proclamation was not written to shame the South, it was written to give the Executive branch the power to protect American citizens who are attempting to secure their freedom*".

Gary Condit, O.J. Simpson, and Robert Blake never asked to be saddled with a murder motive by the family law system in California. The mother of their children was pressed to their head, with the state warning these fathers "this thing has a hair trigger and it will go off, if you do not do as we say, and there is nothing you can do about it". Sandra Levy, Nicole Simpson, and Bonnie-Lee Bakely never asked to be the weapon in this family law home invasion, but they are not around to implicate the state in this conspiracy to provoke their own murder.

This may cause HHS to realize that "*Jim Trafficant was right, when he identified a conspiracy between the Executive and Judicial branches of government, and Gary Condit was the only other member of the Legislative branch who had the guts to actively agree*".

This publication is a service of the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, Inc. (FCF) and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Free Congress Foundation nor is it an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any bill.

Tommy Thompson's Reign Of Terror

<http://www.freecongress.org/commentaries/020912SB.asp>

Stephen Baskerville, 09-12-02

The government claims a crisis of unpaid child support. Leading scholars have declared these claims to be everything from a "myth" to a "hoax." Yet some in the Bush administration seem determined to continue the failed policies of the Clinton years. Health & Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson recently announced mass arrests of parents he says have disobeyed government orders.

The Clinton administration's "Project Save Our Children" illustrates that more political chicanery is perpetrated in the name of children than any other cause. The secretary has begun a "nationwide sweep" to arrest (what he calls) the "most wanted deadbeat parents." By the government's own figures, however, the "worst of the worst" amount to only 69 fathers worthy of prosecution.

Even assuming these few men may be scoundrels, why don't authorities simply arrest them and be done with it? Why all the fanfare from the federal government? Perhaps because these prosecutions are political.

"We will find you," President Clinton would intone against fathers. "We will make you pay." In Maryland, government billboards announce, "We're Looking for You, Child Support Violators." No government warns bank robbers or drug dealers that the government is watching them. This is not law enforcement: It is terror.

"More notable than any one arrest," we are told, is the "message that the administration is sending" that it will use federal agents to enforce divorce. In other words, the aim is not to prosecute lawbreakers but to spread fear. Terrorizing citizens into obeying its orders is not an appropriate role of government in a free society, even when the orders are legitimate.

In this case, the orders are not legitimate. They are creations of a divorce industry eager to encourage divorce by making it more lucrative. A child support "obligation" is simply what judges and bureaucrats decide a father must pay to have his children taken away.

Most divorces are filed by women, usually with no legal grounds. Most obligors have therefore done nothing to incur the imputed obligation, which is set by the same enforcement personnel who collect it. These officials have an interest in separating children from their fathers, imposing impossible child support burdens, and then arresting parents who inevitably fail to pay.

By the government's own account, what is billed as "child support" is little short of plunder. Among those arrested was a man earning all of \$39,000 a year and ordered to pay \$350 a week for one child, almost two-thirds of his likely take-home pay.

These men have no hope for a fair trial; they have already been pronounced guilty in the media by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with no platform to reply in their own defense.

The divorce industry has corrupted local government throughout America. Now its poison is reaching up to the highest levels of our government. The administration is soiling its hands in some of the worst sludge left by the Clintons.

Stephen Baskerville is a professor of Political Science at Howard University and a contributor to FCF News on Demand

Ross Perot Wins Again in Florida

629

We paid for a front row, box seat, air conditioned, and we never got to see the show"

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 09-13-02

Gore and Bush watched anxiously, while the fate of our nation was thrust in the hands, of residents of a state, who chose not to be there. The wisdom and clarity, of those absentee balloteers, empowered them to determine our nation's destiny. But what if they all voted for Ross Perot?

The only reason Clinton became president was because of the landslide victory of Ross Perot. Now, even with Florida's brand new computer system designed to count votes, Ross Perot continues to be elected. I believe I speak for the rest of America by demanding that Ross Perot be allowed to be president. Not because he deserves a chance, but because of the number of elections he has won.

"United We Stand" is not just another credo as a result of 911, it is Ross Perot's platform, and has been for quite some time. Perot's back-home logic and frightening clarity seemed to scare those politicians who belong to traditional parties, because "overhaul" and "redesign" may offend their contributors, regardless of the effects on their constituents.

If all Americans would allow themselves to "get what they pay for, and stop paying if they don't", they may realize that "crime don't pay, people do"

The demand for accountability is a very trendy pursuit these days in this age of Enron, WorldCom, and Martha Stuart. Americans must be shown the "ways and means" by which state governments are allowed to wage war on heterosexual taxpayers, that dare to raise children, in this country. It may seem like a far-fetched idea for taxpayers to choose jail rather than pay, when they realize they are funding slavery, but then they laughed at Henry David Thoreau, too.

The only parent financially capable of providing support for their children is thrown in jail for failing to pay a court ordered amount of money. This is not money awarded by the court due to damages that *has* occurred at the hands of the parent, it is a projected estimate of damages that *will* occur at the hands of the court.

The ability of civil courts to dispense indentured servitude and then impose debtor's prison is not as bad as sentencing these parents in abstenia. Many of these parents are disgusted with the family law system specifically, and not in

contempt of the court generally. These parents are forced to permit the court to destroy their family and then deny these same parents accountability of how their money is spent to reimburse their children.

If a parent was ordered to pay a percentage of their income to support their children, then these parents would not fall so far behind when their employer fires them because of it. A failure to pay any percentage of nothing would not be aailable offense.

The civil court may realize that Child Support Enforcement (CSE) must be "turned on" as soon as "the bun comes out of the oven", to utilize the power of the federal mandate. Not to make debtor's prison more legal, but to allow CSE to protect the indentured servants if they are terminated or denied employment due to the existence of child support garnishments. CSE will be denied the windfall of "sitting on their hands" until what is left of the family files for welfare (TANF).

Jailing a parent for civil contempt is an indictment of non-compliance with a federal mandate and forfeits that state's license to practice family law, or child support enforcement. Attorney Generals would all agree that the laws must be uniformly enforced, and ignorance of the law is no excuse. "It's the little things, there's nothing bigger"

"Do not try to bend the law; that is impossible. Only try to realize the truth. There is no law. Then you will see, that it is not the law that bends, it is only yourself."

Lawrence County judges free 37 child-support offenders

<http://www.post-gazette.com/localnews/20020912support0912p7.asp>

Jan Ackerman, Post-Gazette Staff Writer, 09-12-02

Bowing to pressure from the American Civil Liberties Union, Lawrence County judges yesterday released 37 defendants who had been jailed without hearings for not paying court-ordered child support.

Philip Boudewyns, Lawrence County court administrator, said all those in Lawrence County who were incarcerated for nonsupport after being held in civil contempt were released on orders of President Judge Ralph D. Pratt.

"After the president judge reviewed the cases of these 37 individuals, he decided to release them in order to maintain their civil liberties," Boudewyns said yesterday.

He said the nonsupport cases will be referred back to the county's domestic relations office, where attorneys can file new civil contempt charges against the defendants if they believe charges are warranted.

If new charges are filed, Boudewyns said, the cases will be handled under revised procedures. Each defendant will be brought before a judge for a hearing, where he can either clear himself of the contempt or offer explanations for being in arrears with payments. In the past, defendants in child support disputes in Lawrence County were being jailed without hearings or access to legal counsel.

Court officials immediately notified Witold Walczak, executive director of the Pittsburgh ACLU chapter, who had threatened to sue them for violating the constitutional rights of the men in the nonsupport cases.

"This is an essential first step to keep this dispute out of litigation, and we are pleased that the judges are taking it," said Walczak, who visited Lawrence County last week to discuss the county's methods for handling support issues.

He said an unresolved issue is whether Lawrence County judges will appoint lawyers to handle civil contempt issues involving child support. When he met with the judges last week, Walczak told them the law is clear in that anyone facing imprisonment is constitutionally entitled to a lawyer in civil and criminal procedures.

Boudewyns said the judges still are reviewing that issue. Until their review is complete, he said, no lawyers will be appointed for defendants who are accused of not paying child support.

Jan Ackerman can be reached at jackerman@post-gazette.com or 412-263-1370.

The Message of Joy

628

"Patriots, making the ultimate sacrifice, will live forever in the minds of our children and their message will never be ignored."

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 08-25-02

One year ago today, an aerial assault was carried out by a desperate victim of "misdirected anguish". The intended target of this suicide mission was completely destroyed in the resulting conflagration. The scene of the attack was described as "more surreal than anything else".

Piloting a plane from a nearby airport insured a full payload of fuel. This "home made" weapon of mass destruction was flawlessly delivered in this premeditated surgical attack.

Federal aviation officials investigating this tragedy were forced to realize the "ways and means" by which an "independent entity" could use implements of our own creation as a weapon of destruction against us.

While the identity of the pilot was not immediately verified, the motive for the attack suggested the possible individual responsible. The suspect was found to be motivated to commit this act of desperation in retaliation to an act of betrayal by the U.S. The motive may never be publicly known since the details of this betrayal have been shrouded in secrecy. It is also believed that the suspect was prohibited from legal recourse in seeking civil justice.

On 08-25-01, Louis W. Joy III sacrificed his life to "keep the spoils of war from falling into enemy hands", insuring that "crime don't pay", and sending a clear message that "betrayal, in all it's forms, has no place in civilized society".

After being exiled from his home and forbidden to contact his child, Joy resisted the temptation to disarm the state Family Law "money machine" by eliminating the civil petitioner (his child's mother). Instead, he chose to pilot his private plane into his newly constructed "mansion", taking his own life and reducing the structure to smoking rubble.

"Louis Joy, 43, a published author, business consultant, and motivational speaker, had founded the consulting firm Manufacturing Excellence Inc." He and his wife authored a book entitled "Frontline Teamwork: One Company's Story of Success".

Louis Joy seemed to be aware that "marriage is a foundation for a family to build" and that his foundation was "cracked beyond repair". Ironically the crash scene gave evidence of this message.

This sobering message was delivered 17 days before the copycat attack on 09-11-01, but the political correctness of Family Law injustice in the media limited coverage to the Boston Globe.

Rudy Gulianni could easily testify to those same feelings experienced by Louis Joy. Both men were exposed to a Family Law system that is designed to insure a cash flow by denying child custody to "deep pockets" parents regardless of proven respectability.

The Family Law persecution of the only parent financially capable of supporting their children is limited to heterosexual taxpayers who dare to raise children in this country. Because of the gag order that seems to be imposed on the media, the mainstream public will never become aware of this threat to liberty until they are forced to experience it for themselves.

Patriots, who make the ultimate sacrifice, will live forever in the minds of our children and their message will never be ignored.

Pilot was ordered to leave his home

Notice was served day before crash

Mac Daniel, Globe Staff, 08-28-01

AMHERST, N.H. - Less than 12 hours before his corporate plane slammed into his new \$750,000 hillside home, Louis W. Joy III had been served with a restraining order, sought by his wife earlier that day, by two Amherst police officers. The order, which forced Joy to temporarily leave both his palatial home and his volatile marriage, accused him of domestic violence.

He left the house with a few belongings and without protest on Friday, police said. It is unknown where he spent the night. But by daylight Saturday, after Joy told Nashua airport officials that he was flying south to Atlantic City, the plane buzzed his wooded Amherst neighborhood, banked steeply, then smashed into his empty home, destroying it.

No one on the ground was injured, and federal aviation officials are investigating. Police said they are aware of no suicide note.

The domestic violence petition filed by Joy's wife, Jo, on Friday was sealed early yesterday by a Milford District Court judge at the request of her attorney, David Lauren.

In asking to seal it, Lauren said the affidavit contains information that "would prove extremely damaging" to the couple's 8-year-old daughter. Publication, he said, would further traumatize the child, who "is entitled to retain favorable memories of her father."

The restraining order, which temporarily banished Louis Joy from the house at 19 High Meadow Lane in which he had lived with his wife and daughter for about four months, also awarded custody of the girl temporarily to his wife.

A hearing was scheduled for Sept. 24, but Louis Joy had not yet hired an attorney, according to Lauren's petition. Lauren did not return calls from the Globe yesterday.

Louis Joy, 43, a published author, business consultant, and motivational speaker, had founded the consulting firm Manufacturing Excellence Inc., to which the plane was registered.

He was remembered as a reclusive eccentric who nailed all the windows shut at his Newark, Del., home and became angry with a prospective buyer of the house when she asked if he would remove a fence.

Joy coauthored a book with his wife in 1993 titled "Frontline Teamwork: One Company's Story of Success," which one synopsis said was "guaranteed to capture the interest of front-line workers and help them contribute to the success of their organizations."

Residents in the sprawling Amherst development of million-dollar homes said the plane buzzed the neighborhood around 7:30 Saturday morning before the engine went silent and the plane plowed into the house, avoiding a stand of trees no farther than 75 feet away.

Manchester Superior Court records showed no divorce filings involving the Joys, nor any lawsuits or other legal matters regarding Joy's firm, which he ran out of his home.

The chief medical examiner's office in Concord has not yet positively identified Louis Joy as the man killed in the crash. An official there said yesterday that the office was awaiting out-of-state medical records.

At the crash scene yesterday, the builder of the house, Ron Rees, said the crash and subsequent fire were so severe that the thick concrete foundation of the Colonial structure was cracked beyond repair.

"It's more surreal than anything else," Rees said after viewing the wreckage.

He said he had been in contact with Jo Joy, who he said is "taking it fairly well, and as well as anyone can be expected." It took Rees's workers about a year to construct the custom-built dwelling to the couple's specifications. The \$750,000 house had about 5,000 square feet of space.

The Joys moved in four months ago from Delaware. The long and winding driveway was paved only days before the crash.

"It was a beautiful home," Rees said.

This story ran on page B1 of the Boston Globe on 8/28/2001.

© Copyright 2001 Globe Newspaper Company.

Who's the Deadbeat Now?

576

A Dad can be current with child support payments and still be labeled a "deadbeat"

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 08-03-02

Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson issued a statement explaining the recent roundup of "deadbeat dads":

"These parents have a demonstrated ability to meet their financial responsibilities to their children, but they have consistently refused to provide the support they owe,"

Until the children are granted a legal right to their support, it can never be proved the children received it. Consumer fraud results from the failure of merchants to provide the goods and services to the customer that is purchased by the consumer. Paying child support to CSE who then pays the custodial parent (CP) does not guarantee the children will see a dime.

If a "deadbeat dad" were to pay the back child support of \$100,000, how much of that money would the children receive?

- In California it is presumed that a CP will spend a *"significant portion"* of available resources to support the children.
- In the "100 acre woods" it is presumed that Rabbit will spend a *"tiny smackerel"* of available honey to support Winnie the Pooh.

Bill O'Rielly may invite Barbara Boxer and Winnie the Pooh to the "No Spin Zone" to discuss the salient points of contributions paid but not received by the intended recipients. I believe Mr O'Rielly would agree with the following quotes:

**"Get what you pay for, stop paying if you don't"
"Crime don't pay, people do"**

It seems hard to believe that any of the states harboring these "deadbeats", would be powerless to impose the "iron fist" of Child Support Enforcement (CSE) that has been granted to them by federal mandate. The states have been granted the power to intercept income, deny licenses, and pillage property of these "deadbeat dads" from across counties, across states, and across oceans.

States fail to utilize these outrageous forms of bill collection because CSE is allowed to charge 10% interest on back child support owed. Bringing a "deadbeat dad" into court will only reduce the interest income for the state, which continues to grow at an alarming rate. It is potentially more profitable for states to use the federal mandate to actively prevent the "deadbeat dad" from making payments until the federal government is finally forced to put the "deadbeat" in jail.

The real "deadbeats" are the states who are paid to enforce the federal law, but have chosen to actively subvert it. The exploitation of children for money is not what the federal government had in mind when they instituted the last round of welfare reform. The state CSE that allowed the child support arrearage to reach \$100,000 should be the first defendant in a federal criminal nonsupport charge.

The Department of Health and Human Services are recognized as the complainant in these federal criminal nonsupport charges facing these "deadbeat dads". A criminal charge that makes no mention of money but rather support denied to the children. The children are the actual complainant in this nonsupport charge, but the order of inheritance goes to the CP, state CSE, federal CSE, and then to the NCP. Until the states demand accountability of money paid for child support and money spent to support the children, every charge of criminal nonsupport should demure to prosecution.

A Dad can be current with child support payments and still be labeled a "deadbeat".

Ex-Raider Caught in Support Sting

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20020801/ap_on_sp_fo_ne/fbn_child

AP, 08-01-02

PHILADELPHIA (AP) - A former defensive end for the [Oakland Raiders](#) was among 61 people arrested in a nationwide sweep of parents who authorities said failed to pay child support.

[James Harris](#), an NFL journeyman who played in 82 games from 1993-99, was arrested Wednesday in Chicago. Prosecutors said Harris owes \$100,000 in child support for a son who lives in Pennsylvania.

The arrest was part of a roundup of child support defaulters by the Department of Health and Human Services ([news - web sites](#)). Investigators made arrests in 25 states as part of the sweep. Prosecutors said they are seeking an additional 41 suspects on charges that they skipped out on court-ordered payments to their children.

Collectively, the defendants owe around \$5 million, authorities said. All were at least one year late in making payments and officials said many have not made a payment in several years.

The 34-year-old Harris, of East St. Louis, Ill., was a linebacker at Temple University before joining the NFL. He made \$1.5 million in his pro career, which included stints with the [Minnesota Vikings](#) and [St. Louis Rams](#), prosecutors said.

He was released on a \$100,000 bond. His case will be tried in Philadelphia, prosecutors said.

Dozens of Deadbeat Parents Busted in U.S. Sweep

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/nm/20020801/ts_nm/life_deadbeats_dc_2

Reuters, 07-31-02

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Dozens of America's most wanted "deadbeat" parents, including a former pro football player, have been arrested this week in a nationwide crackdown on people who chronically default on child support payments, a federal official announced on Wednesday.

Teams of federal and state authorities rounded up 61 deadbeat parents in 25 states, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico and are pursuing 41 others, Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson said.

"These parents have a demonstrated ability to meet their financial responsibilities to their children, but they have consistently refused to provide the support they owe," Thompson said in a statement.

Among those taken into custody were former professional football player James E. Harris, who finished his National Football League career with the Oakland Raiders in 1999, said Katherine Harris, an HHS spokeswoman.

The former football player earned more than \$1 million in each of the two years he spent with the Raiders, the spokeswoman said. He currently owns a housing development corporation in Missouri and is \$103,000 in arrears in child support payments, according to the Health and Human Services department.

Harris could not be reached for comment.

HHS said others arrested in the sweep include an Oklahoma sheet metal worker who has not made a child support payment in 16 years and now owes \$297,000; a Florida pharmacist who owes \$63,000 and a Texas car salesman who has crossed state lines and quit several jobs to avoid paying child support.

The 102 defaulters sought in the sweep collectively owe more than \$5 million in child support, the statement said. Thompson said they were among the most "egregious offenders" from cases referred by state agencies to federal authorities for investigation.

HHS spokeswoman Harris said the sweep for child support defaulters, which began on Monday, is the largest such effort since the federal agency launched a special enforcement program four years ago.

"It's a high priority for the department because it's a question of responsibility and what is right," Harris said of the need to crackdown on those who routinely miss child support payments. "Children suffer because of this," she said.

An Ounce of Prevention

"See what is before your eyes and what is hidden from you will be revealed to you"


Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 08-01-02

Credit card companies, abortion clinics, and custodial parents (CPs) are lobbying to make bankruptcy impossible for people who owe them money. New legislation looms over heterosexual taxpayers that dare to raise children in this country (see [article](#) that follows)

- Credit card companies report "millions of dollars in losses a year from bankrupt consumers" while noncustodial parents (NCPs) who are forced into divorce are doomed to file for bankruptcy due to outrageous state child support guidelines.
- Abortion clinics wish to "prohibit people who attack or block access to abortion clinics from declaring bankruptcy to avoid paying court-ordered fines" while court ordered fines can be traded for jail time.
- Single mothers are "seeking child support from bankrupt fathers" while child support can not be discharged by a NCP in bankruptcy (USC 42 666).

Solution:

- The credit card companies must capture the child support market.
- The credit card companies could easily privatize child support and render family law "custody free in 2003".
- "Custody free" child support is "welfare reform" and restores fairness into the family law system.
- The block diagram shown below describes the structure of the child support account.



Requirements:

- Point of Sale (POS) software modifications to itemize all purchases charged to the child support account.
- Credit card summary software to flag illegitimate purchases made by either parent.
- CSE must be involved as soon as child support account is created or ordered.

Benefits:

- Allows parents to start an account to establish child support contributions prior to separation thus avoiding bankruptcy.
- Allows either parent to charge the account for purchases to support the children.
- Allows parents to customize a list of illegitimate charges that must be repaid by offending parent and enforced by CSE.
- Allows CSE to react immediately if employer fires or refuses to hire a parent due to child support garnishments (USC 42 666 b6d i)
- Allows CSE to modify employer child support withholding on a real time basis (USC 42 666 b6d ii)
- Allows CSE to immediately approve TANF contributions if child support account balance falls below acceptable level.
- Eliminates child custody as criteria regarding parent contributions since money can only be spent on the children.
- Provides quantifiable data regarding the money spent to support the children for family of this type.

Enhancements:

- Credit card companies and health care providers may develop many customized medical plans.
- Grocery stores will not be forced to legitimize purchases or count food stamps.
- Allows excessive balance of child support account to "spill over" to the children's college fund.

"To remove the splinter from your brother's eye, you must remove the log from your own eye"
"See what is before your eyes and what is hidden from you will be revealed to you"

White House Hails Bankruptcy Bill

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20020726/ap_on_go_co/congress_bankruptcy_15

JESSE J. HOLLAND, Associated Press Writer, 07-26-02

WASHINGTON (AP) - Hours after making big business more liable to the public, Congress also moved toward making it more difficult for Americans to escape overwhelming debt through bankruptcy protection.

"In these hard economic times, while we're dealing with corporate responsibility, we should also address personal responsibility," GOP Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah said.

After arguing for five years, House and Senate negotiators finally came to an agreement Thursday on a compromise bill that would make it tougher to get credit card and other debts forgiven in bankruptcy court.

White House Spokesman Ari Fleischer praised the agreement. "The president looks forward to signing that," Fleischer said.

The legislation had been stalled all year over a Democratic demand for a provision ensuring that abortion protesters who are sued successfully may not use bankruptcy laws to avoid payment. But with the new agreement, lawmakers planned to put the bill on the fast track before going home for the summer.

The Republican-controlled House was expected to take the bankruptcy bill up Friday, GOP aides said.

How quickly it would move through the Democratic-controlled Senate was uncertain, but "we have worked hard for a year to make this a better and more balanced bill, and we have succeeded," said Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The legislation applies a new standard for determining whether people filing for bankruptcy should be forced to repay debts under court-approved reorganization plans rather than having them dissolved. If a debtor is found to have sufficient income to repay at least 25 percent of the debt over five years or has at least the median income for his or her state, a reorganization plan generally would be required.

Under the current system, it is usually left to a bankruptcy judge or a private attorney appointed by the Justice Department to decide whether someone qualifies for dissolution of debts or should be forced to repay under a reorganization plan. The credit card industry, which claims millions of dollars in losses a year from bankrupt consumers, has long lobbied for changes in the bankruptcy laws.

"At long last, we'll be able to close loopholes exploited by big spenders who have the ability to repay their debts and better protect consumers who have been left to pay higher prices for goods and services as a result," said Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa.

Opponents charged that, particularly in a sagging economy, the measure would remove a crucial safety net for people who have lost their jobs or face huge medical bills, as well as for single mothers seeking child support from bankrupt fathers.

Sen. Paul Wellstone, D-Minn., one of its leading opponents, likely will try to stop the bill by saying tens of thousands of people have lost their retirement savings and jobs since the Enron Corp. and WorldCom Inc., accounting scandals became public.

"This bill is a dastardly one for consumers, especially in these economic times," Wellstone spokeswoman Allison Dobson said. "It should be embarrassing for people to vote for this."

The provision holding up the bill was targeted at violent abortion protesters. It would prohibit people who attack or block access to abortion clinics from declaring bankruptcy to avoid paying court-ordered fines.

A GOP aide, speaking on condition of anonymity, said Republicans succeeded in limiting the provision to only people who intentionally or knowingly violate the law.

New Legislation may End Consumer Fraud

574

IRS may demand accountability of custodial parents

Jim Untersshine, GZS of LB, 07-20-02

The United States is taking a long look at the recent assaults on the American way by the state of California. Allowing the "pledge of allegiance" to be deemed unconstitutional, freeing known terrorists from custody, implementing indentured servitude, debtors prison, consumer fraud, and tax evasion.

The state of California may soon be asked if they are attempting to secede from the Union.

Legislators from the state of California announced they wish to grant custodial parents (CPs) blanket immunity from the US Treasury Department, in return for allowing the state to gather 10% interest ion money that never existed. This is an addendum to the new federal legislation that promises incentives for CPs to get remarried, as well as encouraging employers to hire, promote, and give CPs a pay raise. The standard bonuses already granted to CPs by California, includes the highest tax free child support award in the nation, guaranteed custody of the children, and complete immunity from accountability regarding money spent on the children.

California Family Code 4053 (l) states that "it is presumed that the custodial parent will spend a '*significant portion*' of available resources to support their children". This is the only legal conversion of money paid by the NCP to money spent by the CP to support the children. Obviously, this presumption of a generality is not enough for the IRS to allow the CP to evade taxes on the '*insignificant portion*' of the available resources that the CP does not spend on the children.

- The Treasury Department may demand an accounting of money spent to support the children before it can be deducted from the CP's taxes. They may discover that California is actually eliminating taxpayers by driving NCPs into financial insolvency and denying them federal protection from their employers.
- The Justice Department may realize the new plan may allow a NCP to demure to prosecution regarding a criminal nonsupport charge in California since money is never mentioned in the charge and this vague conversion has never been challenged. They may realize that federal laws are not uniformly enforced in the state of California and rights and privileges of NCPs are being deprived unjustly across counties, across states, and across oceans.
- The Health and Human Services Department may demand a California audit (by a company other than Policy Studies Inc) regarding child support accounting before CPs are told how much they can deduct from their taxes. They may ask Policy Studies Inc. what the scope of their investigation was when they "cooked the books" for Los Angeles County DCSS prior to 9/11.
- The Labor Department may find that California CSE has ignored NCPs filing for unemployment insurance after being fired by their employer or refused to be hired due to child support garnishments.
- The Ways and Means Committee may realize that the California child support awards are grossly misrepresented in their GREENBOOK (Table 8-2). Chairman Herger from California may be cautioned that these gross misrepresentations and attempts by California legislators (Cox and Boxer) to perpetuate the welfare problem, has finally completed a positive feedback path to an already inherently unstable system, transforming the President's proposed welfare reform into a weapon of mass destruction in California. The committee may realize that:
- Every employed NCP that is fired due to child support garnishments, allows the employer to hire a CP, but gives rise to a new TANF recipient
- Every taxpaying NCP that loses their job due to financial insolvency, puts a heavier burden on existing taxpayers
- Every CP that gets remarried may give rise to a new NCP.

This "ENRON" style of accounting will not be tolerated by the IRS, and this exploitation of children for money will not be tolerated by heterosexual taxpayers who dare to raise children in this country.

Detached from the Nation, California slips into oblivion.

NOW do you See Our Point?

572

"It's not that you are a woman, California does this to everybody"

Jim Unterschine, GZS of LB, 07-01-02

The National Organization for Women (NOW) is finally catching on in a very big way. The "out of control" California family law "money machine" has started to deny custody to women. The California NOW Family Law Taskforce has proposed a Legislative, Judicial, Executive, and Grassroots strategy to reform the Family Law Courts.

Renewing their pledge to seek equality, this crack team of humanitarians, are responding to family law injustice that seems to be targeting a few women who got pregnant in the state of California. This outrage is well justified and shared by all California family members, but NOW's angst seems to revolve around women.

The newly released "Family Court Report (FCR)" published by the California contingent of NOW would easily gain universal backing if the word "woman" was replaced with "noncustodial parent" throughout the report.

The FCR exudes the typical family law rhetoric and attempts to "drive home" these presumptions, myths, and legends with a preponderance of rhetorical sources and seems to be based on 300 examples of hearsay evidence. There are 14 million custodial parents in the United States and only 15% (2.1 million) are men. Hearsay testimony from 0.014% (300 / 2.1 million) angry noncustodial women is not enough to prove gender-bias. Of the 373 questions that were included in the extensive questionnaire, that is used as a basis for much of the gender bias conclusions in the FCR, only 4 would be sufficient to prove corruption within the California family law system.

A. Personal Information

15. How many children under age 18 are there from this relationship?

C. Children's Personal Information

6. Amount of Monthly Support Order?

D. Property Division and Spousal Support

4. Your current monthly income?

8. Former husband/partner current monthly income?

If the 300 angry women had a comparable income as their former husband / partner, then the root of the problem would become blatantly clear.

The family law system in California is only designed to guarantee a cash flow between parents, regardless of sex, race, class, culture, ethnicity, or sexual orientation?

The FCR makes many interesting claims:

- NOW was responsible for starting the father's right movement by advancing the women's movement with the Family Law Act.
- The father's rights movement has a sinister agenda in trying to challenge the rights of mothers in an attempt to evade paying child support.
- The Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS) is a farce and is being used by fathers attempting to evade paying child support.
- Women who are victims of domestic violence, whose children make allegations of abuse against their fathers, are particularly at risk of losing custody of their children to the perpetrator.

The FCR should have made the following claims:

- California uses unwed mothers as a tool to guarantee a cash flow into the state family law "money machine", which has provoked "misdirected anguish" by NCPs attempting to disarm the state.
- 21% of all female homicide victims were killed by their spouse in California **11**
- 43% of all female homicide victims were killed by a family member in California **11**.
- 41% of all child homicide victims were killed a family member in California **11**.
- The feminists from Indiana (Institute of Family and Social Responsibility) have provided fraudulent data regarding California's child support guideline to the US House, denying Legislative visibility into the highest child support guideline in the nation **12**.
- California paid an undisclosed amount to profiteers from Colorado (Policy Studies Inc.) to "subvert the federal law" for the Judicial Council in San Francisco prior to 9/11/01. **13**
- California paid \$250,000 to profiteers from Colorado (Policy Studies Inc.) to "cook the books" for the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) in Los Angeles prior to 9/11/01. **14**
- California led the nation, reporting 35,000 paternity establishments over and above out-of-wedlock births in 1995 - 1998. **15**
- California led the nation, making a \$189 million profit in 1998 regarding Child Support Enforcement (CSE). **16**
- California led the nation, transferring \$307 million into the Child Care and Development fund (CCDF) in 1999 regarding Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF). **17**

NOW do you see our point? (Continued)

572_2

- 11 California Attorney General's "Crime Statistics 2000", part 1, pg 12, <http://caag.state.ca.us/cjsc/publications/homicide/homi2000/cr1.pdf>
- 12 Ways and Means "GREENBOOK" section 8, (CSE), Table 8-2, http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=wm014_08.pdf&directory=/disk2/wais/data/106_green_book/
- 13 California Judicial Council Guideline Review, <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/newsreleases/NR64-98.HTM>
- 14 Los Angeles Times, Greg Krikorian, 06-03-01, "County Child Program's Accounting Under Scrutiny by State" and Los Angeles Times, Greg Krikorian, 01-05-02, "Reformed Child Support System Termed a Success"
- 15 Ways and Means "GREENBOOK" section 8, (CSE), Table 8-20, 8-21, and 8-22, http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=wm014_08.pdf&directory=/disk2/wais/data/106_green_book
- 16 Ways and Means "GREENBOOK" section 8, (CSE), Table 8-23, http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=wm014_08.pdf&directory=/disk2/wais/data/106_green_book
- 17 Ways and Means "GREENBOOK" section 7 (TANF) Table 7-17 http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.37&filename=wm014_07.pdf&directory=/diskb/wais/data/106_green_book,