



Redistributing the Wealth — Fairly

Some family friends of ours had quite a bit of excitement recently: They adopted a baby boy! Their new boy is the joy of joys for them because, though they desperately wanted children, they had been languishing on adoption waiting lists for years, without much hope of getting a child. They were ideal prospective parents: Both the husband and the wife are college educated; the couple is financially stable; they could produce an almost endless supply of character references; and their marriage vows remain solidly intact after nearly 20 years together. In other words, they could provide a stable, loving, traditional home for a child.



But there were no children to be had. Fortunately for them, an adoption agency in Wisconsin recommended that they apply at an agency in Florida where it might be possible to get a child.

Then they had to make a trip from Wisconsin to Florida to get their new son and spend five to 10 business days there to get the legalities worked out before the legal system would let them have their new son.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Such travails, and much worse, are commonplace among prospective adoptive parents, rather than the exception. Get several sets of these adoptive parents in a room and listen for hours as they go through all of the red tape, costs, and anguish of waiting for children — and recount their frustration. Many couples simply give up the idea of having what, I believe, most parents would say is the uttermost joy of their lives: children.

In reflecting on this couple's adoption hardships, I pondered what could be done to remedy the situation, and I realized that if I were to think as liberals do, the answer would be easy: Obviously "government ought to do something about this."

In the interest of fairness and to end such deprivation, we could create a law that mandates that any woman who accepts government welfare to care for herself or her kids should henceforth be obligated, should she get pregnant, to carry the child to term and allow him to be adopted by deserving (meaning "taxpaying") couples who have been unfairly deprived of the children they desire — "redistributing the wealth." This assumes, of course, that the prospective parents would pay for the costs of pregnancy and birth.

In the Third World, children have been regarded as a form of wealth for eons, so kids ought to be considered wealth here too because, as liberals so often tell us, it is only right that we look to legal precedents across the rest of globe to design U.S. law so that justice can prevail. And the great thing is that there is no need to worry about the consequences of using foreign law in the place of American



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 28, 2011

law, as the Constitution apparently means nothing these days. (Obama is now using the U.S. military to bomb Libya without any constitutional or congressional authority whatsoever — breaking the law and killing people — without penalty.)

Looking to foreign law, we find that the Supreme Court in India has recently ruled that in child adoption cases when the Indian parent actually kidnapped the child from the custodial parent in another country, Indian courts have jurisprudence — and likely won't give the child back to the custodial parent — so it must be OK to take American kids from their mothers.

Knowing that U.S. judges pick and choose which foreign court precedents they apply from the world based on whims and desires — for instance, judges here condemn Christian speech and holidays in schools though such speech and holidays are freely observed in European countries — Indian law should suffice.

But in case it doesn't, we could even throw in some U.S. precedents: In the United States, Child Protective Services regularly forcefully takes children from their birth parents for basically no reason, such as from Steve Bennett and Heidi Tranberg. Their five children were snatched from them because one daughter had a low-calcium condition. (The removal of the children was prompted when a doctor informed CPS on them because the parents chose to follow another doctor's advice, rather than her advice.)

Of course, many would say that my proposed law would be “unfair” on its face because it would force some women to carry a burden that they don't want for nine months, and carrying a baby carries with it health risks.

“Fair,” I say, because not only do deserving adoptive parents (meaning, again, “taxpayers”) have to pay taxes year-in and year-out to provide support for welfare recipients, causing them to have to work years longer in order to be able to retire, some studies show that personal stress — such as from having a job and not having desired children — lowers one's life expectancy. Besides everyone has a “right” to be parents.

I still need to work out a couple of details of the plan, such as how to spy on women to know when they get pregnant, but such details can likely be collected from Medicaid recipients' medical records, using power vested in government through ObamaCare — no problem.

Ah, liberal “freedom.”



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.