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PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION: GRAND EVASIONS

hic se aperit diabolis\(^1\)

To introduce a book supposes the greatest difficulty — because of the inevitable, inescapable presupposing.\(^2\)

Hilaire Belloc

It was Francis Bacon who first asserted that: “A man is known by the company that he keeps — for in both the positive and the negative, interaction unveils the voluminous mysteries of the heart.”\(^3\) As true as that principle may be, G. K. Chesterton’s revision is truer still: “A man is known by the company that he does not keep — for in both the positive and the negative, non-interaction unveils the voluminous mysteries of the heart.”\(^4\)

I have considered this notion intently over the past several years as I have — often in wonderment — witnessed the non-interactive evasions of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America and its sundry institutional cohorts in the abortion industry to this book.

Awaiting Their Reply

Wherever I go throughout North America for various kinds of speaking engagements — and even as I venture beyond this continent from time to time — a barrage of questions inevitably confronts me concerning the book:

• What has been the response of Planned Parenthood?
• Have you been sued yet?
• Has the organization ever published a substantial refutation?
• Has it consented to a nationally broadcast debate with you?
• What about the United Way or the March of Dimes? Have they responded?

My answers are often rather astonishing to the uninitiated—to those who actually believe that the facts actually matter in this titanic struggle for life, liberty, and truth:

• Planned Parenthood is trying its best to ignore the book.
• I have not been sued.
• No refutation of the book, substantial or otherwise, has been published.
• The organization has effectively enforced a debate blackout.
• Like Planned Parenthood, the United Way has attempted to ignore the book, while the March of Dimes has circulated a remarkably scandalous letter full of easily demonstrable fabrications.

And this despite the fact that Grand Illusions was the first comprehensive and up-to-date exposé of the gargantuan leader of the international abortion industry, examining its history, philosophy, programs, and agendas. With nearly fifteen hundred copiously annotated footnotes and four hundred pages of primary documentation, it has won awards—including the ECPA Gold Medallion for publishing excellence—it has achieved a "best seller" ranking—with nearly 100,000 copies in print—and, it has been anthologized, excerpted, reviewed, abridged, and translated in virtually every medium imaginable in both secular and Christian circles on three continents. It has been critically acclaimed and recommended by every faction and organization in the pro-life/pro-family movement world-wide.

You would think that Planned Parenthood, the United Way, and the March of Dimes would sit up and take notice. You would think that the organization would attempt to answer the charges. You would think that it would at least give it the good-ole-college-try.

But no.

The strategy of Planned Parenthood and its pro-death bedfellows has been to meet the mounting criticism fomented by the
book with deafening silence. It has almost completely ignored the book. In fact, only when it is absolutely forced to comment on the issues raised by the book does it deign to acknowledge its existence. And even then, it merely cynically sneers—dispatching all its evidence with a semi-lethal barrage of name calling and derision.

The only two official responses to the book from Planned Parenthood came in a single issue of the organization's in-house newsletter, *Insider*.

The first response is a simple note of warning from Douglas Gould, Planned Parenthood's Vice President for Communications:

> Please do not encourage Mr. Grant by agreeing to debate him should he come to your town. With one exception he has not appeared on any mainstream broadcasts, and his book has not been given serious attention.⁵

That is the voice of desperation. It is also the voice of deception. Gould knows full well that innumerable national "mainstream" broadcasts as well as print mediums have indeed profiled me and my book—and that many more would like to, if only they could get an opposing viewpoint from Planned Parenthood. The bottom line is that he is exercising a bit of covert damage control.

The second response purports to be a book review—despite the fact that it is less than five paragraphs and three hundred words long. Instead of dealing with the book substantively, the author of the "review," Planned Parenthood staffer Peter Grimaldi, resorts to name calling:

> Mr. Grant's book, like so many of its ilk, is a textbook example of the paranoid style, filled with heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy.⁶

No specifics. No countering evidence. No solid defenses. No debating ideas, philosophies, or methodologies. Grimaldi believes that it is sufficient to simply assert the PPFA orthodoxy and leave it at that:

> "The claims made in this book," he says, "are lies."⁷
The only substantive rebuttal that he offers at all concerns two apparent statistical errors that don't even appear in the book. If this is the best that Grimaldi can do, he is skating on awfully thin ice.

**Just the Facts**

The reality is that doctors, lawyers, journalists, economists, political scientists, sociologists, pro-life leaders, educators, activists, and numerous other experts in related fields have poured over virtually every detail of *Grand Illusions*—before it was published, between each of the numerous printings, and following the most recent revision—to assure its accuracy and cogency.

What that ultimately means is that—for all its fulminations to the contrary—Planned Parenthood really has no answer to the serious and multitudinous accusations posed by the book.

So, they just try to ignore it. Which is getting harder and harder to do with every passing day.

The United Way has attempted to follow this same strategy to the letter—with no better success. The organization pretends that the serious allegations about its ethical integrity simply do not exist. In its correspondence, the national office feigns utter incognizance. Before the “Aramony Scandal” broke into the news—when the president of the national organization was found to be utilizing a vast amount of the charity’s donations for his own pleasures—a few minor officials made inquiries into my background and probed a bit into the various ministries that I have been involved with. Their efforts have proven to be tiresome but not too serious.

That, at least, is more honest an approach than the one the March of Dimes has taken.

In a letter written by staffer Richard P. Leavitt, signed by vice-president Mary Hughes, and circulated to all inquirers to the national office of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation, the organization actually fabricates data in answer to the charges in *Grand Illusions*. The letter asserts concerning Chapter Eight in the book’s first edition:

The primary sources for Grant’s footnotes #66 and #69 are two books published in 1967 and 1953 respectively. Since prenatal genetic diagnosis by amniocentesis was first reported in 1967, I
doubt that anyone could survey geneticists about amniocentesis results and publish the findings in a book that same year—or that any such survey 22 years ago, even if it were done, would have any bearing on the March of Dimes today. More clearly absurd is the citation of a March of Dimes statement of our neutrality on the abortion controversy in a book published in 1953, because in that year we were still purely a polio organization that had not even conceived of becoming involved in birth defects, let alone any as yet nonexistent debates about prenatal diagnosis or abortion. These anachronisms suggest that Grant, or someone he’s citing as a secondary source, simply made up these citations, as well as the allegations themselves.8

Sounds convincing. At least it sounds convincing until the careful reader actually turns to footnotes #66 and #69, in the first edition of the book (or #69 and #72 in this edition), and discovers that it is Leavitt that is making things up. The dates for the sources cited are in fact, 1977 and 1985 respectively—not 1967 and 1953 as Leavitt claims.

Besides these deliberate distortions, the rest of the four-page memo amounts to little more than a vague blanket denial of any March of Dimes wrong-doing in amniocentesis research, funding of geneticists through the organization’s granting process, and institutional involvement with Planned Parenthood—despite all the irrefutable evidence to the contrary. Shame-faced silence, blatant falsehood, or sly evasion are ultimately the organization’s only recourses.

Revisions

None of this is to say that the first edition of the book was flawless. On the contrary, the text’s glitches, omissions, and awkward passages were more than a little glaring to me from the start. That is why I am so grateful to have this opportunity to revise and refine the manuscript for this second edition.

Readers of the original will notice several additions: a new chapter on International Planned Parenthood, a new appendix, a new select bibliography, and material on RU-486 and other technological developments. Besides those changes, I have noted the dramatic political changes in the United States—which have radically altered the sociocultural climate worldwide—as well as updated relevant statistics where necessary.
Aside from those substantive changes, only cosmetic alterations have been made to the work. Even so, I pray that they will enable it to find a whole new era of usefulness as the pro-life movement enters its third decade of struggle for the sanctity of human life—and that it will continue to fluster the professional bureaucrats and ideologues at Planned Parenthood into an embarrassed silence.

**The Gnarled Tare**

It seems that the minions of the death industry can face anything except the obstacle of truth. They will go to absurd lengths to avoid it, to rail against it, to deny it, or failing all else, to smother it in a morose blanket of subterfuge.

Their end can not but be as described so powerfully in the violet prose of Tristan Gylberd:

```
When ere a man has ought to hide,
   Or follows hard,
   Beside the tried;
When ere he feigns true delight,
   Or captures lust,
   Behind the night:
Beware, I say, beware.
   Leviathan has sown;
   And his is the gnarled tare.⁹
```

Its grand evasions notwithstanding, Planned Parenthood—and its dastardly confederates—stands condemned by its own pride of silence.
I N T R O D U C T I O N

AD VITUM

apologia pro vita

A good battle for justice is the beginning of all great songs.

Hilaire Belloc

Why Planned Parenthood?
Why a whole book dedicated to examining—and quite apparently exposing—one of the largest and most respected social service providers in our nation’s history?
Sour grapes?
Spite?
Uninformed animosity?
Guilt?
Religious vendetta?
No, the fact is that despite nearly a century of controversy and conflict surrounding Planned Parenthood, there have only been a handful of comprehensive examinations of the organization’s history, policies, procedures, and programs. And most of these have been specialized academic studies.

This book then is an attempt to fill that void.
The question of why the void has existed for so long is one that has plagued me for many years. It was only as I undertook the massive task of researching Planned Parenthood that any kind of answer to that question began to surface.

For one thing, Planned Parenthood is actually not an organization. Instead, it is a loose affiliation of several hundred separately incorporated, separately administered, and separately financed organizations throughout the world. These separate organizations share a common history, a common philosophy, a common agenda, and a common public image. They all pay annual affiliation fees and dues to national and international bureaucratic entities. And they all cooperate in various educational,
political, judicial, and financial concerns. But, they all maintain distinctives that make detailed analysis and blanket assessments very difficult indeed.

Beyond the structural and institutional dilemma, the fact is that though the name *Planned Parenthood* is a registered service-mark, it always has been—and probably always will be—the generic name of a movement as well. For several decades following World War II, central figures in the organization were encouraging the use of the name *Planned Parenthood* to identify the entire birth control-abortion-population control social phenomenon. Although there are vast areas of agreement between the many individuals and institutions in this generic movement, widespread diversity again makes detailed analysis and blanket assessment terribly tenuous.

Finally, the frenetic litigal character of Planned Parenthood—both as an institutional association and as an instrumental movement—has no doubt discouraged previous serious investigations. Most authors and most publishers tend to shy away from legal entanglements. Despite these serious difficulties, I became convinced that I needed to write a comprehensive expose of Planned Parenthood.

That conviction was confirmed when several pro-life activists from America, Canada, and Great Britain came knocking on my door with several hundred thousand never-before-disclosed Planned Parenthood documents: internal memoranda, clinic visit records, medical charts, financial statements, publicity files, confidential correspondence, and meeting minutes. Frankly, I was flabbergasted by what I saw as I thumbed through those documents. I had been deeply immersed in the pro-life movement for more than a decade, and I was still shocked.

So I set myself to the task. You have before you the result. But be apprised, this book is by no means the last word on Planned Parenthood. I have actually only just skimmed the surface. A full treatment of Planned Parenthood's political connections, its judicial agenda, its research manipulations, its propaganda techniques, and its theological orientation will have to be taken up by others.

**Presuppositions**

Several kind reviewers have asked me why I chose to make my manuscript openly and overtly Christian. Their concern was
simply that the book might be quickly dismissed and its message ignored in the marketplace of ideas. They felt that it might be perceived as impractical, apolitical, and unpragmatic when in point of fact it is none of those things. In a milieu where traditional values have been exiled to a desolate cultural outback and where the proponents of those values have voluntarily sequestered themselves in a squalid spiritual and intellectual ghetto, those concerns are not at all unwarranted.

Even so, I feel that the **only** appropriate response to Planned Parenthood is a distinctively Christian response. And I am entirely at ease in announcing that from the start.

G. K. Chesterton once quipped that any new book of modern social inquiry is bound to be drollardly predictable in both form and function:

> It begins as a rule with an analysis, with statistics, tables of population, decrease of crime among Congregationalists, growth of hysteria among policemen, and similar ascertained facts; it ends with a chapter that is generally called *The Remedy*. It is almost wholly due to this careful, solid, and scientific method that *The Remedy* is never found. For this scheme of medical question and answer is a blunder; the first great blunder of sociology. It is always called stating the disease before we find the cure. But it is the whole definition and dignity of man that in social matters we must actually find the cure before we find the disease. 9

This book is obviously an exploration, explanation, and exposition of the disease of Planned Parenthood. But as Chesterton has said, we need not approach our subject medically—which might lead us to a repugnant *victimization* or *co-dependency* model of social relationships. In this case, it is entirely appropriate for us to announce the cure before we engage in examination and diagnosis or indulge in recovery and relating. The cure is, very simply, the Word of God. The Scriptures. The Bible.

The Bible is God's own revelation of wisdom, knowledge, understanding, and truth. It is not simply a marvelous collection of quaint sayings and inspiring stories. It is God's message to man. It is God's instruction. It is God's direction. It is God's guideline, His plumb line, and His bottom line.

All those who in faith have gone on before us—forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists,
martyrs, confessors, ascetics, and every righteous spirit made pure in Christ—have always looked to the Bible as the blueprint for living. They have always taken it seriously, studying it, applying it, and obeying it. That is because they have comprehended the reality that from Genesis to Revelation the Bible is indeed God's Word. And that God's Word is hope for the hopeless, help for the helpless, salve for the sick, balm for the broken, and strength for the stricken. It is the cure.

The doctors, lawyers, politicians, social scientists, judges, psychologists, bureaucrats, and various and sundry other experts who have harnessed their disciplines for the Planned Parenthood movement, certainly cannot be faulted for their concern over the plight of women and children—if indeed their concern is genuine. Where they have gone astray is in taking matters into their own hands, seeking out their own new and novel cure. Instead of adhering to the wise and inerrant counsel of the Bible—walking along the well-trod path of the Saints—they have done "what was right in their own eyes" (Judges 21:25). They have completely ignored—and as a consequence violated—God's Wisdom. Their policies, proposals, and programs have been blatantly man-centered. In other words, they have been humanistic.

"Humanism is," according to the Russian iconodule Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "the proclaimed and practiced autonomy of man from any higher force above him."10 Or, as theologian Francis Schaeffer has said, it is "the placing of man at the center of all things and making him the measure of all things."11 According to humanistic dogma, there is no notion of absolute right or wrong. There are no clear-cut standards. Morality is relative. And problem solving is entirely subjective.12

The problem is that humanism is entirely out of sync with the fabric of reality:

To the Law and to the Testimony! If they do not speak according to this Word, it is because they have no dawn (Isaiah 8:20).

To attempt to solve the perilous problems of modern society without hearing and heeding the clear instructions of the Bible is utter foolishness (Romans 1:18-23). It is an invitation to inadequacy, incompetency, irrelevancy, and impotency (Deuteronomy 28:15). All such attempts are doomed to frustration and failure.
Humanism cannot work because humanism ignores the essence of reality (Ephesians 5:6). It is fraught with fantasy (Colossians 2:8). Only the Bible can tell us of things as they really are (Psalm 19:7-11). Only the Bible faces reality squarely, practically, completely, and honestly (Deuteronomy 30:11-14). Thus, only the Bible can provide genuine solutions to the problems that plague mankind (Psalm 119:105).

Jesus was forever reminding His disciples of these facts. He made it clear to them that the Bible was to be their ultimate standard—for life and godliness, for faith and practice, and for profession and confession:

It is written, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but on every Word that proceeds out of the mouth of God” (Matthew 4:4).

But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one stroke of a letter of the Law to fail (Luke 16:17).

Whoever then annuls one of the least of these Commandments, and so teaches others, shall be called least in the Kingdom of Heaven; but whoever keeps and teaches them, he shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven (Matthew 5:19).

Again and again He affirmed the truth that “all Scripture is God breathed” (2 Timothy 3:16), that it is useful for “teaching, rebuking, correcting, and training in righteousness” (2 Timothy 3:17), and that it “cannot be broken” (John 10:35):

All His Precepts are sure. They are upheld forever and ever; they are performed in truth and uprightness (Psalm 111:7-8).

All men know this. Even the diligent and studied humanists in Planned Parenthood know this. The work of God’s Law is written on the hearts of all men (Romans 2:14-15). They must actively restrain or suppress this Truth in order to carry on with their novelties (Romans 1:18). Though they know what is right, they deliberately debase themselves with futile thinking, foolish passions, and filthy behavior (Romans 1:19-24, 26-27). They purposefully betray reality, exchanging God’s Word for lies (Romans 1:25). Though they know the Ordinances of Life, they consciously choose the precepts of death (Romans 1:28-31). And then they
attempt to impose their conjured insanity on the rest of us, pro­posing it as the solution to all our earthly ills (Romans 1:32).

So, despite their desperate ravings to the contrary, the only way that we will be able to develop compassionate solutions to the tough dilemmas of crisis pregnancies, poor maternal health, over­extended family resources, teen promiscuity, and venereal dis­eases is if we submit ourselves to the eternal, established, and effectual Word of Truth (Psalm 119:152). The only way we will be able to develop genuine and dynamic alternatives to the humanistic programs of Planned Parenthood is if we yield ourselves to the solitary, supreme, and sufficient Word of Life (Proverbs 6:23).

“For My Thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My Ways,” declares the Lord. “For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My Ways higher than your ways, and My Thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and do not return there without watering the earth, and making it bear and sprout, and furnishing seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall My Word be which goes forth from My mouth; it shall not return to Me empty, without accomplishing what I desire, and without succeeding in the matter for which I sent it” (Isaiah 55:8-11).

Throughout this book, as we survey the landscape Planned Parenthood has laid waste, this will ever be before us.

The Cure Applied

In the first two chapters we will look at Planned Parenthood—both the generic movement and the institutional association—in very general terms. We will basically be getting a lay of the land. Concepts and controversies introduced in these chapters will be dealt with in much greater detail later in the book.

In Chapter 3 we will begin to examine the history of Planned Parenthood. I say “begin” simply because the historical context of the organization’s policies, programs, principles, priorities, plans, and procedures is an important theme that we will return to again and again throughout the book.

In Chapter 4 we will look into the medical practices of Planned Parenthood. Abortion, birth control, and sterilization are at the heart of the organization’s work. Just how safe are these practices?
In Chapter 5 we will examine the very controversial subject of prejudice and discrimination. Is Planned Parenthood a racist movement?

In Chapter 6 we will look at Planned Parenthood’s crusade to bring comprehensive sex education to every man, woman, and child in America. Just what does sex education actually accomplish? How effective is it in combating teen pregnancy, runaway promiscuity, venereal diseases, and interpersonal irresponsibility?

In Chapter 7 we will closely examine the finances of Planned Parenthood. Where do the funds to run this massive coast-to-coast, international, cross-cultural phenomenon come from? And how are they spent?

In Chapter 8 we will take a look at the many different organizations and institutions that actively support and cooperate with Planned Parenthood’s program for social transformation.

In Chapter 9 the media will be our concern. How does the established media deal with Planned Parenthood? And why?

In Chapter 10 the extensive international agenda of Planned Parenthood will be traced.

In Chapter 11 we will turn our attention to the church. Is there a connection between the church’s actions—or inactions—and Planned Parenthood’s tremendous influence?

With Chapter 12 we will begin to look at specific strategies to deal with the problems raised by Planned Parenthood. First, we will determine what we must be in order to confront evil.

Then in Chapter 13, we will determine what we must do in order to confront evil.

In Chapter 14, we will look at some positive, constructive alternatives to the Planned Parenthood juggernaut.

In Chapter 15, the vignette from the opening of the book is framed and resolved.

The book closes with some appended resources to enable faithful Christians to make a practical difference in their families, in their communities, and in their world.

In ancient Alexandria, a school of literary interpretation was developed that analyzed texts on three different levels simultaneously: the physical or literal level, the intellectual or philosophical level, and the spiritual or allegorical level. This book was written to conform to that Alexandrian model. Thus it operates
on all three of those levels. So, for instance, the various affiliate
statistics, personal stories, and historical overviews are to be
taken quite literally. The sociological analysis, the Biblical theol­
ogy, and the institutional suppositions are to be understood
philosophically. And the literary allusions, Spielbergian feints,
and Latin puzzles are allegorical indicators. Each level is true,
but each level has its own perspective of and approach to that
truth—a truth ultimately summed up and encapsulated in
Christ Jesus alone: the Truth (John 14:6).

Ad Maiorem Dei Gloriam.
There is above all this supreme stamp of the barbarian; the sacrifice of the permanent to the temporary.\textsuperscript{1}

\textit{G. K. Chesterton}
ONE

IN THE HEAT OF THE FIGHT

casus belli

There is a moral strain, arising from the divergence between what our laws and moral phrases pretend, and what our society actually is.

Hilaire Belloc

I heard him coming.
Who wouldn’t?
Stumbling over the piles of rubbish, refuse, and overgrowth that littered the alley, his stealth was extremely questionable.
But his determination certainly wasn’t. Nor was his destination. He was headed right for me.
I looked up, peering between the cracks of broken boards. The dilapidated fence gave me momentary vantage and advantage. And I saw him. He was a perfect picture of spit and polish. His crisp blue uniform played a stark contrast against the alley’s cudulent clutter. The gleam of chrome and polished leather threw flitting reflections of sunlight on the ground, shattered triangles of morning brightness skipping across the discarded baubles and forgotten fascinations that composed the heaps of garbage between him and me.
“Hey. Hey you!”
The moment of decision. And I was frozen in indecision.
“Hey. Get out of there.”
I did. Clambering over the edge of the wretched and rusted bin, I hoisted a bulky sack to my shoulder and skirted around the fence.
“Stop. Right where you are.”
I didn’t. As best I could, I began to run, my indecision washed away in a tidal wave of adrenalin.
"Stop, dammit. I said stop."

I was running as fast as I could now, burden upon my back, fire in my lungs, and passion in my heart.

"I'm warning you. Stop."

I ran as if my life depended on it.

"I'll shoot you down, dammit."

I was straining, my heart bursting at my chest, my fear stabbing at my soul.

"I mean it. I'll shoot."

He swore vilely. He swore again. And again. And then he opened fire. Just as I reached the end of the alley and rounded the corner, he shattered the Saturday morning stillness with a furious report.

I was panic stricken.

I ran harder and faster. But he was gaining on me anyway. In desperation I threw myself toward the street, still clutching my precious sackload. Another shot erupted overhead. And another.

I ran. I prayed. I made for the parking lot ahead.

Ducking past a retainer wall and stumbling over a guardrail, I burst into a small crowd of men, women, and children pacing back and forth along a thirty-foot stretch of sidewalk between the lot and the street. My friends. Safety.

"Get me out of here," I screeched.

Gawking, uncomprehending, they just stood there.

Breathless and terrified, I lunged toward a car. "The keys. I need the keys. Now!"

Just then, the security guard came charging toward us from behind the retainer wall.

"The keys. I need the keys."

I stuffed my sack through the window and jumped behind the wheel. Honking wildly and screaming madly, I finally snapped their spell of astonishment, and several men sprang into action.

One tossed me the keys. Two others piled into the back seat. I skidded away from the curb just as another blast echoed round about us.

"Which way do I go?" I was gasping for air. My senses were numb. "Which way?"

"Uh, I dunno. Uh, head for the freeway, I guess."

"Which way is that?" Impatient, I swerved around the corner, leaving a trail of dust clouds and flaying skree.
As they steered me in the right direction, I glanced back. The security guard was not about to let us get away. Of that, I was sure. He roared after us in an ominous and carnivorous pickup. It was the kind of truck that young boys drool over: jacked high off the ground, and gaudily adorned with fog lamps, mud gear, and massive chrome mags. It lurched into view just a block and a half behind us.

The chase was on.  

**Facing the Anomaly**  

Day had just begun and I was already off the mark. The vast unending midwestern sky was crystalline blue and cloudless. Songbirds filled the air with sweetness and delight. The fresh aroma of turned soil and amber waves of grain beckoned from the outskirts of town. And here I was, careening down the freeway like a scalded cat.

Not quite my idea of a pleasant Saturday morning out.

It had all started out innocently enough, though. I was in town for a couple of speaking engagements. Several pro-life advocates, including the two men currently playing “Elliot Ness” in the back seat of my “getaway car,” had invited me to participate in their regular Saturday morning picket of a local abortion clinic. Such invitations for me are like the bite of a silk piranha. I accepted.

The night before, my hosts had taken me out and about town to show me the sights. We visited some of the great architectural icons of North America’s heartland: an imposing Sullivan warehouse, an eclectic Graves showroom, a landmark Wright home, a daunting Jahn office tower, and a sterling Johnson theater. We reveled in the gloriously sculpted bridges and the marvelously restored depots. We stopped by the farmers’ market where a furious cacophony of sights, sounds, and smells drenched us with the delirium of business-as-usual. Neon, granite, and steel combined with flesh and blood to proclaim with unmistakable clarity the vibrancy and vitality of this community.

The city was alive. It pulsed with an assured urgency. It bore in its breast that brash existential exuberance that demarcates American society.

As a last stop on our whirlwind tour, my hosts drove me past the site of the picket scheduled for the next morning: the abortuary.
Suddenly, I was confronted with the central anomaly of these modern times: a liberal lust for life, a lavish love of life, a luxuriant litany of life, and yet, simultaneously, a leaden loathing of life. I was struck by the complex absurdity of our cultural dance: a compulsive rehearsal of the rite of life confused and confounded by a chronic denial of the right to life.6

Back in my hotel room, alone with my thoughts, a haunting refrain rang in my ears:

We must cry out for the young
How long must this crime go on?
Until we see
The Church in unity?

We must cry out for the young
Sound the warning, make it strong
And move as one
The time has come.
The time has come.7

I caught myself pining. Maudlin moments.8
I shook the mood before it took hold, though. I decided to put on my "Matt Scudder Cap"9 and do a bit of research.10 The time had come.

It didn't take me long to get the ball rolling, even at that late hour. I perused the phone directory. I made several calls to hospitals, pathology labs, disposal services, and emergency clinics—adding to my hotel bill an obscene fifty cents apiece. And I asked a few key questions of a few key people.11

Within half an hour I knew with a fair amount of certainty what I would find in the morning. It would not be pleasant.

A shiver went up and down my spine.

In the Belly of the Beast

Dawn broke tawny as a lion and somnolent as a hearthside tom. A belvedere weekend, teal true and rumor red, beckoned through the hotel window sheers.

I hastily went through my regular morning ritual: shower, shave, devotions, and a frantic search for my wallet. I always try to put my money in a "safe place" when I'm away from home.
Invariably, I forget where that "safe place" is and am forced to spend precious moments racking my still anesthetized brain in order to discover how "clever" I was the night before. On this particular morning, I hunted through drawers, in closets, and under mattresses for almost twenty minutes before I remembered that I had hidden the wallet in the ice bucket. I've since been told that's one of the first places a thief checks when he's casing a room.

I didn't have time for breakfast now, so I went down to the lobby to await my ride to the picket.

The drive was pleasant and uneventful. Talk ranged from baseball scores to department stores, from amusement parks to broken hearts, from movie releases to dry-cleaned creases. No one said a word about the dark portent of danger that we all felt. I, for one, was trying to ignore it, hoping that it would just go away.

But it wouldn't.

And I knew why.

I knew what would be waiting for us at the clinic. And no amount of hoping could erase that knowledge.

We parked just across from the old building. It was a real oddity in the once distinguished neighborhood. Situated on the main street in town, it was down four or five blocks from where the commercial section began, in an area that had long ago sported wide lawns and overarching elms. Now, all those trees were gone, victims of Dutch Elm disease, and the grand promenade had an exposed, befuddled air. Gallant English gardens and proud Tudor homes had given way to a barren wasteland of asphalt and gaudy metal warehouses. The clinic occupied a remnant of the past. It was once a stately mansion—brownstone and ivy, leaded glass and cedar shakes. It was an island of antiquity amidst a sea of modernity.

When it was built around the turn of the century, it was serious and simple to excess. Contemporary men rarely appreciate that style. They prefer the esoteric eccentricity of modernism. No doubt they are right, since they are restless space-time nomads. But men and women who have lived long and are tired of wandering—who want rest, who have done with temporal aspirations and ambitions, whose life in the urban Negev has
been a broken arch—feel its repose and self-restraint as they feel nothing else.\textsuperscript{14} The quiet strength of its curved lines, the solid support of its tall columns, the moderate proportions of its gables and transepts, even its absence of display, of effort, and of self-consciousness, satisfy them as no other art does. They come back to it to rest, after a long circle of pilgrimage—the cradle of rest from which their forefathers started.\textsuperscript{15}

Here though, they find that rest none too deep.

The apex of the brownstone rose like a sugarloaf forty feet above the foundations, majestic and unfettered. But the foundations below had been despoiled by the creeping convenience of contemporaneity.\textsuperscript{16} The bottom floor of the building was apparently remodeled sometime during the irreverent days of the sixties in order to accommodate the clinic. A false facade and broad spans of plate glass invited clients into a sterile beige foyer. The renovations of the sixties, like the buildings of the sixties, show bland economy, and sometimes worse. The world grew cheap, as the world's world must.\textsuperscript{17}

Contemporary men may like it all the better for being less serious, less heroic, and more what the French call “bourgeois”—just as they may like the style of Louie Louie better than that of Louis XIV, Madonna better than Montesquieu, and videos better than Videossis—for taste is as free as will. Athanasius called such freedom “captivity.” Luther called it “bondage.” Calvin called it “depravity.” Basil called it “vanity.” Chrysostom called it “debauchery.” And Solzhenitsyn called it “irresponsibility.” Sin's shackles severely limit the latitude of both taste and will.\textsuperscript{18}

A scraggly line of picketers were already doing their paces back and forth in front of the building. They made for a motley crew. A sweetly attired grandmother was walking with a fully festooned college student. A young mother pushing a double stroller and carrying a gargantuan sign was accompanied by a teenager who preened a tragically hip haircut and a phosphorescently decorated T-shirt. A middle-aged couple, perfectly type-cast fundamentalists, were engrossed in a conversation with three nuns. Several young families, who looked as if they had suddenly been sidetracked from a trip to the zoo or a picnic in
the park, supervised children's activities. Two men, in whose veins flowed zealot's blood, were taking turns reading passages of Scripture over a megaphone. One was dressed in a banker's gray flannel suit. The other wore ragged jeans and a chambray work shirt. Hardly heterogeneous, yet they testified as one that the old building bore the sorry stains not only of bad taste, but of bad will as well.\textsuperscript{19}

I joined them.\textsuperscript{20}

Every thirty minutes for the next two and a half hours, we watched as a fresh clutch of doe-eyed girls were whisked into the clinic by "pro-choice escorts." They met the girls at their cars and quickly aimed them up the sidewalk. They snarled at our offers of help and batted away our literature. If a girl displayed the least hint of hesitation, the "escorts" would take her by the arm and rush her toward the door. So much for "choice."\textsuperscript{21}

When, despite their best efforts, a frightened and confused teen slipped their grasp and turned aside to talk to one of the protestors, to read a Gospel tract, the "escorts" flew into a frenzied rage. They lunged at the picket line. Taunting, jeering, cursing, and reviling, they tried to recapture their prey. One turned her contorted, wild-eyed gaze toward me.

"You pig," she sputtered. "You damned, chauvinist pig. Let the girl go."\textsuperscript{22}

I looked over my shoulder where the girl was kneeling in the grass, quietly praying with several picketers, utterly incognizant of the efforts of this thrashing, yammering champion for "choice."\textsuperscript{23}

"Why don't you go home? Mind your own business!" She was right in my face, yelling in my ear, shoving, red-faced, and livid. "You're traumatizing the girl, you pig."

She went on and on, clichés repeated like a worn-out record. But all to no avail. The girl was walking away, arm in arm with her new-found friends. She said she was keeping her baby.\textsuperscript{24}

Frustrated, the "escorts" retreated to the building. A quick conference ensued with the clinic director, two nurses, and a security guard. They were clearly disturbed and kept gesturing in our direction with stabbing fingers and malevolent stares. After a few moments of haggling between themselves, they dispatched the guard, presumably to "restore order" to this now thoroughly unpleasant Saturday morning.
As he sauntered toward us, calling us to attention, he struck me as an anguished, angry man. But his anger was hidden and subversive. It was tucked neatly into the dark folds of his uniform like a murderer’s knife hidden inside an old coat on a closet shelf. On his breath was what the philosophic observer was free to regard as either his last drink on Friday or his first on Saturday. Certainly, he was not particular.

“Look here, people. Don’t you think you’ve caused enough of a ruckus here today? Why don’t you just go on home?”

Most of the picketers ignored him. They resumed their march back and forth on the sunset side of the building, while the banker with the megaphone and the sweetly attired grandmother explained Scriptural profundities to him.25

“I don’t wanna hear your spiel. I just want you to leave. Now.”

Unperturbed, the banker continued reading from his well-worn Bible.

“Hey, come on. Give me a break, will ya? I don’t need this grief.”

Now, it was the grandmother’s turn. She quoted Scripture by memory. King’s English. Perfect inflection.

“You people are impossible.”

At that, both protesters turned tender and tried to reason with the guard.26 But, there was no reasoning with him. Stern faced, anger no longer hidden, he harumphed a few moments longer. And then, thoroughly flustered, he turned to go.

Suddenly, all was quiet on the western front.

I decided it was now or never.

Hell’s Ballad

I left the sidewalk and rounded the corner of the building. A long retainer wall dropped off to the parking lot. The concrete there was overlaid with graffiti, years of abbreviated manifestos, twisting into a single metascrawl of rage and indignation.27 I crossed the lot and ducked behind an old fence into a service alley.

Before me was a large garbage dumpster. The object of my reconnaissance. I stood before its reeking hulk and paused. Uncertain. Hesitant. And skittish.
I felt faint and foolish. "What on earth am I getting myself into?" I wondered.  

It was the same sensation that I'd felt standing on the free throw line in the Pershing Elementary School gym a quarter century earlier. We were one point behind, and I knew that with seven seconds to go I held the district championship in my hands. But all I wanted to do was to crawl up under the old pine bleachers and throw up. I didn't want to bravely face my destiny. I didn't want to take my free throws.

I knew what was in that dumpster just as surely as I knew that I would miss those shots.

Memory is a madman that hoards my colored rags and throws away my precious gems. Prescience is a school-marm that belabors what I ought to be and ignores what I thought to be. I took a deep breath and climbed into the bin.

The stench was overwhelming. Rotten fruit, stale tobacco, fetid beer, and hospital astringent assaulted my senses. Bile rose up like a knot in my throat.

But, the sight was worse even than the smell. It was horrid. A scene like a ballad come to life. A ballad composed about the tragic events in some border hell.

Several garbage bags had spilled their contents out into the open bin. Mixed with the empty Coke cans, fast food wrappers, cigarette butts, and office litter were bundles of surgical gauze and laminaria matted with blood. And wrapped in those bundles were the broken bodies of several dozen children. Dismembered arms and legs. Crushed skulls. Mutilated corpses. Unseeing eyes. The leering look of death was all around me.

They tell me that comparisons with the Nazi Holocaust are inappropriate. Hyperbole, they say. Apparently, such people have never been inside this dumpster. Their comprehension of the abortion issue is theoretical. It is political. Or sociological. But, this dumpster is as inescapable as Auschwitz. Its evidence is as irrefutable. As damnable.

I reached across the carnage and opened one of the plastic bags. Even with all that I'd seen thus far I was entirely unprepared for this. There were no bloody limbs. There were no brutal decapitations. There were no broken spines, disemboweled bodies, or shredded extremities. Instead, what I saw in this bag was
a _perfect_ baby. Whole. Unblemished. Brown haired and olive skinned. The sort of child you’d make silly faces at through the maternity ward window. The sort of child you’d expect to see in a bassinet, snuggled into a fluffy pink blanket.

I caught my breath. Stunned.

The Greek gods tossed men like dice. Invoking spirits from the vast deep or calling up enormities from earthen elements, they made a rude fetish of cruelty. Their diabolism knew no bounds. But, even they would have strained to conjure a decadence as ugly as this.²⁸

I lightly brushed the child’s cheek with the back of my hand and marveled at the delicacy of life. Like hymning angels chime, I whispered a prayer. And tears fell from my eyes like rain.²⁹

Just then, I heard the security guard coming. I bundled the child up in her crude plastic sarcophagus and made my mad dash to safety.³⁰

**Insomnia’s Clarity**

“Why was that guy shooting?”
“Can he really get away with that?”
“Shouldn’t we report him to the police?”
“Or was he the police?”
“Do you think we could prosecute?”
“Would the DA even believe our story?”
“How many actual witnesses do we have?”
“How did you know what you’d find in the garbage?”
“It’s not legal to throw babies out like that, is it?”
“What do we do now?”
“Are you sure he’s not still following us?”

We were weaving through light traffic on the freeway. The security guard had apparently broken off the chase and we were headed back to my hotel. The immediate crisis was past and my “getaway” accomplices were full of questions.

I didn’t have a whole lot of answers.

I knew that I would find a mass grave in the dumpster, I told them, because of the little bit of telephone work the night before.³¹

It appeared that neither the state nor the city had fetal disposal or medical waste ordinances. There were no pathology labs in town that had business dealings with the clinic. There were no
bio-medical incinerator services. Like so many other abortuaries around the country, this clinic had little choice but to hurl its victims into the garbage. Offered up on the Altar of Convenience, they are indignantly heaped upon Gehenna.\textsuperscript{35} That, I'd expected. The guard, the gun, the chase—well, that was another story altogether. I had heard of incidents, from time to time, of overwrought clinic operators or staff doctors wildly wielding handguns in the face of pro-life opposition. I had seen gruff and overbearing security guards stretch the letter of the law, pushing, shoving, and baiting picketers. I had seen District Attorneys refuse to take up, or even consider, legitimate charges against clinic personnel in extremely abusive situations. I had even witnessed the exercise of raw judicial power in an attempt to quash pro-life activities. But, in all my days, I had never seen a more reckless or foolhardy display.\textsuperscript{36}

Back at the hotel, we all got busy tying up loose ends. We called a lawyer for legal counsel. We called a local pastor so that the baby could be properly buried. We called our families, our friends, our contacts, and the media. Over the next several hours, we were subjected to interviews, accusations, charges, and countercharges. But as the day wore on, it became all too apparent that the "powers that be" considered the baby in the dumpster and the shots in the alley nothing more than a tempest in a teapot. A soon-to-be-forgotten unfortunate incident.

By the next evening I was on a plane headed home. The flight was long and tiresome. I tried to catch a quick nap, but the perfect recall and vivid clarity of insomnia wreaked havoc on my repose. My mind was haunted by insane images of twisted lifeless bodies, faces recoiling in terror, and sprays of gunfire scoring the ground around me with deep fury.\textsuperscript{37}

When at last I arrived at home, all the lights were out and everyone was fast asleep in their beds. I went from room to room looking at each of my children as they slept. I sat on the edge of the bed where my youngest was snuggled up with his special blanket clutched tight to his breast.

I gazed at him lying there for a long moment. Awestruck. I lightly brushed his cheek with the back of my hand and marveled at the delicacy of life. Like hymning angels chime, I whispered a prayer. And once again, tears fell from my eyes—like rain.

Only then did I feel some measure of relief.

And resolve.
It is not difficult to discern that the practical man in social reform is exactly the same animal as the practical man in every other department of human energy, and may be discovered suffering from the same twin disabilities which stamp the practical man wherever found: an inability to define his own first principles and an inability to follow the consequences proceeding from his own action.

Hilaire Belloc

Abortion is nasty business. And it is big business. Since its decriminalization twenty years ago, abortion has grown into a five-hundred-million-dollar-a-year industry in the United States, and an estimated ten billion dollars a year worldwide. More than one hundred and twenty thousand women each day, almost fifty million per year, resort to abortion and then to its various birth control subsidiaries. It has thus become the most frequently performed surgical operation. Though propaganda still hangs like a ground mist over the already complicated issue, these statistics make one thing quite certain: The mind-numbing vastness of the market, the opportunities for a wildly profitable stock-in-trade, and the cataclysmic effects on the social fabric have catapulted abortion to the forefront of our social, economic, political, and ethical concerns.

And standing out like the Nephilim in the midst of those concerns is Planned Parenthood.

Planned Parenthood is the world's oldest, largest, and best-organized provider of abortion and birth control services. From its humble beginnings around the turn of the century, when the entire shoestring operation consisted of a two-room makeshift clinic in a rundown Brooklyn neighborhood staffed by three untrained volunteers, it has expanded dramatically into a multi-billion-dollar international conglomerate with programs and
activities in one hundred thirty nations on every continent. In the United States alone, it employs more than twenty thousand staff personnel and volunteers in over eight hundred clinics, nearly two hundred affiliates, and more than fifty chapters in every major metropolitan area, coast to coast.

Utilizing this considerable wealth, manpower, and influence, Planned Parenthood has muscled its way into virtually every facet of modern life. It now plays a strategic role in the health and social services community. It is actively involved in both advertising and programming in the mass media. It exerts a major influence on public and private education. It carries considerable political clout through lobbying, legislation, advocacy, campaigning, and litigation. It is involved in publishing, research, medical technology, judicial activism, public relations, foreign affairs, psychological counseling, sociological planning, demographic investigation, curriculum development, pharmacological distribution, theological reorientation, and public legal service provision.

But despite this nearly omnipresent intrusion into family, Church, state, and culture, Planned Parenthood has somehow managed to manufacture for itself a sterling reputation. It has brokered its abortion trade into a public image that is very nearly unassailable.

It has a reputation for providing effective and professional social services for the needy. It has a reputation for developing honest and insightful educational programs for the young. It has a reputation for maintaining the rights and liberties of the weak, the desperate, the frightened, and the downtrodden. It has a reputation for advocating low-cost, readily available counseling and health care services for women. And it has a no-nonsense, tough-as-nails, down-to-earth, where-the-rubber-meets-the-road kind of reputation that has made it a glittering star in the grand constellation of the American social service field.

All that glitters, however, is not gold.

Just as Planned Parenthood’s wealth and prestige has been built on death, defilement, and destruction, its reputation has been built on deception, disinformation, and distortion. It is a reputation built on illusions.

Planned Parenthood is not all that it is cracked up to be. In fact, it is not anything that it is cracked up to be. It is not even close.
The Pro-Choice Illusion

Planned Parenthood claims to advocate the freedom of women to choose if and when they will have children, without government interference. But that is an illusion.

Planned Parenthood is anything but a "pro-choice" organization. And it is anything but a populist, non-interventionist champion of liberty against governmental coercion.

The truth is that from its very inception, Planned Parenthood has sought mandatory population control measures—measures carefully designed to deny the freedom to choose. Over the years it has proposed that our government implement such things as "compulsory abortion for out-of-wedlock pregnancies," federal entitlement "payments to encourage abortion," "compulsory sterilization for those who have already had two children," and "tax penalties" for existing large families.

Although Planned Parenthood's sterilization crusade has only seen acceptance in the United States from time to time—especially among the ill, the infirm, the poor, and the incarcerated—most of its other coercive programs have been embraced enthusiastically elsewhere around the globe.

China, for example, has taken Planned Parenthood's suggestions to heart, launching a brutal, no-holds-barred, one-child-per-couple policy. Nearly one hundred million forced abortions, mandatory sterilizations, and coercive infanticides later, Planned Parenthood continues to maintain that the communist government's genocidal approach to population control is a "model of efficiency." It has fought to maintain United States funding of the Chinese operation, and has continued to increase its own funding and program support involvement despite widespread reports of human rights atrocities.

Similar draconian measures have been implemented at Planned Parenthood's behest in dozens of countries throughout the Third World. Providing many of these countries with detailed restraints and quotas, suggested compulsory incentives and disincentives, and assistance in circumventing public opinion and moral opposition, Planned Parenthood has taken the lead in the international campaign to crush the rights of women to choose if and when they will have children.

The slow advance of Planned Parenthood's coercive programs has eroded freedom of choice in the United States as well.
Parents often cannot choose to obtain full medical disclosure for their minor children. Fathers often cannot choose to save the lives of their unborn babies. Pro-life advocates often cannot choose to exercise their first amendment rights in front of abortuaries and clinics. Alternative centers for women with crisis pregnancies often cannot choose to counsel, lobby, solicit, or advertise on an equal basis with abortuaries. Medical personnel often cannot choose to abstain from abortion, infanticide, fetal harvesting and euthanasia procedures. Cities and states often cannot choose to unilaterally regulate commercial abortion activities within their jurisdictions. And political candidates cannot choose to broadcast television ads that portray the “brutal truth” of abortion-on-demand. All this, thanks to the diligence of Planned Parenthood and its insistence on government interference into the personal lives of men, women, and children everywhere.

In a recent survey of women who had received abortions at Planned Parenthood, sixty percent stated that their counselor had “very strongly encouraged them to choose abortion as the best solution to their problem.” This is especially significant in light of the fact that over ninety percent of those encouraged to abort by their Planned Parenthood counselor said that “there was a strong chance” they would have chosen against the abortion if they “had not been so strongly encouraged to abort.” Over sixty percent were “still hoping to find an alternative” when they went in for counseling. Only twenty-five percent were already “firm in their decision” to obtain an abortion.

So what did the “champions of choice” at Planned Parenthood do to help these women through the agonizing decision-making process? Did they lay out all the options? Did they discuss all the available alternatives? Did they go over all the possible risks, hazards, and complications? Did they offer women a real choice? Hardly.

Ninety-five percent of the women said that their Planned Parenthood counselors gave “little or no biological information about the fetus which the abortion would destroy.” Eighty percent said that their counselors gave “little or no information about the potential health risks which might follow the surgery.” Sixty-eight percent felt that “the procedure was not described with any degree of depth or clarity.” And eighty-nine percent said that their counselor was “strongly biased in favor of the abortion.”
Far from advocating choice then, Planned Parenthood has become, over the years at home and abroad, the most valiant crusader against choice since Madame Mao and the “Gang of Four” conducted the Cultural Revolution.

Planned Parenthood is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a “pro-choice” organization. It is instead one of the most vicious opponents of choice in the world today. It knows no glasnost. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

The Charity Illusion

Planned Parenthood claims to serve the needs of poor women and low-income families. But that is an illusion.

Planned Parenthood’s pose as a champion of the underprivileged is a cruel hoax foisted on the uninformed and unsuspecting.

The truth is, Planned Parenthood appears to want to eliminate the poor, not serve them. Animosity toward the weak and lowly has been its hallmark from its earliest days. In fact, its entire program of family limitation was designed to foster an elitist pogrom against the underclasses.

In 1922, Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood, chided social workers, philanthropists, and churchmen for perpetuating “the cruelty of charity.” She argued that organized attempts to help the poor were the “surest sign that our civilization has bred, is breeding, and is perpetuating constantly increasing numbers of defectives, delinquents, and dependents.” She went on to write that the most “insidiously injurious philanthropy” was the maternity care given to poor women. She concluded her diatribe by describing all those who refused to see the necessity of severely regulating the fertility of the working class as “benign imbeciles, who encourage the defective and diseased elements of humanity in their reckless and irresponsible swarming and spawning.”

Her alternative to charity was “to eliminate the stocks” that she felt were most detrimental “to the future of the race and the world.” To that end, Planned Parenthood has always targeted minorities, the unwanted, and the disadvantaged for family limitation, contraception, abortion, and sterilization. “More children from the fit, less from the unfit,” Sanger pined, “that is the chief issue of birth control.”
To this day the thrust of Planned Parenthood's literature focuses on the terrible burden that the poor place on the rich. It continually reminds us of the costs that welfare mothers incur for the elite. It constantly devises new plans to penetrate Black, Hispanic, and ethnic communities with its crippling message of Eugenic racism. It seems that its only use for the deprived and rejected is as bait for huge federal subsidies and foundation grants. "If we must have welfare," Sanger argued, "give it to the rich, not to the poor." Her organization has for years attempted to translate that philosophy into public policy.

Among measures Planned Parenthood has recently spotlighted in its literature are such things as the elimination of child care, medical attention, scholarships, housing, loans, and subsidies to poor families. In addition it has given voice to such notions as maternity benefits being drastically reduced or even eliminated, substantial, across-the-board marriage and child taxes being imposed, and large families not being given preferential charitable relief.

Planned Parenthood is not, by any stretch of the imagination, an advocate of the poor. It is instead a great oppressor and exploiter of the poor. Its image-conscious rhetoric of compassion is a paragon of Orwellian Newspeak-double think. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

The Private Funding Illusion

Planned Parenthood claims to be a privately funded, non-profit family planning organization. But that is an illusion. First of all, Planned Parenthood is not an "organization"—it is instead an association of more than three hundred separately incorporated organizations worldwide. Second, it is not involved primarily in "family planning"—it is instead involved in "family banning." Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it is by no means "privately" funded, either.

The truth is, a vast proportion of Planned Parenthood's funding at every level—from the local level to the international level—comes right out of the American taxpayer's pocket. It has become for all intents and purposes an unofficial—and thus unrestrained and unrestricted—branch of the federal government.

It is widely known that Planned Parenthood receives tens of millions of tax dollars through the Title X appropriations of the
Public Health Service Act.\textsuperscript{88} In fiscal 1987, Title X funds amounted to a whopping $142.5 million.\textsuperscript{89} In 1988, that sum was upped to $146 million.\textsuperscript{90} And by 1992 it topped $200 million.\textsuperscript{91} During the twelve years of pro-life Republican administrations, funding for Planned Parenthood's lascivious Title X programs actually tripled.\textsuperscript{92} For the Democrats now in power, only the sky is the limit.\textsuperscript{93} Dispensed as a virtual block grant, to be spent in whatever way Planned Parenthood and the other beneficiaries see fit, this Title X money is obviously a major source of income for the abortuaries and birth control clinics of our land.\textsuperscript{94}

What is not widely known, however, is that those Title X appropriations represent only a small proportion of Planned Parenthood's taxpayer largess. There are some eighteen additional federal statutes,\textsuperscript{95} as well as hundreds of state and local measures, that authorize public expenditures and support for "family planning" programs, policies, and procedures.\textsuperscript{96} So, for instance, even during the "pro-life" Republican administrations, Planned Parenthood clinics, affiliates, and chapters received annual federal funding under the seventeen-million-dollar Title V provision of the Social Security Maternal and Child Health Program.\textsuperscript{97} Each year they received federal funding under the nine-million-dollar Medicaid appropriations bill. In addition, those clinics, affiliates, and chapters benefited each year from the government's eight-million-dollar contraceptive development splurge,\textsuperscript{98} its three-million-dollar expenditure for a contraceptive evaluation project,\textsuperscript{99} its sixty-six-million dollar spending spree for "reproductive sciences,"\textsuperscript{100} its fourteen million dollars spent on demographic and behavioral research,\textsuperscript{101} and its twenty-seven million dollars budgeted for community services block grants.\textsuperscript{102} Internationally, various Planned Parenthood agencies have been able to skim the cream off virtually every United States foreign aid package. This includes a lion's share of the more than two hundred million dollars in International Population Assistance funds,\textsuperscript{103} and the more than one hundred million dollars in contraceptive and abortifacient research appropriations.\textsuperscript{104} Additionally, Planned Parenthood gets a larger part of the untold billions in grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, the World Bank, and the Agency for International Development.\textsuperscript{105}

That is a lot of money. That is a lot of your money and a lot of my money. And it is getting worse with every passing moment.
Planned Parenthood is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a privately funded, non-profit family planning organization. It is instead one of the largest—if not the largest—publicly funded multi-national collectives the world has ever seen. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

**The Birth Control Illusion**

Planned Parenthood claims that its system of birth control is safe and effective. But that is an illusion.

Planned Parenthood's blind faith in its chemical and mechanical methodology is completely and entirely unfounded. The truth is, Planned Parenthood's program of birth control has failed to inhibit unwanted pregnancies, and it has dramatically increased the risk of severe medical problems for the women who follow it. Ninety percent of the fifty-five million women of reproductive age in the United States use some form of contraception, including as many as seventy-nine percent of all sexually active teens. Even so, more than three million unwanted pregnancies are reported every year. More than fourteen million cases of venereal disease are reported every year.

The number of reported complications and side effects increases with every passing day. All this is directly attributable to Planned Parenthood's cult of contraception.

According to Planned Parenthood's own figures, the annual in-use failure rate for the Pill is as high as eleven percent. For the diaphragm, the normal failure rate is nearly thirty-two percent. For the intra-uterine device (IUD), it is almost eleven percent. For “safe sex” condoms, it is over eighteen percent. And for the various foam, cream, and jelly spermicides, it can range as high as thirty-four percent. That means that a sexually active fourteen-year-old girl who faithfully uses the Pill has a forty-four percent chance of getting pregnant at least once before she finishes high school. She has a sixty-nine percent chance of getting pregnant at least once before she finishes college. And she has a thirty percent chance of getting pregnant two or more times. If she relies on “safe sex” condoms, the likelihood of an unwanted pregnancy while she is in school rises to nearly eighty-seven percent. In other words, the Planned Parenthood system virtually guarantees that women will get pregnant—and that they will then be “forced” to fall back on the birth control lynch pin: abortion.
Safe and effective? Not by a long shot. Planned Parenthood's program of birth control is nothing but foreplay for abortion. Besides the fact that it is fraught with awful side effects, complications, and medical risks, it is incapable of preventing unwanted pregnancies as well. Planned Parenthood's entire myth is an empty charade. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

The STD Illusion

Planned Parenthood claims that it is in the forefront of the battle against sexually transmitted diseases. But that is an illusion.

Planned Parenthood is not only not in the forefront of the battle, it is not even in the battle. The truth is, Planned Parenthood's efforts have been tragically counterproductive. It has become a veritable Typhoid Mary, actually encouraging the spread of syphilis, gonorrhea, chlamydia, herpes, hepatitis, granuloma, chancroid, and even AIDS at an alarming rate. Besides the fact that it constantly exhorts youngsters to flaunt a ribald and irresponsible promiscuity, it continually promotes an alarmingly "unsafe" exercise of that promiscuity. Instead of affording its fornicating disciples with the slim security of barrier devices, it primarily peddles the entirely unguarded prescription birth control methods. Eighty percent of Planned Parenthood's clients receive non-barrier contraceptives, and eighty-eight percent of those who previously practiced "safe sex" are dissuaded from continuing.

Admittedly, barrier devices such as condoms offer only limited protection against venereal infection. Due to in-use mechanical failure—leaks, breaks, tears, slippage, and spillage—their effectiveness has been estimated to be at best eighty-two percent. But the Pill offers no protection whatsoever. Neither does the IUD or the diaphragm or spermicides or contraceptive sponges or any of the other non-barrier birth control devices that Planned Parenthood favors. Worse, recent studies indicate that not only do these methods fail to guard against venereal infection, they may actually enhance the risks. "Apparently," says demographic analyst Robert Ruff, "Planned Parenthood believes that safe sex is a lot less important than free sex."

Planned Parenthood is not, by any stretch of the imagination, in the forefront of the battle against venereal disease. It is instead
part of the problem, serving as a conduit for “unsafe” sexual practices. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

The Sex Education Illusion

Planned Parenthood claims that sex education is a necessary and effective means of preventing teen pregnancies.\textsuperscript{132} But that is an illusion. Planned Parenthood’s multi-million-dollar, tax-funded educational efforts have proven to be anything but necessary and effective.

The truth is, Planned Parenthood’s sex education programs have backfired, actually increasing teen pregnancies. According to its own survey, conducted by the Louis Harris pollsters, teens who have taken “comprehensive” sex education courses have a fifty percent higher rate of sexual activity than their “unenlightened” peers.\textsuperscript{133} And yet the courses had no significant effect on their contraceptive usage.\textsuperscript{134} The conclusion, one that even Planned Parenthood researchers have been unable to escape, is that sex education courses only exacerbate the teen pregnancy problem.\textsuperscript{135}

In an effort to denounce the threat that such a conclusion poses to its precious empire, Planned Parenthood has erected a scaffold of spurious statistics, studies, and surveys.\textsuperscript{136} A long fusillade of figures come clamoring out of it. Fresh salvos of arithmetic are marshalled to the cause. But all to no avail. The cold hard facts like granite tetons straddling its path have forced Planned Parenthood to go on a quixotic offensive.\textsuperscript{137}

In 1970 fewer than half of the nation’s school districts offered sex education curricula and none had school-based birth control clinics.\textsuperscript{138} Today more than seventy-five percent of the districts teach sex education and there are more than one hundred clinics in operation.\textsuperscript{139} Yet the percentage of illegitimate births has only increased during that time, from a mere fifteen percent to an astonishing fifty-one percent.\textsuperscript{140}

In California, the public schools have required sex education for more than thirty years, and yet the state has maintained one of the highest rates of teen pregnancy in the nation.\textsuperscript{141}

According to the Harris poll, the only things that effectively impact the teen pregnancy problem are frequent church attendance and parental oversight,\textsuperscript{142} the very things that Planned
Parenthood has been railing against for three-quarters of a century—the very things that sex education courses are designed to circumvent.\textsuperscript{143}

Planned Parenthood's program of sex education is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a necessary or effective means of preventing teen pregnancies. Instead, it does just the opposite. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

**The Abortion Illusion**

*Planned Parenthood claims that its efforts to provide abortion services have at last removed the specter of dangerous back-alley abortions from our land.*\textsuperscript{144} But that is an illusion.

The specter remains, darker and more ominous than ever before.

The truth is, many of the butchers who ran the old back-alley operations have simply moved uptown to ply their grisly trade for Planned Parenthood.\textsuperscript{145}

The same unsafe techniques, the same lecherous motivations, and the same twisted and perverse ethics that marred their criminal careers continue to haunt them.\textsuperscript{146} The 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision did nothing to change that. Planned Parenthood's "efforts" do nothing to change it, either.

Abortions are dangerous. Planned Parenthood's own liability release forms say so—in very fine print, of course.\textsuperscript{147} There is no such thing as a "safe and legal" abortion. *Legal*, yes.\textsuperscript{148} *Safe*, no way.\textsuperscript{149}

Recently the Centers for Disease Control conducted a study of maternal deaths and discovered that abortion is now the sixth most common cause. The results of the study, released in the journal *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, admitted that those abortion-related deaths may be under-reported by as much as fifty percent.\textsuperscript{150}

According to a Johns Hopkins University study, nearly twenty percent of all mid-trimester abortions result in serious genital tract infections.\textsuperscript{151} And a study conducted by two UCLA obstetrical and gynecological professors concluded that "abortion can be a killer," due to "pelvic abscess, perforation of the uterus, and sometimes also of the bowel."\textsuperscript{152} But even if such infections and abscesses do not prove to be fatal, they can cause
serious and permanent medical complications. According to one physician, writing in the British *Journal of Venereal Disease*, "infection in the womb and tubes often does permanent damage. The Fallopian tube is a fragile organ, a very tiny bore tube. If infection injures it, it often seals shut. The typical infection involving these organs is pelvic inflammatory disease, or PID."\textsuperscript{153} This condition affects nearly fifteen percent of all those who submit to induced abortion.\textsuperscript{154}

Other medical complications of abortion include sterility—as many as twenty-five percent of all women receiving mid-trimester abortions;\textsuperscript{155} hemorrhaging—nearly ten percent of all cases require transfusions;\textsuperscript{156} viral hepatitis—occurring in ten percent of all those transfused;\textsuperscript{157} embolism—in as many as four percent of all cases;\textsuperscript{158} cervical laceration, cardio-respiratory arrest, acute kidney failure, and amniotic fluid embolus—occurring in as many as forty-two percent of all Prostaglandin abortions.\textsuperscript{159}

As a result of these complications, women in America have seen a massive increase in the cost of medical care.\textsuperscript{160} While the average cost of normal health maintenance for men has increased nearly twelve percent over the last eight years due to inflation, the average cost for women has skyrocketed a full twenty-seven percent.\textsuperscript{161}

Planned Parenthood has not removed the specter of dangerous back-alley abortions. Not by any stretch of the imagination. As the world’s number one abortion provider and promoter, it has instead extended that dark and dismal shadow all across the land.\textsuperscript{162} We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

**The Innovation Illusion**

*Planned Parenthood claims that it is on the cutting edge of medical technology with its birth control and abortifacient research. But that is an illusion.*

The truth is, Planned Parenthood’s research and development projects have almost universally proven to be utter failures. The recent RU-486 debacle is a case in point.

Spawning a spate of news stories and editorials in the international news media extolling the homeric virtues of the French abortion drug, Planned Parenthood pundits have heralded RU-486 as a stunning breakthrough—not only as a conventional abortifacient but possibly as an effective “morning after”
contraceptive pill as well. They have thus thrust the drug—which they helped to develop along with the World Health Organization, the United Nations Population Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, and Roussel-Uclaf—before a woe-weary world with a hearty yo-heave-ho.

Etienne-Emile Baulieu, the chief developer of the drug and an international spokesman for Planned Parenthood, says with no little hyperbole, that it is, “the most important invention of the twentieth century,” and that it therefore has been rightfully “elevated to mythic status.”\(^\text{163}\) Apparently his assessment is something more than political posturing or personal braggadocio—for he is by no means alone:

According to Patricia Ireland, the president of the National Organization for Women—and another strong supporter of Planned Parenthood—the drug is indeed, “symbolic of the battle for women’s rights. It is the cornerstone of our future.”\(^\text{164}\)

Molly Yard, who was Ireland’s immediate predecessor at NOW, agrees, saying that RU-486 is “a most critical drug.” Perhaps even, “the most significant medical advance in human history and the symbol of a brighter future for women everywhere.”\(^\text{165}\)

Paul Ehrlich, population researcher and author—as well as a Planned Parenthood board member—asserts that it is the “medical breakthrough” that “women everywhere have been hoping and praying for.”\(^\text{166}\)

Nita Lowey, a congresswoman from New York, claims it is “an important medical innovation that could dramatically enhance women’s privacy and health.”\(^\text{167}\)

Eleanor Smeal, president of the Feminist Majority Foundation, says that RU-486 is a “truly remarkable” drug that has “amazing properties which hold tremendous promise for the benefit of women.” Indeed, she bubbles, it is “an historic breakthrough in medicine.”\(^\text{168}\)

Syndicated columnist and Planned Parenthood mouthpiece Ellen Goodman opined that, “RU-486 offers the best possibility of muting the abortion conflict while at the same time protecting privacy.”\(^\text{169}\) That is a marriage that she apparently believes was made in heaven.

But the most laudatory praise of all comes from Lawrence Lader, longtime Planned Parenthood advocate and founder of the National Abortion Rights Action League. He said:
RU-486 presents a classic case of how scientific progress can revolutionize our lives. Within the last century, the railroad opened up Western America and became a major factor in turning the United States into an economic colossus. The elevator was essential to the development of the skyscraper, the vertical city, and the concentration of business and services in a unified geographic area. The automobile gave us more than speed; it opened up the suburbs and the possibility of combining a rural or semi-rural lifestyle with employment in the central city. The cathode-ray tube made television possible. Antibiotics and other pioneering drugs extended our life-span and improved the quality of these added years. But when it comes to making an impact on our personal relationships, the science of controlling human reproduction must be considered unique. No other development—not even the telephone, with its advantage of bringing families and friends together—has so drastically changed our lives.  

According to Lader, "With the development of RU-486, scientific progress has reached a whole new stage." It is difficult to argue with an invention that is touted as even more significant than the railroad, the elevator, the automobile, television, antibiotics, and the telephone—one that would put an end to bitterness and strife and offer mankind a dazzling new hope.

The fact is, after a decade of feverish fine-tuning, RU-486 is unreliable, unsafe, and utterly unremarkable.

For starters, it doesn't work very well. That it has a standalone failure rate of between fifteen and forty percent—and yet is still taken seriously—is itself a marvel of modern medicine. Even with the addition of the prostaglandin, the failure rate is abysmally high. One out of every twenty RU-486 abortions fail—whereas only one in two hundred surgical suction procedures need to be repeated.

It is not at all safe or easy either. In a recent clinical study in Britain, five hundred eighty-eight women were given abortions with RU-486 combined with the prostaglandin gemeprost. Five of the women bled so much that they required transfusions. One hundred sixty-six of them needed narcotics to ease the pain. Some one hundred fifty vomited, and another seventy-three suffered diarrhea. Thirty-five failed to abort and had to undergo
a follow-up surgical procedure. And together, they averaged more than twenty days of heavy bleeding afterwards.¹⁷⁴

And that report is by no means an isolated anomaly. Again and again, wherever RU-486 has been tested, serious complications have been reported. On April 9, 1990, an International Inquiry Commission on RU-486 was established in Puteaux, France, to investigate the wide range of these alleged medical hazards. Ten of the most highly regarded medical and pharmaceutical researchers in Europe—including the current presidents of the French National Academy of Medicine and the National Pharmacological Commission—examined every shred of clinical and consumer data on the drug. Their final report was more than a little disturbing. Besides the common side effects of nausea, irregular pulse, and diarrhea, they found that “abnormal uterine metrorrhagia” developed “in more than ninety percent of the cases.”¹⁷⁵ Moreover, an average drop of thirty percent in haematocrite was observed.¹⁷⁶ “That may partially explain,” they argued, “the unduly high incidence of coronarite crises.”¹⁷⁷ Finally, they noted “a strong stimulating effect by RU-486 on the growth of a breast cancerous cellular line,” and “notably severe inhibitory properties on the immunitory system.”¹⁷⁸

 Shortly after the report was released, Roussel-Uclaf admitted that nearly ten percent of all the women who had used the drug experienced “undesirable side effects.”¹⁷⁹ Two life-threatening heart attacks had been reported: one myocardial infarction and one cardiac arrest.¹⁸⁰ In addition, they revealed that another woman had fallen into a coma for more than thirty-six hours following the administration of the procedure.¹⁸¹

When the first RU-486-related deaths were reported in the spring of 1991, the French Ministry of Health—which had once heralded the drug as the “moral property” of women—instituted a whole host of new restrictive regulations.¹⁸² When questioned about these precautions, Roussel-Uclaf’s official spokeswoman, Catherine Euvrard, explained simply that the drug was “too dangerous” to remain in use with “unregulated abandon.”¹⁸³

Not only is RU-486 ineffective and dangerous, the treatment involves a long and protracted ordeal—requiring up to four clinical visits.¹⁸⁴ It is physically painful and psychologically debilitating.¹⁸⁵ Newsweek magazine regretfully, but honestly,
reported, "RU-486 is not the miraculous, painless, private morning-after drug that some have envisioned." And that is the height of understatement.

But even apart from such obvious boondoggles as RU-486, Planned Parenthood's best efforts to pawn off its slightly less flamboyant technological schemes has ended in complete failure. Despite spending billions of our tax dollars over the last forty years in an effort to convince the women of the world that casual promiscuity, recreational drug use, and child-killing on demand are enlightened and sophisticated solutions to all their woes, their sexual behavior remains—by Planned Parenthood's standards—boorishly recalcitrant.

Citing their own massive demographic and health survey in twelve nations, Planned Parenthood admitted that only 25.2 percent of all the women utilizing its various birth control technologies were either "successful" or "satisfied." A full 56 percent had abandoned Planned Parenthood's draconian programs because of a variety of complaints, including a huge proportion of in-use failures and undesired physical and emotional side-effects. Further, the survey revealed that an additional 200 million current users of Planned Parenthood services were expected to discontinue before long. In other words, Planned Parenthood is faced with a wholesale multi-cultural rejection of its precepts and principles. Even so, social workers, activists, and politicians continue to place their faith in them. The irascible H. L. Mencken once quipped that "Hooey pleases boobs a great deal more than sense." Apparently he was right. Nevertheless, the women of the world have discovered this dirty little secret: Planned Parenthood's technological advances aren't advances at all. Not by any stretch of the imagination. They don't work. They never have, and they apparently never will. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

The Population Illusion

Planned Parenthood claims that its birth control, sex education, and abortion juggernaut is essential to control rapid population growth. But that is an illusion.

Its justifications ring hollow. Planned Parenthood is simply grasping at straws.
The truth is that there is no rapid population growth for Planned Parenthood to control. There is no population crisis. There is no population explosion. There aren’t too many people. If anything, there aren’t enough people. Instead of worrying about Planned Parenthood’s “population bomb,” many researchers are concerned about a “birth dearth.”

Fertility in the United States has been steadily declining for two centuries. And it has been below replacement level since 1972. In Western Europe, the figures are even more frightening: The Netherlands saw its fertility rate plunge fifty-three percent in just twenty years. The French rate has dropped thirty-two percent in just eleven years. Only Finland has been able to avoid the suicidal bent of the rest of the continent, prompting French statesman, Jacques Chirac, to exclaim, “Europe is vanishing. . . . Soon our countries will be empty.”

In the Third World regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, fertility rates are now declining almost as rapidly. As a result, the worldwide birthrate is now falling faster than the mortality rate for the first time in recorded history. And the trend appears to be accelerating. Despite this, Planned Parenthood persists in issuing frantic invectives against overcrowding and overpopulation. False figures tumble out of it like the dry rush of a grain chute. It is lost in a don’t-confuse-me-with-the-facts kind of oblivion. Like Don Quixote it is madly crashing across foggy moors, jousting with phantoms, wind churns, and vain imaginations. But of course, the joke is on us, because Planned Parenthood pursues its folly at our expense. Spending our money, stealing our future, and wasting our hope, it careens down the path of death and destruction.

Planned Parenthood’s attempt to justify its birth control, sex education, and abortion schemes by appealing to the threat of a population explosion has been a brilliant but desperate public relations assault on reality. Flying in the face of the facts, its campaign has been as false as the shimmering sands of the Sahara. We simply cannot contend or pretend otherwise.

The Big Lie

Lies. Lies. Lies. All lies.

One after another, Planned Parenthood’s lies, hallowed in near sanctity, blaze forth in a positive conflagration of revered shibboleths. Taken together, those lies comprise the lie. The Big Lie. The Grand Illusion. The Myth of Planned Parenthood.
Myths, according to theologian J. I. Packer, are “stories made up to sanctify social patterns.” They are lies, carefully designed to reinforce a particular philosophy or morality within a culture. They are instruments of manipulation and control.

When Jeroboam splintered the nation of Israel after the death of Solomon, he thought that in order to consolidate his rule over the northern faction he would have to wean the people from their spiritual and emotional dependence on the Jerusalem temple. So he manufactured myths. He lied.

And Jeroboam said in his heart, “Now the kingdom will return to the house of David. If this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, then the heart of this people will return to their lord, even to Rehoboam king of Judah; and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam king of Judah.”

So the king consulted, and made two golden calves, and he said to them, “It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem; behold your gods, O Israel, that brought you up from the land of Egypt.” And he set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan. Now this thing became a sin, for the people went to worship before the one as far as Dan. And he made houses on high places, and made priests from among all the people who were not of the sons of Levi. And Jeroboam instituted a feast in the eighth month on the fifteenth day of the month, like the feast which is in Judah, and he went up to the altar; thus he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves which he had made. And he stationed in Bethel the priests of the high places which he had made. Then he went up to the altar which he had made in Bethel on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, even in the month which he had devised in his own heart; and he instituted a feast for the sons of Israel, and went up to the altar to burn incense (1 Kings 12:26-33).

Jeroboam instituted a false feast at a false shrine, attended by false priests, before false gods, and all on a false pretense. But his lies succeeded in swaying the people. Jeroboam’s mythology sanctified a whole new set of social patterns. What would have been unthinkable before—idolatry, apostasy, and travesty—became almost overnight not only thinkable or acceptable, but conventional and habitual. As a result, the new king was able to manipulate and control his subjects.
The powerful, the would-be-powerful, and the wish-they-were-powerful have always relied on such tactics. Plato and Thucydides observed the phenomenon during Greece's classical era.\textsuperscript{209} Plutarch and Augustine identified it during the Roman epoch.\textsuperscript{210} Sergios Kasilov and Basil Argyros noted it during the Byzantine millennium.\textsuperscript{211} Niccolo Machiavelli and Thomas More recognized its importance during the European Renaissance.\textsuperscript{212} And Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Colin Thubron have pointed it out in our own time.\textsuperscript{213} Most of the myth-makers never actually believed in the gods upon Olympus, across the River Styx, or within the Kremlin Palace. After all, they knew all too well from whence those lies came. But as high priests of deceit, they used the lies to dominate the hearts and minds and lives of the masses.

The Bible says that such men are full of deceitful words (Psalm 36:3). Their counsel is deceitful (Proverbs 12:5). Their favor is deceitful (Proverbs 27:6). And their hearts are deceitful (Mark 7:22). They defraud the unsuspecting (Romans 16:18), displaying the spirit of anti-Christ (2 John 7), all for the sake of wealth, prestige, and prerogative (Proverbs 21:6).

Such puissance is in the long run all too fleeting, however (Revelation 21:8), because myth-makers do not go unpunished (Proverbs 19:5). Ultimately, their sin finds them out (Jeremiah 17:11).

Still, because their lies wreak havoc among the innocent (Micah 6:12), it is essential that we not be taken in. Not only are we to be alert to deception (Ephesians 4:14), testing the words and deeds of the myth-makers against the Truth (1 John 4:1-6), but we are to expose their deceptions as well (Ephesians 5:11).

Planned Parenthood, not at all unlike Jeroboam and the other infamous myth-makers throughout history, has thus far been able to parlay its deception into a substantial empire. But now, the truth must be told. The illusion must be exposed. The Big Lie must be demythologized.

Woe to the bloody city, completely full of lies and pillage; Her prey never departs (Nahum 3:1).
The modern world is full of the old Christian virtues gone mad. The virtues have gone mad because they have been isolated from each other and are wandering alone. Thus some scientists care for truth; but their truth is pitiless. And thus, some humanitarians only care for pity; but their pity—I am sorry to say—is often untruthful.¹

G. K. Chesterton
THREE

BAD SEED: THE HISTORICAL LEGACY

dux femina facti

To comprehend the history of a thing is to unlock the mysteries of its present, and more, to disclose the profundities of its future.

Hilaire Belloc

On January 1, 1900, most Americans greeted the twentieth century with the proud and certain belief that the next hundred years would be the greatest, the most glorious, and the most glamorous in human history. They were infected with a sanguine spirit. Optimism was rampant. A brazen confidence colored their every activity.

Certainly there was nothing in their experience to make them think otherwise. Never had a century changed the lives of men and women more dramatically than the one just past. The twentieth century has moved fast and furiously, so that those of us who have moved in it feel sometimes giddy, watching it spin; but the nineteenth moved faster and more furiously still. Railroads, telephones, the telegraph, electricity, mass production, forged steel, automobiles, and countless other modern discoveries had all come upon them at a dizzying pace, expanding their visions and expectations far beyond their grandfathers' wildest dreams. It was more than unfounded imagination, then, that lay behind the New York World's New Year's prediction that the twentieth century would "meet and overcome all perils and prove to be the best that this steadily improving planet has ever seen."

Most Americans were cheerfully assured that control of man and nature would soon lie entirely within their grasp and would
bestow upon them the unfathomable millennial power to alter the destinies of societies, nations, and epochs. They were a people of purpose. They were a people of manifest destiny.

What they did not know was that dark and malign seeds were already germinating just beneath the surface of the new century's soil. Josef Stalin was a twenty-one-year-old seminary student in Tiflis, a pious and serene community at the crossroads of Georgia and the Ukraine. Benito Mussolini was a seventeen-year-old student teacher in the quiet suburbs of Milan. Adolf Hitler was an eleven-year-old aspiring art student in the quaint upper Austrian village of Brannan. And Margaret Sanger was a twenty-year-old shy and out-of sorts nurse-probationer in White Plains, New York. Who could have ever guessed on that ebullently auspicious New Year’s Day that those four youngsters would, over the span of the next century, spill more innocent blood than all the murderers, warlords, and tyrants of past history combined? Who could have ever guessed that those four youngsters would together ensure that the hopes and dreams and aspirations of the twentieth century would be smothered under the weight of holocaust, genocide, and triage?

As the champion of the proletariat, Stalin saw to the slaughter of at least fifteen million Ukrainian kulaks. As the popularly acclaimed Il Duce, Mussolini massacred as many as four million Ethiopians, two million Eritreans, and a million Serbs, Croats, and Albanians. As the wildly lionized Führer, Hitler exterminated more than six million Jews, two million Slavs, and a million Poles. As the founder of Planned Parenthood and the impassioned heroine of feminist causes célèbres, Sanger was responsible for the brutal elimination of more than twenty million children in the United States and as many as one and a half billion worldwide.5

No one in his right mind would want to rehabilitate the reputations of Stalin, Mussolini, or Hitler. Their barbarism, treachery, and debauchery will make their names live on in infamy forever. Amazingly though, Sanger has escaped their wretched fate. In spite of the fact that her crimes against humanity were no less heinous than theirs, her place in history has somehow been sanitized and sanctified. In spite of the fact that she openly identified herself in one way or another with their aims, intentions, and movements—with Stalin’s Sobornostic Collectivism,6 with Hitler’s Eugenic Racism,7 and with Mussolini’s Agathistic Distributism8—she somehow managed to establish an independent reputation for the perpetuation of her memory.
In life and death, she has been lauded as a “radiant” and “courageous” reformer. She was heralded by friend and foe alike as a “heroine,” a “champion,” a “saint,” and a “martyr.” Honored by men as different and divergent as H. G. Wells and Martin Luther King, George Bernard Shaw and Harry Truman, Bertrand Russell and John D. Rockefeller, Albert Einstein and Dwight Eisenhower, the “woman rebel” somehow was able to secret away her perverse atrocities, emerging in the annals of history vindicated and victorious.

That this could happen is a scandal of grotesque proportions.

Growing Up Wrong
Margaret Sanger was born on September 14, 1879, in the small industrial community of Corning in upstate New York, the sixth of eleven children. Her father, Michael Higgins, was an Irish Catholic immigrant who fancied himself a freethinker and a skeptic. As a youngster he had enlisted in General William Sherman’s Twelfth New York Cavalry, and proudly participated in the infamous campaign that ravaged and ravished the South, across Tennessee, through Atlanta, and to the sea. He worked sporadically as a stone mason and a tombstone carver but was never willing or able to provide adequately for his large family. Margaret’s mother, Anne Purcell, was a second generation American from a strict Catholic family. She was frail and tuberculous but utterly devoted to her improvident husband and her ever growing brood of children.

The family suffered cold, privation, and hunger. They also suffered scorn, shame, and isolation because of Michael’s radical Socialist ideas and activities. Margaret would later describe her family’s life together as “joyless and filled with drudgery and fear.”

Clearly, theirs was an impoverished life. But, not only did the Higginses suffer socially and materially, they were spiritually deprived as well. One day when Margaret was on her knees saying the Lord’s Prayer, she came to the phrase “Give us this day our daily bread,” and her father cut in. “Who were you talking to?” he asked. “To God,” she replied. “Well, tell me, is God a baker?” With no little consternation, she said, “No, of course not. But He makes the rain, the sunshine, and all the things that...
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make the wheat, which makes the bread.” After a thoughtful
pause her father rejoined, “Well, well, so that’s the idea. Then
why didn’t you just say so? Always say what you mean, my
daughter, it is much better.”

In spite of Michael’s concerted efforts to undermine Margaret’s
young and fragile faith, her mother had her baptized in St.
Mary’s Catholic Church on March 23, 1893. A year later, on
July 8, 1894, she was confirmed. Both ceremonies were held in
secret—her father would have been furious had he known. For
some time afterward she displayed a zealous devotion to spiri­
tual things, but gradually the smothering effects of Michael’s
cynicism took their toll. By the time she was seventeen her pas­

tion for Christ had collapsed into a hatred of the church—a hat­
red that would be her spiritual hallmark for the rest of her life.

Margaret moved away from her unhappy home as soon as
she could. First, she went away to a boarding school, Claverack
College of the Hudson River Institute, where she got her first
taste of freedom. And what a wild and intoxicating freedom it
was: She plunged into radical politics, suffragette feminism, and
unfettered sex. When she could no longer afford the tuition,
she moved home only long enough to gather her belongings and
set her affairs in order. She had drunk from the cup of con­
cupiscence and would never again be satisfied with the quiet vir­
tues of domestic tranquillity.

She decided to move in with her older sister in White Plains,
taking a job as a kindergarten teacher. Assigned to a class made
up primarily of the children of new immigrants, she found that
her pupils couldn’t understand a word that she said. She quickly
grew tired of the laborious routine of teaching day in and day
out, and quit after two terms. Next, she tried nursing. But hos­
pital work proved to be even more vexing and taxing than teach­
ing. She never finished her training. She escaped from the
harsh “bondage” of labor and industry in the only way a poor girl
could in those “unenlightened” days when the Puritan Work
Ethic was still ethical: She married into money.

The Winter of Her Discontent

William Sanger wasn’t exactly rich, but he was close enough
for Margaret. He was a young man of great promise. An archi­
tect with the famed McKim, Mead, and White firm in New York
City, he had already made a name for himself while working on the plans for Grand Central Station and the Woolworth building. He met Margaret at a party in White Plains and immediately fell head over heels in love. He courted her with a single-minded zeal, promising her devotion, leisure, and a beautiful home—the fulfillment of her most cherished dreams. Within a few months, they were married.

The Sangers settled into a pleasant apartment in Manhattan’s upper east side and set up housekeeping. But housekeeping appealed to Margaret even less than teaching or nursing. She quickly grew restless. Her doting husband began casting about, trying to find a way to satisfy her passions. He sent her off for long vacations in the Adirondacks. He hired maids and attendants. He bought her expensive presents. He even built her an extravagant home in the suburbs. Nothing seemed to suit his temperamental bride.

In short order they had three children, two boys and a girl—Margaret thinking that they would be the keys to her fulfillment. But alas, they too proved to be but temporary diversions. After nearly a decade of undefined domestic dissatisfaction, Margaret convinced William to sell all they had, including their suburban estate, and move back into the Manhattan hubbub.

She quickly threw herself into the fast-paced social life of the city: shopping, dining, reveling, and theater going. She attempted to drown her rootless discontent in the wastrel champagne of improvidence.

Meanwhile, William began to renew old ties in radical politics by attending Socialist, Anarchist, and Communist meetings down in Greenwich Village. From time to time, when she bored of her patrician activities, Margaret would tag along. Before long, she could think of little else. She suddenly shed her bourgeois habits and took to Bohemian ways. Instead of whiling the hours away in the elegant shops along Fifth Avenue, she plunged headlong into the maelstrom of rebellion and revolution.

The Woman Rebel

At first, William was thrilled by Margaret’s conversion. It seemed that his bride had at last found fulfillment. Her commitment was rabid. She was forever attending rallies, meetings, and
caucuses, getting acquainted with the foremost radicals of the
day: John Reed, Eugene Debs, Clarence Darrow, Will Durant,
Upton Sinclair, Julius Hammer, and Bill Haywood.33 She joined
the Socialist Party and attended all of its functions. She even vol­
unteered as a women's organizer for Local Number Five, speak­
ing at labor organization meetings and writing for the Party
newspaper, The Call.

By this time, virtually all the revolutionary elements of Amer­
ican political life had been unified in the Socialist Party: the Radical Republicans, the Reformist Unitarians, the Knights of Labor,
the Mugwumps, the Anarchists, the Populists, the Progressivists, the Suffragettes, the Single Taxers, the Grangers, and the
Communists.34 From ten thousand members in 1901, it had
swollen to fifty-eight thousand by 1908, and more than twice that
number were recorded four years later.35 And its voting strength
was many times greater even than that, accounting for more
than six percent of all the votes cast in the national elections of
1912. When Margaret and William Sanger entered the fray that
year, the Party had elected twelve hundred public officials in
thirty-three states and one hundred and sixty cities, and it regu­
larly published over three hundred periodicals.36 Especially en­
ticing to Margaret was the fact that no other political movement
in American history had fought so consistently for women's
suffrage, sexual liberation, feminism, and birth control.

While William was happy that Margaret had finally found a
cause that satisfied her restless spirit, he gradually became con­
cerned that she was taking on too much too soon. Their apart­
ment was in a perpetual state of disarray. Their children were
constantly being farmed out to friends and neighbors. And their
time alone together was non-existent.

But then when Margaret fell under the spell of the militant
utopian Emma Goldman, William's husbandly concern turned
to extreme disapproval. Margaret had gone from an arch-typical
"material girl" to a revolutionary firebrand almost overnight.
And now she was taking her cues from one of the most contro­
versial insurrectionists alive. It was just too much.

Goldman was a fiery renegade who had close connections with
revolutionaries the world over: Bolsheviks in Russia, Fabians in
England, Anarchists in Germany, and Malthusians in France.
She lectured around the country, drawing large crowds, discoursing on everything from the necessity of free love to the nobility of incendiary violence, from the evils of capitalism to the virtues of assassination, from the perils of democracy to the need for birth control. She made her living selling her Anarchist magazine *Mother Earth* and by distributing leaflets on contraception and liberated sex.\(^{37}\)

Margaret was completely overwhelmed. She hung on Goldman’s every word and began to read everything in Goldman’s library including the massive, seven-volume *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* by Havelock Ellis, which stirred in her a new lust for adventure. She told William that she needed emancipation from every taint of Christianized capitalism, including the strict bonds of the marriage bed.

He was shocked.

William too was committed to the revolution, but only to a point. In a desperate attempt to save their marriage, he rented a cottage on Cape Cod and took Margaret and the children for a long vacation.

By the time they returned, Goldman had departed the Bohemian scene in Greenwich Village for a speaking tour, and Margaret’s attentions were deflected from promiscuity, at least for the moment. She continued reading the radical and sensual literature of Ellis and others, but her activism took a different turn.

A strike of textile workers in Lawrence, Massachusetts, drew the attentions of Socialist sympathizers all over the country. Sponsored by a militantly Marxist union, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), the strike was seen as a tremendous chance to bring the revolution to the streets of America. Bill Haywood, the labor leader who had opportunistically formed the union after a series of “sweat shop” disasters, came to the Village looking for professional organizers to help him manage the strike.

Margaret jumped at the chance.

Her great tenacity and innocent winsomeness proved to be a tremendous asset for Haywood. She was able to stir up a great deal of sympathetic publicity, and as a result the strike was a tremendous success. In fact, it was really *too* successful. It had
attracted the support of Governors, Congressmen, and even President Taft. The battle was won, but the war was lost—the revolution never made it to the streets because the anger of the rebellion was diffused by the acceptance of the establishment. The IWW was unable to recover from its victory and was never again able to stage a successful strike. Margaret returned to William and the children, despondent and discouraged.

In the weeks that followed, she occupied herself by dabbling in midwifery by day and by holding court in Mabel Dodge’s salon by night.

Dodge was a wealthy young divorcée, recently returned from France, where she had spent most of her married years. She had a stunning Fifth Avenue apartment where she started a salon modeled after those in the Palais Royale and Paris’s Left Bank. Her series of evenings were opportunities for intellectuals, radicals, artists, actors, writers, and activists to gather, mingle, debate, aspire, and conspire. Each night had its own theme: sometimes it would be politics, sometimes drama, or perhaps poetry or economics or art or science. Ideas and liquor flowed freely until midnight, when Dodge would usher in a sumptuous meal of the finest meats, poultry, cheeses, and French pastries.

Margaret’s topic of discussion was always sex. Her detour into labor activism had done little to dampen her interest in the subject. When it was her turn to lead an evening, she held Dodge’s guests spellbound, ravaging them with intoxicating notions of “romantic dignity, unfettered self-expression, and the sacredness of sexual desire.”38 Free love had been practiced quietly for years by the avant-garde intellectuals in the Village. Eugene O’Neill took on one mistress after another, immortalizing them in his plays. Edna St. Vincent Millay “hopped gaily from bed to bed and wrote about it in her poems.”39 Max Eastman, Emma Goldman, Floyd Dell, Rockwell Kent, Edgar Lee Masters, and many others had for some time enjoyed unrestrained sexploits.40 But no one had championed sexual freedom as openly and ardently as Margaret.41 When she spoke, the others became transfixed. Dodge was especially struck by her sensuous didactae. Later she would write in her memoirs:
Margaret Sanger was a Madonna type of woman, with soft brown hair parted over a quiet brow, and crystal-clear brown eyes. . . . It was she who introduced us all to the idea of birth control, and it, along with other related ideas about sex, became her passion. It was as if she had been more or less arbitrarily chosen by the powers that be to voice a new gospel of not only sex-knowledge in regard to conception, but sex-knowledge about copulation and its intrinsic importance.

She was the first person I ever knew who was openly an ardent propagandist for the joys of the flesh. This, in those days, was radical indeed when the sense of sin was still so indubitably mixed with the sense of pleasure. . . . Margaret personally set out to rehabilitate sex. . . . She was one of its first conscious promulgators.

Everyone seemed to be delighted by Margaret's explicit and brazen talks. Everyone except her husband, that is. William began to see the Socialist revolution as nothing more than "an excuse for a Saturnalia of sex." He decided he had best get Margaret away once again.

This time, he took Margaret and the children to Paris. He could pursue his interests in modern art. Margaret could study her now keen fascination with the advanced contraceptive methods widely available in France. And together they could refresh their commitment to each other in the world's most romantic city. Again though, he would be disappointed. After two weeks, Margaret became anxious for her Village friends and lovers. She begged William to return. He refused, so she simply abandoned him there, and returned to New York with the children.

Without her husband to support her every whim and fancy, Margaret was forced to find some means of providing an income for herself and the children. She had continued to write for The Call and found some degree of satisfaction in that, so she decided to try her hand at writing and publishing a paper herself.

She called it The Woman Rebel. It was an eight-sheet pulp with the slogan "No Gods! No Masters!" emblazoned across the masthead. She advertised it as "a paper of militant thought," and militant it was indeed. The first issue denounced marriage as a "degenerate institution," capitalism as "indecent exploitation," and sexual modesty as "obscene prudery." In the next issue, an
article entitled "A Woman's Duty" proclaimed that "rebel women" were to "look the whole world in the face with a go-to-hell look in the eyes." Another article asserted that "rebel women claim the following rights: the right to be lazy, the right to be an unmarried mother, the right to destroy . . . and the right to love." In later issues, she published several articles on contraception, several more on sexual liberation, three on the necessity for social revolution, and two defending political assassinations.

_The Woman Rebel_ was militant, all right. In fact, it was so militant that Margaret was promptly served with a subpoena indicting her on three counts for the publication of lewd and indecent articles in violation of the federal Comstock Laws.

The Comstock Laws had been passed by Congress in 1873. Their purpose was to close the mails to "obscene and lascivious" material, particularly the erotic postcards and pornographic magazines from Europe which, during the confused post-Civil War period, were flooding the country. Anthony Comstock, its sponsor, was appointed a special agent of the Post Office, with the power to see that it was strictly enforced. For nearly half a century he fought a single-handed campaign to "keep the mails clean" and to "ensure just condemnation for the purveyors of filth, eroticism, and degeneracy."

If convicted — and conviction was almost certain — Margaret could be sentenced to as much as five years. Frightened, she obtained several extensions of her court date. But then, deciding that her case was hopeless, she determined to flee the country under an assumed name. She had her Socialist friends forge a passport, provide her with connections in Canada and England, and take charge of her children. As a final gesture, just before she slipped over the border, she had them print and distribute one hundred thousand copies of a contraband leaflet she had written on contraception called _Family Limitation_. It was lurid and lascivious, designed to enrage the postal authorities and titillate the masses. But worse, it was dangerously inaccurate, recommending such things as Lysol douches, bichloride of mercury elixirs, heavy doses of laxatives, and herbal abortifacients.

Margaret Sanger's illustrious career as the "champion of birth control" was now well underway.
Sex Education

Margaret spent more than a year in England as a fugitive from justice. But she made certain that the time was not wasted. She had found her cause: Revolutionary Socialism. She had found her niche in the cause: Sexual Liberation. And now she would further that cause with a single-minded zeal.

As soon as she came ashore, Margaret began to make contact with the various radical groups of Britain. She began attending Socialist lectures on Nietzsche’s moral relativism, Anarchist lectures on Kropotkin’s subversive pragmatism, and Communist lectures on Bakunin’s collectivistic rationalism. But she was especially interested in developing ties with the Malthusians.

Thomas Malthus was a nineteenth-century professor of political economy whose theories of population growth and economic stability quickly became the basis for national and international social policy throughout the West. According to his scheme, population grows exponentially over time, while production only grows arithmetically. Poverty, deprivation, and hunger are thus evidence of a population crisis. It follows that the only responsible social policy is one that addresses the unnatural problem of population growth. In fact, Malthus argued, to deal with sickness, crime, privation, and need in any other way simply aggravates the problems further.

In his magnum opus, An Essay on the Principle of Population, published in six editions from 1798 to 1826, Malthus wrote:

All children born, beyond what would be required to keep up the population to a desired level, must necessarily perish, unless room be made for them by the deaths of grown persons. . . . Therefore . . . we should facilitate, instead of foolishly and vainly endeavoring to impede, the operations of nature in producing this mortality; and if we dread the too frequent visitation of the horrid form of famine, we should sedulously encourage the other forms of destruction, which we compel nature to use. Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country, we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settlements in all marshy and unwholesome situations. But above
all, we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases; and restrain those benevolent, but much mistaken men, who have thought they were doing a service to mankind by projecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disorders.\textsuperscript{50}

Malthus’s disciples—the Malthusians and the Neo-Malthusians—believed that if Western civilization were to survive, the physically unfit, the materially poor, the spiritually diseased, the racially inferior, and the mentally incompetent had to be eliminated. And while Malthus was forthright in recommending plague, pestilence, and putrification, his disciples felt that the subtler approaches of education, contraception, sterilization, and abortion were more practical ways to ease the pressures of over-population.

As historian Paul Johnson has shown, the Malthusians “were not men of action.”\textsuperscript{51} Instead, “they tried to solve the problems of the world in the quiet of their studies, inside their own heads. . . . They produced a new vocabulary of mumbo-jumbo. It was all hard-headed, scientific, and relentless.”\textsuperscript{52} Even so, their doctrines were immensely appealing to the intellectual elite. According to Johnson:

All the ablest elements in Western society, the trendsetters in opinion, were wholly taken in by this monstrous doctrine of unreason. Those who objected were successfully denounced as obscurantists, and the enemies of social progress. They could no longer be burned as heretical subverters of the new orthodoxy, but they were successfully and progressively excluded from the control of events.\textsuperscript{53}

This, despite the fact that the Malthusian mathematical scheme had been proven by historical verities to be utterly obsolete, if not entirely false.\textsuperscript{54}

Margaret immediately got on the Malthusian bandwagon. She was not philosophically inclined, nor was she particularly adept at political, social, or economic theory, but she did recognize in the Malthusians a kindred spirit and a tremendous opportunity. She was also shrewd enough to realize that her notions of Radical Socialism and Sexual Liberation would not ever have the popular support necessary to usher in the revolution without some appeal to altruism and intellectualism. She needed somehow to capture the moral and academic “high ground.” Malthusianism,
she thought, just might be the key to that ethical and intellectual posture. If she could argue for birth control using the scientifically verified threat of poverty, sickness, racial tension, and overpopulation as its backdrop, then she would have a much better chance of making her case. So she began to absorb as much of the Malthusian dogma as she could.

Margaret also immersed herself in the teachings of each of the Malthusian offshoots. If a little bit of something is a good thing, then a lot is even better. There were the Phrenologists, the Eugenicists, and the Social Darwinists. There were Oneidians, Polygenists, Craniometricists, Recapitulationists, Lambrosians, Binetists, Hereditarians, Freudians, and Neotenists. From each group she picked up a few popular slogans and concepts that would permanently shape her crusade.

But even more important than these institutional and intellectual connections, Margaret's English exile gave her the opportunity to make some critical interpersonal connections as well. Her bed became a veritable meeting place for the Fabian upper crust: H. G. Wells, George Bernard Shaw, Arnold Bennett, Arbuthnot Lane, and Norman Haire. And of course, it was then that she began her unusual and tempestuous affair with Havelock Ellis.

Ellis was the iconoclastic grandfather of the Bohemian sexual revolution. The author of nearly fifty books on every aspect of concupiscence from sexual inversion to auto-eroticism, from the revolution of obscenity to the mechanism of detumescence, from sexual periodicity to pornographic eonism, he had provided the free love movement with much of its intellectual apologia. Much to his chagrin however, he himself was sexually impotent, so he spent his life in pursuit of new and ever more exotic sensual pleasures. He staged elaborate orgies for his Malthusian and Eugenicist friends; he enticed his wife into innumerable lesbian affairs while he quietly observed; he experimented with mescaline and various other psychotropic and psychedelic drugs; and he established a network for both homosexual and heterosexual encounters.

To Margaret, Ellis was a modern-day saint. She adored him at once, both for his radical ideas and for his unusual bedroom behavior. The two of them began to plot a strategy for Margaret's cause. Ellis emphasized the necessity of political ex-
pediency. Margaret would have to tone down her pro-abortion stance. She would, he said, have to distance herself from revolutionary rhetoric. The scientific and philanthropic-sounding themes of Malthus and Eugenics would have to replace the politically charged themes of old-line labor Anarchism and Socialism.

By the time her year in England was over, Margaret's ideas were firmly in place, her strategy was thoroughly mapped out, and her agenda was carefully outlined.

She set out for America with a demonic determination to alter the course of Western civilization.

Ultimately, she succeeded.

**Planned Parenthood Is Conceived**

Margaret's first task after crossing the Atlantic was to face the legal charges against her. Using the skills she developed in the IWW, she immediately began a brilliant public relations campaign that so rallied public support for her cause that the authorities were forced to drop all charges.

She had won her first victory.

Then, in order to capitalize on all the publicity that her victory had generated, she embarked on a three-and-a-half-month, coast-to-coast speaking tour. She was a stunning success, drawing large, enthusiastic crowds.

Another victory.

Next, she decided to open a birth control clinic. Papers, pamphlets, and speeches could only do so much to usher in the revolution. Following her Malthusian and Eugenic instincts, she opened her clinic in the Brownsville section of New York, an area populated by newly immigrated Slavs, Latins, Italians, and Jews.

But there would be no victory for Margaret Sanger in this venture. Within two weeks, the clinic had been shut down by the authorities. Margaret and her sister, Ethel, were arrested and sentenced to thirty days each in the workhouse for the distribution of obscene materials and the prescription of dangerous medical procedures.

Margaret was undeterred, of course. As soon as she was released, she founded a new organization, the Birth Control League, and began to publish a new magazine, *The Birth Control Review*. She was still intent on opening a clinic, but her time in
jail had convinced her that she needed to cultivate a broader following before she made another attempt at that. The new organization and magazine would help her do just that.

And she was right.

Though she was now drawing severe public criticism from such men as the fiery popular evangelist Rev. Billy Sunday, the famed Catholic social reformer Msgr. John Ryan, and the gallant former president Theodore Roosevelt, Margaret was gaining stature among the urbane and urban intelligentsia. Money began to pour into her office as subscriptions and donations soared. And the fact that articles from influential authors such as H. G. Wells, Pearl Buck, Julian Huxley, Karl Menninger, Havelock Ellis, and Harry Emmerson Fosdick appeared on the pages of the Review only boosted Margaret’s respectability that much more.

By 1922 her fame and fortune were unshakably secure. She had won several key legal battles, had coordinated an international conference on birth control, and had gone on a very successful round-the-world lecture tour. Her name had become a household word and one of her numerous books had become an instant bestseller in spite of—or perhaps because of—the tremendous controversy it had caused.

Entitled *The Pivot of Civilization*, it was one of the first popularly written books to openly expound and extol Malthusian and Eugenic aims. Throughout its 284 pages, Margaret unashamedly called for the elimination of “human weeds,” for the cessation of charity, for the segregation of “morons, misfits, and the maladjusted” and for the sterilization of “genetically inferior races.” Published today, such a book would be labeled immediately as abominably racist and totalitarian. But writing when she did, Margaret only gained more acclaim.

Her cause seemed unstoppable now. The revolution had truly begun.

Even so, Margaret was miserable. Her private life was in utter shambles. Her marriage had ended. Her daughter caught cold and ultimately died of pneumonia. Her boys were neglected and forgotten. And her once ravishing beauty was fading with age and abuse.

Desperate to find meaning and happiness, she lost herself in a profusion of sexual liaisons. She went from one lover to
another, sometimes several in a single day. She experimented with innumerable erotic fantasies and fetishes, but satisfaction always eluded her grasp. She began to dabble in the occult, participating in seances and practicing Eastern meditation. She even went so far as to apply for initiation into the mysteries of Rosicrucianism and Theosophy.

When all else failed, she turned to the one thing that she knew would bring her solace: once again, she married into money.

J. Noah Slee was the president of the Three-in-One Oil Company and a legitimate millionaire. A conservative church-going Episcopalian, he opposed everything that Margaret stood for, but found her irresistible anyway.

At first, Margaret resisted his pleas for marriage. She still believed that it was a "degenerate institution." But nine million dollars was a mighty temptation. It was a temptation she simply could not resist.

But just to make certain that the new relationship would not interfere with her affairs and her cause, she drew up a prenuptial agreement that Slee was forced to sign just before the wedding ceremony. It stipulated that Margaret would be free to come and go as she pleased with no questions asked. She was to have her own apartment and servants within her husband's home, where she could entertain "friends" of her own choosing, behind closed doors. Furthermore, Slee would have to telephone her from the other end of the house even to ask for a dinner date.

Margaret told her lovers that with that document, the marriage would make little or no difference in her life—apart from the convenience of the money, of course. And she went out of her way to prove it; she flaunted her promiscuity and infidelity every chance she could get.

She was still terribly unhappy, but at least now she was terribly rich, too.

Immediately, Sanger set herself to the task of using her new wealth to further the cause. She opened another clinic—this time calling it a "Research Bureau" in order to avoid legal tangles. Then she began to smuggle diaphragms into the country from Holland. She waged several successful "turf" battles to maintain control over her "empire." She campaigned diligently to
She secured massive foundation grants from the Rockefellers, the Fords, and the Mellons. She took her struggle to Washington, testifying before several congressional committees, advocating the liberalization of contraceptive prescription laws. And she fought for the incorporation of reproductive control into state programs as a form of social planning. With her almost unlimited financial resources, she was able to open doors and pull strings that had heretofore been entirely inaccessible to her.

Margaret was also able to use her new-found wealth to fight an important public relations campaign to redeem her reputation. Because of her Malthusian and Eugenic connections, she had become closely associated with the scientists and theorists who put together Nazi Germany’s “race purification” program. She had openly endorsed the euthanasia, sterilization, abortion, and infanticide programs of the early Reich. She published a number of articles in The Birth Control Review that mirrored Hitler’s Aryan-White Supremacist rhetoric. She even commissioned Dr. Ernst Rudin, the director of the Nazi Medical Experimentation program, to write for The Review himself.

Naturally, when World War II broke out and the grisly details of the Nazi programs began to come to light, Margaret was forced to backpedal her position and cover up her complicity. The Great Depression had been a boon for racist and Eugenic arguments, but those days were now past. Charges of anti-Semitism had been harmlessly hurled at her since her trial in 1917, but now that Auschwitz and Dachau had become very much a part of the public conscience, she realized she would have to do something, and quickly.

Her first step toward redeeming her public image was to change the name of her organization. “Planned Parenthood” was a name that had been proposed from within the birth control movement since at least 1938. One of the arguments for the new name was that it connoted a positive program and conveyed a clean, wholesome, family-oriented image. It diverted attention from the international and revolutionary intentions of the movement, focusing instead on the personal and individual dimensions of birth control. By 1942, it was decided. The organization would be called the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.
Next, she embarked on an aggressive affiliation program that brought hundreds of local and regional birth control leagues under the umbrella of a national organization, and then dozens of national organizations were brought under the umbrella of an international organization. This enabled Margaret to draw on the integrity and respectability of grassroots organizations, solidifying and securing her place at the top.

Finally, she initiated a massive propaganda blitz aimed at the war-weary, ready-for-prosperity middle class. Always careful to hide her illicit affairs and her radical political leanings, her campaign emphasized patriotism and family values.

Before long, Margaret’s brilliant strategy had won for her, and Planned Parenthood, the admiration and respect of virtually the entire nation, and certainly of the entire social services community.

Of course, these tremendous successes did little to ease the ache of her perpetual unhappiness. She continued her sordid and promiscuous affairs even after old age and poor health had overtaken her. Her pathetic attraction to occultism deepened. And perhaps worst of all, by 1949 she had become addicted to both drugs and alcohol.

By the time she died on September 6, 1966, a week shy of her eighty-seventh birthday, Margaret Sanger had nearly fulfilled her promise to spend every last penny of Slee’s fortune. In the process, though, she had lost everything else: love, happiness, satisfaction, fulfillment, family, and friends. In the end, her struggle was for naught, “for what does it profit a man to gain the whole world, but to lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?” (Mark 8:36-37).

The Continuing Legacy

Just as a nation’s “head” defines the character and vision of that nation, so an organization’s “head” defines the character and vision of that organization.

This is a very basic Biblical principle. It is the principle of “legacy.” It is the principle of “inheritance.”

The Canaanite people were perverse and corrupt. They practiced every manner of wickedness and reprobation. Why were they so dissolute? The answer, according to the Bible, is
that their founders and leaders passed evil onto them as their *legacy*, as their *inheritance* (Genesis 9:25; Leviticus 18:24-25; Amos 1:3-12).

Similarly, the Moabites and the Ammonites were a rebellious and improvident people. They railed against God's Law and God's People. Why were they so defiant? Again, the Bible tells us that their founders and leaders passed insurrection on to them as their *legacy*, as their *inheritance* (Genesis 19:30-38; Numbers 21:21-23; Amos 1:13-15; Amos 2:1-3). A seed will always yield its own kind (Genesis 1:11). Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest (Ezra 9:2; Isaiah 1:4; Isaiah 14:20). You reap what you sow (Galatians 6:7). A nation or an organization that is sown, nurtured, and grown by deceit, promiscuity, and lawlessness, cannot help but be evil to the core (Hosea 8:7).

Planned Parenthood is a paradigmatical illustration of this principle. Margaret Sanger's character and vision are perfectly mirrored in the organization that she wrought. She intended it that way. And the leaders that have come after her have in no wise attempted to have it another way.

Dr. Alan Guttmacher, the man who immediately succeeded her as president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, once said, "We are merely walking down the path that Mrs. Sanger carved out for us." Faye Wattleton, president of the organization during the decade of the eighties, has claimed that she is "proud" to be "walking in the footsteps" of Margaret Sanger. And the president of the New York affiliate is Alexander Sanger, her grandson.

Thus, virtually everything that she believed, everything that she aspired to, everything that she practiced, and everything that she aimed for is somehow reflected in the organization and program of Planned Parenthood, even today. The frightening thing about Planned Parenthood's historical legacy is that the legacy is not just historical. It is as current as tomorrow morning's newspaper.

Abortion. In her book *Women and the New Race*, Margaret Sanger asserted that "the most merciful thing a large family can do to one of its infant members is to kill it." Today, Planned Parenthood's commitment to that philosophy is self-evident. The organization is the world's number-one abortion provider. It has aggressively fought the issue through the courts. It has made killing infant members of large families its highest priority. Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest. The legacy continues.
**Promiscuity.** Like her mentors Emma Goldman and Havelock Ellis, Margaret Sanger was not content to keep her lascivious and concupiscent behavior to herself. She was a zealous evangelist for free love. Even in her old age, she persisted in proselytizing her sixteen-year-old granddaughter, telling her that kissing, petting, and even intercourse were fine as long as she was "sincere," and that having sex about "three times a day" was "just about right." Today, Planned Parenthood's commitment to undermining the moral values of teens is evident in virtually all its literature. It teaches kids to masturbate. It endorses premarital fornication. It approves of homosexuality. It encourages sexual experimentation. It vilifies Christian values, prohibitions, and consciences. Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest. The legacy continues.

**Socialism.** Margaret Sanger was committed to the revolution. She wanted to overthrow the old order of Western Christendom and usher in a "New Age." Though in her latter years she toned down her radical rhetoric, she never wavered from that stance. Today, Planned Parenthood continues to carry the banner for big government, big spending, freewheeling liberal causes and agendas. Even the normally sedate *Wall Street Journal* had to admit that "Planned Parenthood's love affair with Socialism has become more than a harmless upper middle-class hobby and now borders on the ludicrous." Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest. The legacy continues.

**Greed.** When Leon Trotsky came to the United States briefly in 1917, he met Margaret Sanger and her friends and came away with a feeling of great revulsion. In his memoirs, he recorded nothing but distaste for the rich, smug Socialists he encountered in the Village. He said they were little better than "hypocritical Babbits," referring to the Sinclair Lewis character who used his parlor-room Socialism as a screen for personal ambition and self-aggrandisement. Sanger and the other Village elitists were revolutionaries only to the extent that Socialism did not conflict with wealth, luxury, and political influence. Today, Planned Parenthood's commitment to the revolution continues to hinge on that unswerving pursuit of "filthy lucre." From its dogged preoccupation with government contracts, grants, and bequests, to its commercial ventures, investments, and vocations, its
mercenary avariciousness is everywhere apparent. Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest. The legacy continues.

Religion. In her first newspaper, The Woman Rebel, Margaret Sanger admitted that “Birth control appeals to the advanced radical because it is calculated to undermine the authority of the Christian churches. I look forward to seeing humanity free someday of the tyranny of Christianity no less than Capitalism.” Today, Planned Parenthood is continuing her crusade against the church. In its advertisements, in its literature, in its programs, and in its policies, the organization makes every attempt to mock, belittle, and undermine Biblical Christianity. Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest. The legacy continues.

Deceit. Throughout her life, Margaret Sanger developed a rakish and reckless pattern of dishonesty. She twisted the truth about her qualifications as a nurse, about the details of her work, and about the various sordid addictions that controlled her life. Her autobiographies were filled with exaggerations, distortions, and out-and-out lies. She even went so far as to alter the records in her mother’s family Bible in order to protect her vanity. Today, Planned Parenthood faithfully carries on her tradition of disinformation. The organization continually misrepresents the facts about its lucrative birth control, sex education, and abortion enterprises. Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest. The legacy continues.

A recent Planned Parenthood report bore the slogan “Proud of Our Past—Planning the Future.” If that is true—if the organization really is proud of its venal and profligate past, and if it really is planning the future—then we all have much to be concerned about.

Those who plow iniquity and those who sow trouble harvest it.
By the breath of God they perish, and by the blast of His anger they come to an end (Job 4:8-9).
There is no fortress of man's flesh so made, but subtle, treacherous time comes creeping in. Oh, long before his last assaults begin, the enemy's on; the stronghold is betrayed; and the one lonely watchman, half-dismayed, beyond the covering of dark, he hears them come: the distant hosts of death that march with muffled drum.

Hilaire Belloc
observe the city's teeming crush of variety. And it had afforded us a unique opportunity to talk. Anonymity and privacy are never so available than when surrounded by thousands of strangers on a New York subway.

Caroline was twenty-two when she had her first abortion. Eight months later, she had another. “The first one seemed to go just fine,” she told me. “There was a little bleeding and some pain for the next few weeks. Nothing serious, though.”

But it was serious. That became readily apparent when she went in for the second abortion. “There was quite a bit of scar tissue in my cervix. The physician seemed hesitant at first, but decided to go ahead with the procedure.”

That was not the last mistake that the doctor would make that day. His sharp, blindly wielded curette inadvertently perforated Caroline's already scarred cervix. When he inserted the suction apparatus, it passed through to the body cavity. The shearing force of the suction then seriously lacerated the bladder and tore loose the right ureter—the tube that carries urine from the kidneys to the bladder. The delicate parametrium and peritoneum membranes were ruptured and a pooling hematoma surrounded the entire right renal system.

Completely unaware of the damage he had caused, the doctor finished the procedure, sent Caroline to the recovery room, and turned his attentions to other matters. After a forty-five minute rest, he released her.

“I collapsed on the subway on my way home. I think I was in shock,” she said. She was suffering from a lot more than shock. An emergency room examination revealed heavy hemorrhaging and leakage of urine per vaginam. Attendants rushed her into the operating room where surgeons reluctantly performed an emergency right nephrectomy and oophorectomy—the removal of the right kidney and ovary. They also evacuated the hematoma and resected the torn endometrium.

“I spent about ten days in the hospital after that,” she told me as we walked past the Juilliard toward the Hudson River. Those ten days had cost her a place in the school's renowned drama department. “But the worst was still yet to come.”

Over the next several weeks, Caroline suffered from recurring abdominal pain, high fever, vaginal discharge, and abnormal bleeding. She was scheduled for both a cystoscopy and a laparoscopy and was once again admitted to the hospital. The
exploratory surgeries revealed that a portion of the fetal skull had been imbedded into the resected intra-abdominal tissue. They also revealed a severe pelvic inflammation caused by bacteria from the mangled renal system.

“The doctors said that I had no choice but to undergo a complete hysterectomy.” Tears began to well up in her eyes. “I was only twenty-two. My whole life was ahead of me. I was happy. Carefree. And then this . . . well, I just couldn’t believe that this was actually happening to me.”

The next day, the doctors removed Caroline’s remaining ovary, along with her uterus, cervix, fallopian tubes, and lymph glands. She would never again be able to bear children.

“The counselors at Planned Parenthood told me that abortion was the only responsible choice in my situation,” she said. “Now look at me. My health is broken. My career is ruined. My emotions are shot. And the only two children I’ll ever bear are dead and gone.”

By now we were looking out over the dark roiling waters of the Hudson. Angry swells broke over the old stone walls at the river’s edge, drenching the sidewalk with a bone-chilling spray. The blaring sounds and glaring lights of the city had receded into the background as the grey turbulent channel before us filled up our senses.

After a long and uncomfortable silence, Caroline turned to me, her tears no longer contained. “Why didn’t someone tell me? Why didn’t anyone tell me that abortion wasn’t safe? Why?”

Why indeed?

The Medical Risks of Abortion

While Planned Parenthood continues blithely promoting their “safe and legal” abortions, thousands of women just like Caroline Ness all across America and around the world suffer from the “inherent risks” and “complications” that those procedures present. For some that suffering is but a minor and temporary inconvenience. For others, like Caroline, it becomes a permanent disability.

Dr. Horton Dean is a gynecologist with a private practice in a fashionable neighborhood near Los Angeles. Since 1973 he has seen a marked increase in the number of patients with significant complications—both mental and physical—as a result of legal abortions. “I am convinced,” he told me, “that the Planned
Parenthood programs pose the greatest health hazard in America today. He estimates that as many as fifteen percent of all first-trimester, forty percent of all mid-trimester, and ninety percent of all late-trimester abortions result in problems demanding serious medical attention.

A number of studies conducted by some of the finest medical research institutions all around the globe confirm Dean's conclusion that "there is no such thing as a safe and legal abortion": in Hungary, Japan, Greece, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, The Netherlands, Norway, Israel, Yugoslavia, Free China, and in the United States at the Johns Hopkins University Medical School, the Vanderbilt University Medical School, the University of Maryland Medical School, Creighton University Medical School, Cornell University Medical School, the UCLA Medical School, and the University of North Carolina Medical School. In every case, abortion was found to dangerously risk maternal mortality, perinatal fitness, congenital malformation, and future fertility.

All this evidence flies in the face of what Planned Parenthood has repeatedly maintained over the last several years. According to its statistics, the complication rate for legal abortion is less than one percent and is thus safer than full-term pregnancy and childbirth.

According to renowned obstetrician and gynecologist Matthew Bulfin, the reason that these estimated figures are so skewed is that Planned Parenthood and the various other agencies that measure maternal complication rates are "missing vital input for their mortality and morbidity studies by not seeking information from the physicians who see the complications from legal abortions—emergency room physicians and the obstetricians and gynecologists in private practice. The physicians who do the abortions and the clinics and centers where abortions are done should not be the only sources from which complication statistics are derived."

"There are a lot more complications out there than anyone seems to care to believe," says Dean. "It is a national health disaster."

Although Planned Parenthood stubbornly refuses to admit publicly that such a disaster exists, privately it is quite concerned. So, ever since 1986, it has conducted "medical risk reduction seminars." Instead of focusing on the actual abortion procedures
and techniques used in their clinics though, the Planned Parenthood professionals gave the bulk of their attention to the question of how to contain sky-rocketing insurance rates and ever-increasing malpractice suits.\textsuperscript{32} Apparently they knew only too well that it is \textit{impossible} to develop safe abortion procedures or techniques. The best they could hope to do was reduce their legal liability.\textsuperscript{33}

The fact is, \textit{every} one of the procedures and techniques that Planned Parenthood utilizes in its booming abortion trade involves two victims: the murdered unborn child\textsuperscript{34} and the mutilated, violated, and uninformed mother. It is by Planned Parenthood's own admission a terribly "risky business."\textsuperscript{35}

\textit{Menstrual extraction}. This method of abortion is generally performed immediately following a rape incident. Since a pregnancy cannot be confirmed at this early stage, menstrual extractions are not counted in abortion statistics, but it is estimated that as many as fifteen thousand a year are performed in the United States.\textsuperscript{36} The procedure involves the insertion of a vacuum aspirator into the uterus and the extraction of all uterine contents. As innocuous and simple as this may sound, it can result in serious complications: urinary tract infections, cervical trauma, sepsis, peritonitis, endometritis, and salpingitis.\textsuperscript{37}

Leslie Thompson was "date raped." "When the police were finished taking my statement," she said, "they took me to a Planned Parenthood clinic. The counselor there told me that a doctor was going to treat me with a \textit{rape kit}. I was so upset, I never asked any questions. I didn't have any idea what a \textit{rape kit} was. I figured that the police and the nurses and the doctors were just following procedure."

The clinic personnel performed a menstrual extraction abortion on Leslie and released her an hour later. "For the next several days," she told me, "I had a persistent pain and a low grade fever that I just couldn't knock. I finally went in to see my own doctor." Upon examination he found that she was suffering from endometritis—an inflammation of the uterine lining caused by an infection that had set in following the abortion. He was able to treat Leslie with antibiotics and she quickly recovered. "He told me that if I'd waited even a day or two longer, I'd have been in real trouble. I guess I was fortunate. But it kinda makes me wonder how many women \textit{don't} have that kind of good fortune."
Suction-Aspiration. This first-trimester method of abortion is one of the most common techniques used in Planned Parenthood clinics. It may account for as much as eighty-five percent of all abortions now performed in the United States.\textsuperscript{38} The procedure involves paralyzing the cervical muscle ring and then inserting a vacuum tube into the uterus and against the body of the child. The suction is almost thirty times more powerful than a home vacuum cleaner, and literally tears the child’s body limb from limb. The scraps are then sucked through the tube and into a bottle. The procedure is completed when the abortionist cuts the placenta loose from the inner wall of the uterus and sucks it into the bottle as well. Suction-aspiration abortions share the risks of urinary tract infections, cervical trauma, sepsis, peritonitis, endometritis, and salpingitis that are common to menstrual extraction abortions. But in addition, a number of other complications may also result: uterine laceration, renal trauma, pelvic inflammation, embolism, thrombus, and even sterility.\textsuperscript{39}

Martha Tollesk’s divorce had been final just three days when she discovered that she was pregnant. “Everybody told me that I should just go out and get an abortion,” she said. “I’d just enrolled in night courses at the local community college. I had a great new job. My life was coming together finally. And then this!”

Martha’s friends talked her into visiting a Planned Parenthood center where she received a fistful of brochures and tracts on the benefits and blessings of abortion. “It all sounded so simple and so secure. So I went ahead and scheduled an appointment.” The doctor performed a suction-aspiration abortion on her three days later. “It was incredibly painful. It was just awful. But they told me all had gone well and they sent me on home.”

But all was not well. After almost a week, Martha was admitted to the hospital with a number of alarming symptoms: swelling of the abdomen, severe pain, nausea, vomiting, rapid heartbeat, chills and fever, and shortness of breath. Her obstetrician diagnosed her as suffering from peritonitis—an inflammation of the membrane covering the wall of her peritoneum. Caused by a small uterine puncture during the abortion, the bacterial infection had quickly spread throughout her body cavity. “They tell me I’m lucky,” she said. “But I’m not sure I call four days in the hospital and a close call with death lucky. I call it irresponsible.”
Dilatation and Curettage (D&C). This once-favored method of abortion now accounts for only about five percent of all abortions performed due to its poor medical track record.\textsuperscript{40} The procedure involves the insertion of a curette—a very sharp loop-shaped knife—up into the uterus. The placenta and the child are then dismembered and scraped out into a basin. In addition to all of the complications of menstrual extractions and suction-aspirations, D&C abortions also carry the risk of uterine perforation, hemorrhaging, pelvic abscesses, genital tract infections, bowel lacerations, and thromboembolism.\textsuperscript{41}

Jared McCormick took his girlfriend, Susie Glanze, to Planned Parenthood for a pregnancy test late last year. “She was really scared, and so was I,” he said. “I told her that we could go ahead and get married. We were planning on it anyway. We’d just have to move things up a little, is all. But she wanted me to finish up with school first. So, there we were. At Planned Parenthood.”

The test was positive and Susie made an appointment for an abortion the next Saturday. “I really went berserk,” Jared said. “I was dead set against the abortion. I begged her to marry me and keep our baby. But she wouldn’t listen.”

The doctors performed a D&C. There was profuse bleeding, but since that is quite common with D&C abortions, the clinic personnel didn’t think anything of it.

That was a terrible mistake. An hour later, Susie was still hemorrhaging and had to be rushed to the nearest hospital emergency room. There she was given two units of blood and treated for severe lacerations of the cervix and uterus. It would be almost two days later before she would be released.

“It’s amazing what can happen between two people in just a couple days’ time,” Jared said. “Susie was so grieved over what she’d done—over what they’d done—that she just couldn’t stand to be with me any more. Just like that. It was all over between us. I’m convinced that if she’d known how risky the operation was we’d be together today. And our baby would still be alive.”

Dilatation and Evacuation (D&E). This particularly brutal method of abortion is commonly used when pregnancies have reached well into the second and third trimesters. Strips of laminaria—a spongy seaweed—are placed in the cervix to stretch it open. A pliers-like pair of forceps is then used to crush the child’s
skull and snap its spine. The now pliable corpse is wrenched piece by piece out of the womb. Next, the abortionist must reassemble the body parts on the surgical table in order to make certain that nothing was left behind in the uterus. Finally, the raw and empty womb is swabbed with a disinfectant and aspirated with a vaginal vacuum. In addition to the complications common to D&C abortions, the D&E method is especially prone to infections: pelvic, renal, cervical, and peritonital. D&E abortions are also associated with clinically low-birth-weight infants, stillbirths, ectopic implantation, neonatal deaths, and congenital malformations in future pregnancies.

Melinda Davies and Cheryl Cook were best friends all through high school. During the summer following graduation, both girls became pregnant. “We decided to go in to Planned Parenthood together. We didn’t want our parents to find out,” said Cheryl.

“Yeah, it was kind of scary,” Melinda told me, “but we thought we could help each other through it all.”

Both girls were given D&E abortions. “Mine went just fine,” said Cheryl. “But Melinda really had a lot of trouble.” For the rest of the summer, in fact, Melinda fought off one infection after another.

“I had bladder infections, vaginal infections, and cervical infections, and my doctor couldn’t understand why. Finally, I had to tell him what I’d done. Thank goodness he was then able to treat the cause.” And what was the cause? “Well,” Melinda said, “apparently the doctor at Planned Parenthood did the procedure with unsterile instruments. The bacteria just wreaked havoc on my body.”

“Nobody told us that something like this could happen,” said Cheryl. “I feel like we were deceived.”

“We were,” agreed Melinda. “We really were. Abortion is a lousy gamble.”

**Saline Amniocentesis.** This once-common method of abortion is now used only when gestation passes the sixteen-week mark. During the procedure, a long needle is inserted through the mother’s abdomen and directly into the child’s amniotic sac. A solution of concentrated salt is then injected into the fluid there. The child breathes in, swallowing the poisonous salt. After
about an hour of convulsing and struggling, the child is over­
come and the mother goes into labor. About a day later she will
deliver a corpse. Not surprisingly, complications are common
and include uterine rupture, pulmonary thromboembolism, dis­
seminated intravascular coagulation (a dangerous blood clotting
disorder), hypernatremia, erosive gastritis, hemolytic anemia,
hemoglobinuria, and acute renal failure.\textsuperscript{43}

Bethany de Grassi received a saline abortion several years
ago. She was nineteen at the time and a freshman at Auburn
University. “I was living with a guy at the time,” she told me,
“and I really thought we were in love. When I got pregnant, I was
happy. I thought we’d just settle down, raise a family, and pursue
the American dream. But he had other ideas. When I refused to
get an abortion he just moved out. Boom. My whole world caved
in. I didn’t know what to do. I was scared and confused.”

Bethany waited almost three months before she did anything
at all. Finally, she went to a Planned Parenthood clinic. “They
told me that they didn’t do the procedure I needed there in the
clinic, so they referred me to one of their doctors that had a pri­
vate practice on the side for late-term abortions. They gave me
all kinds of literature with charts and tables and footnotes and
all, telling me that the technique was perfectly safe.”

Later, when Bethany was filling out the liability release form,
she had a change of heart. “The form had a long, long list of pos­
sible complications in tiny print and I started to get really ner­
vous. But the nurse came in and sat by me, assuring me that
everything was going to be okay. I believed her.”

She shouldn’t have. Clinic personnel are trained to calm
their customers. Sometimes with smiles. Sometimes with lies.
Anything, just to get the job done.\textsuperscript{44}

Bethany’s troubles began with the delivery. “The baby was
gasping when it came out,” she recalled. “It was awful. I started
screaming. The doctor was cursing. And the nurse didn’t seem
to know what to do. It was a nightmare.”

The child expired quickly and the clinic personnel were able,
after a few moments of coaxing and consoling, to calm Bethany
down. She went into recovery and was released.

Two days later, she suffered a series of seizures and lapsed into
a coma. At the hospital, her doctors found that she had hyperna-
tremia—salt poisoning. Her parents were notified and a long six-day struggle for her life ensued. Finally, the medical team at the hospital was able to restore Bethany’s electrolyte balance intravenously and she was roused from the coma. “I should have paid attention to my conscience,” she now says. “I knew better than to try to come up with some easy fix for my problems. There’s just no such thing.”

Prostaglandin Abortion. Some twenty years ago, the Upjohn Corporation introduced Prostin F2-Alpha, a synthetic hormonal drug, designed to induce violent labor and the premature delivery of an unwanted child. In succeeding years, the company refined its processes and introduced a whole series of new products: Prostin E2, Prostin 15M, suppositories, injections, and urea solutions. For a time it looked as if Upjohn’s prostaglandin trade would corner the abortion pharmaceutical market. But then evidence of serious side effects and complications dampened the giant drug maker’s hopes. Although the FDA had approved Upjohn’s abortion products for widespread consumer use, prostaglandins were quickly shown to commonly cause uterine rupture, sepsis, hemorrhaging, cardio-respiratory arrest, vomiting and aspiration, strokes, and acute kidney failure.45 The side effects did not occur only occasionally: As many as forty-two percent of all prostaglandin abortions result in one or more of these complications.46

Christine Aulen was shocked when her daughter Deana told her one day after school that she was pregnant. “I decided to put on my brave Mom’s-your-best-friend-and-confidante act,” she told me. “So we sat down together and talked through our options. After much debate and discussion, we realized that we just didn’t have enough facts to make a rational decision. As if rationality was the issue.”

That is when they decided to go to Planned Parenthood. “We thought they could give us the facts so that we could make an objective decision. We were wrong.”

The counselor at the clinic immediately recommended abortion. “She seemed to be so sweet and kind. She made the referral for us and set up our appointment.”

Sweet and kind or not, what happened was like a script from a horror movie. Once the procedure had begun, there were immediate complications. Deana went into shock and suffered a
series of seizures. Frantic, the clinic personnel called for an ambulance. But before it could arrive, Deana died. Christine, sitting out in the waiting room reading magazines, fidgeting, and worrying, never knew what was going on behind closed doors.

That was several years ago, but for Christine it seems like just yesterday. “Angry? You bet, I’m angry,” she says. “No one warned us. No one told us. Tragedies like this shouldn’t happen. They don’t have to happen.”

The facts speak for themselves. Abortion is dangerous.

Planned Parenthood officials are not incognizant of the facts. They know that their abortion procedures and techniques are unsafe. They know that tragedies like Christine and Deana Aulen’s happen only because they persist in performing those unsafe procedures and techniques. As long ago as 1963, Planned Parenthood published a booklet saying that “an abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun. It is dangerous to your life and health.” Nothing has changed in the intervening years. And they know it.

Recently, pro-life workers in Houston discovered several thousand clinic visit records, medical charts, internal minutes and memoranda, letters, confidential surveys, and financial statements in the trash at a Planned Parenthood abortuary. A comprehensive analysis was made of each document and a database was developed so that analysis could be tabulated systematically. Their findings were astonishing.

More than a third of the medical charts recorded “severe” or “very severe pain” for the women during their abortion procedures. Almost five percent of the women were said to have “screamed” during their operations. Another eleven percent “cried,” ten percent “overreacted,” and five percent “complained.” Almost ten percent experienced “nausea” or “vomiting,” and another ten percent “fainted” or “fell unconscious.”

One chart described blatantly unsterile operating procedures. Another detailed a doctor’s brutal and abusive behavior. Still another called into question the racial motivations of the clinic personnel.

The evidence is indisputable.

Planned Parenthood officials know precisely what they are doing. They know full well that abortion is unsafe. They know
that women by the thousands are being exploited by the abortion trade. They see it every day.

Even if unborn children were not murdered by abortion, men and women of conscience would still have to stand unwaveringly opposed to it. It is dangerous. Scandalously so.

**The Medical Risks of Birth Control**

The dangerous propagation of abortion is not the only medical scandal that Planned Parenthood has been involved in over the last several years. Its birth control programs have also been terribly flawed.

All birth control methods are subject to FDA approval, and must be tested on laboratory animals and human subjects before they can be marketed to the public. This process may take anywhere between three and ten years to complete. At first blush, that appears to be a ponderously slow approval process, but in fact, it is far too hasty. It may take as long as fifteen to twenty years for the complications of various birth control methods to become apparent. Planned Parenthood and its birth control allies in the medical-industrial complex have pressured the FDA to rush products to market long before those complications can be known. The result is that women using birth control are little more than guinea pigs—unwitting subjects in prolonged and deathly dangerous experiments. A number of important studies have shown that, indeed, Planned Parenthood's favored contraceptive programs are all unwarranted medical risks—from Depo-Provera and Ovral to Norplant and RU-486.

Dr. Frederick Robbins, a noted figure in population research, justified Planned Parenthood's dependence on unsafe birth control products saying, "The dangers of overpopulation are so great that we may have to use certain techniques of contraception that may entail considerable risk to the individual woman." Once again, "choice" is thrown to the wind.

**The Pill.** For Margaret Sanger, birth control was not simply a technique, it was a religion. And the Pill was the Holy Grail of that religion. Beginning in the late twenties and early thirties, she helped fund a number of research projects that she hoped would one day produce a safe and effective chemical contraceptive. In 1950 she met a brilliant biologist named Gregory Pincus. His stunning successes in ovulation research with laboratory animals
encouraged Margaret to invest over two million dollars over a ten-year span in his work. By 1954 the Pill was ready for human testing. By 1958 Sanger and Pincus had persuaded G. D. Searle, the pharmaceutical giant, to begin test marketing the product in the United States with provisional approval of the FDA. Then finally, after an unprecedented media blitz and political lobbying campaign, the Pill was given full approval in 1960.

Utilizing synthetic hormones — either estrogen or progesterone or a combination of both — the Pill interrupts the regular menstrual cycle, thus preventing ovulation in most cases. If ovulation does occur, the Pill has a number of fail-safe features that help the uterine lining resist implantation, thus aborting any human embryos.

The Pill, on the heels of Planned Parenthood’s ecstatic public relations splurge, quickly became the most widely used prescription drug in the world. In the United States more than a million women were using it within two years of its introduction. A decade later, that figure had risen to more than ten million.

And then the trouble began.

Women were reporting a number of minor side effects: migraine headaches, depression, nausea, fatigue, skin rashes, inflammation of the gums, weight gain, breast tenderness, and irregular menstruation.

Although medical research is notorious for contradictory data and inconclusiveness, a number of studies began to pour in indicating that the medical complications did not end there. They showed that women who use the Pill are susceptible to hypertension — abnormally high blood pressure. They have an increased risk of heart attacks, thromboembolism, and strokes. They are significantly more susceptible to various kinds of growths, cysts, and malignancies including ovarian cancer, liver cancer, and skin cancer. In addition, it appears that the Pill can make women more susceptible to diabetes, urinary tract infections, epilepsy, asthma, pleurisy, arthritis, eczema, urticaria, chloasma, and ulcers.

Margaret Sanger’s Holy Grail has turned out to be a holy terror. Since the Pill has an in-use failure rate of as high as eleven percent per annum, the perceived benefits of contraception—whatever they may be—hardly outweigh the risks. And yet Planned Parenthood continues to push this dangerous drug on
its clients. Almost eighty percent of those who walk into a Planned Parenthood clinic walk out with the Pill.77

Lisa Godet, Patty Manfra, and Barbara Ammunds decided to visit the Planned Parenthood clinic near their school together in order to obtain birth control pills. Lisa and Patty were already sexually active. Barbara was “still just hoping,” she said. Their sex education teacher had told them that the clinic would provide them with free contraceptives and that their parents wouldn’t have to find out. “It sounded almost too good to be true,” Lisa told me, “so we decided to check it out.”

Sure enough, the staff personnel were very accommodating. The girls were all scheduled for after-school checkups and were given a three-month supply of Pills.

Over the next several months, Lisa and Patty noticed no physiological changes to speak of. “Oh, I gained a little bit of weight,” Patty said. “But I probably went on a chocolate binge or something.”

For Barbara, though, it was a different story. “My blood sugar started to fluctuate really wildly. I’d be really up one minute, and then the next, I’d be totally worn out.” Her parents noticed the ups and downs but attributed them to the fickleness of teenage emotions. Then the fluctuations became more dramatic. One evening at the dinner table, Barbara passed out and went into a mild seizure.

A battery of tests over the next several days yielded a diagnosis of diabetes. “My doctor suspected that I might be on the Pill,” she said, “because of the unusual way my symptoms suddenly began. He told me that I needed to stop taking it right away. I didn’t need any further convincing. I quit.”

Lisa and Patty quit, too. After seeing Barbara’s trauma and hearing for the first time about the medical risks of birth control pills, they decided that the best way to prevent unwanted pregnancies is abstinence. “I hope we’ve all learned,” Patty said, “that sneaking around and doing the wrong thing can only lead to trouble.”

The Intrauterine Device (IUD). Like the Pill, the IUD seemed to be the perfect birth control device when it was introduced in the early sixties. It was said to be nearly ninety percent effective per year and since it did not introduce synthetic hormones into
the woman's system or alter her body chemistry, it was supposed to be safe as well. Within just a few years, nearly sixty million women worldwide had begun using the IUD, making it the most popular contraceptive alternative to the Pill.\(^7\)

But, once again, Planned Parenthood and the pharmaceutical industry enthusiastically rushed the product to market and through the approval process long before sufficient research had confirmed its safety.\(^7\) As a result, IUD users were for all intents and purposes the subjects of a vast program of human experimentation.

The device is a small and irregular coil of copper or plastic with several trailing filaments. It is installed in the uterus where it causes an inflammation or chronic low-grade infection that inhibits implantation. Thus, the IUD does not prevent conception, it simply dislodges and aborts any human embryos that make their way out of the fallopian tubes. What researchers failed to detect as they were developing the IUD is that the entire obstruction process is terribly risky and terribly dangerous. The product has been directly linked to a high number of cases of Pelvic Inflammatory Disease and spontaneous septic miscarriages.\(^8\) It commonly causes excessive bleeding, cramping, perforation of the uterine wall, ectopic pregnancy, and endometritis.\(^8\) It has even been implicated in dozens of deaths.\(^8\) Currently there are more than a thousand major lawsuits pending against its manufacturers, and several models have been removed from the United States market.\(^8\)

Sandra LaCazio, a mother of four, began using the IUD in 1973. "My next-door neighbor was a nurse at Planned Parenthood," she said, "and was constantly urging me to come in and be fitted for an IUD. I'd been having a few problems with the Pill, so I took her up on her offer. That was a big mistake. A really big mistake."

Sandra had problems with her IUD right from the start. "It was a constant irritant. I went back several times and my neighbor just told me to be patient—I would get used to it. But I never did."

And no wonder. By the time Sandra finally sought help from her regular obstetrician, the IUD had become embedded in her uterine wall. She was suffering from severe cases of peritonitis, endometritis, and salpingitis. Her fallopian tubes were scarred
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beyond repair. And her entire uterus was raw and inflamed. The doctor had no choice but to schedule her for a complete hysterectomy.

"I'm so thankful that my doctor knew just what to do," she later told me. "I could very easily have died. My neighbor, of course, keeps insisting that my problems were unusual and isolated. But I know better. Everywhere I go, I hear horror stories from women who have been misled by Planned Parenthood and suffered the consequences."

Other Devices. Although the Pill and the IUD are Planned Parenthood's favored contraceptive technologies, several alternative methods are available at its clinics as well.

Ever since Margaret Sanger began smuggling diaphragms into the country—in liquor bottles through rum-runners—Planned Parenthood has offered the soft rubber barrier devices to its clients. Used alone, the diaphragm's effectiveness is dubious at best. Used in conjunction with spermicidal foams, creams, and jellies, its effectiveness increases significantly, but its safety plummets. Several spermicides have been forced off drugstore shelves due to serious medical complications and a number of multi-million dollar lawsuits.

Vaginal contraceptive sponges and cervical caps may share that same fate. Although both offer some contraceptive protection as a partial barrier within the uterus, their real effectiveness depends on supplementary spermicidal agents. And there is the rub. The spermicides have simply not proven to be safe. They can cause everything from minor allergic reactions to serious vaginal infections, from cervical irritation to serious hormonal imbalances, from a slight genital abscess to chronic endometritis.

Robin Cohen began to use a spermicidal jelly after being fitted for a diaphragm at a Planned Parenthood clinic near her home. Both she and her husband experienced a good deal of irritation during intercourse, so she changed brands. "With the second brand, both Bill and I broke out in a painful genital rash," she said. "So I quickly changed brands again. This time, I tried a cream. And that was even worse. I came down with a serious vaginal infection and had to take antibiotics for almost two weeks."
Still undeterred, Robin’s counselor at Planned Parenthood had her try still another spermicide. “I don’t know why I couldn’t get it through my thick skull that those things just aren’t safe. When I got another infection—this time with fever, nausea, headaches, and swollen lymph glands—I knew I’d really blown it.”

Indeed she had. The back-to-back infections, though easily treated, caused a good deal of scarring in Robin’s fallopian tubes. Two years later when she and Bill decided that they wanted to have children, she found that she couldn’t get pregnant. A fertility specialist informed her that if she ever wanted to restore her fertility she would have to undergo reconstructive surgery. “Can you believe it? I have to have surgery now because those people at the clinic are handing out dangerous drugs. It makes you wonder how they can possibly stay in business.”

Medicine and the Lost Legacy

The past one hundred years have been called “The Golden Age of Medicine.” And for good reason. It has been a period in which mankind has gained “unprecedented insights into diseases that for millennia have held millions of people in a cruel and unrelenting grasp.” With a dizzying array of new technologies and treatments at our every beck and call, we are now able to do far more than our grandfathers could have ever imagined. The miracles of organ transplants, software implants, and cybernetic replicants now make it possible for us to help the blind to see, the deaf to hear, and the lame to walk. With the advent of biomedical research, laser surgery, macro-pharmacology, fiber optic scanning, and recombinant DNA engineering, has come new hope. The afflicted are raised up, the broken and distressed are sustained, and those once left for dead are somehow restored. We can now do all this and more.

But sadly, amidst this great hymn of victory, a dissonant chord has sounded. The immoral, barbaric, backward, and scandalously unsafe medical practices of Planned Parenthood have sidled their way into mainstream medicine. And thus the victory celebration has been crashed with the shadowy figures of statistics that do not lie—new diseases, new defects, new ways to die.

Medicine is a tool for the preservation of health and life. Technology is a tool for the enhancement of productivity and
fruitfulness. Whenever wicked men try to wield those tools for
the dissemination of death and destruction, for broadcasting
barrenness and brutality, disaster becomes inevitable.\(^90\)

Fruitfulness is a blessing from God (Genesis 17:20; Exodus
23:6; Deuteronomy 7:14). Life is a glorious gift of grace (John
10:10). And so while fruitfulness and abundant life bring joy and
jubilation (Psalm 113:9), barrenness and death bring sadness and
sorrow (Job 24:21, 39:6; Jeremiah 4:26).

All men are commanded to be fruitful (Genesis 9:1). We are
to be fruitful in all that we set our hands to do (Colossians 1:10).
And we are to have nothing to do with the works of unfruitfulness
(Ephesians 5:11). Now that does not mean that we are not to
exercise wise stewardship over our lives, our families, and our
environment. On the contrary, we are commanded to “exercise
dominion” over these things (Genesis 1:28). But the clear purpose
of that stewardship and dominion is to enhance and multiply
fruitfulness, not barrenness.

There can be no compromise, no hedging, and no capitula­
tion on this matter: death is the enemy that Christ came to destroy
(1 Corinthians 15:26; 2 Timothy 1:10). Barrenness is the curse that
He came to remove (Isaiah 32:15; 2 Peter 1:8). Death and barren­
ness never have been and never will be “rest,” “relief,” “freedom,” or
“natural.” Death and barrenness are the awful, obscene, and
wretched results of the fall (Genesis 2:17, 3:16-19). They are the
torturous and unnatural shackles of sin (Romans 6:23).

To shun fruitfulness and life for barrenness and death is
utterly insane (Romans 1:18-22). It is to invite disaster (Deuter­
onomy 28:15-68).

One hundred years ago—before the Golden Age—the medi­
cal establishment led a valiant crusade to criminalize the flour­
ishing abortion and birth control enterprises of the day.\(^91\) They
led that crusade not just because they thought they were immoral,
but because they knew they were unsafe. They fought abortion
and birth control because death and barrenness are the anti­
thesis, not the ambitions, of medicine.

As a result of that clear and uncompromising stand, their
profession flourished—and the Golden Age dawned.\(^92\)

Today, because the medical establishment has embraced
Planned Parenthood’s morbid fascination with death and barren­
ness, the Golden Age is coming to a close, and we are seeing many
of the gains of the last century slip out of our grasp: incurable retro-viruses ravaging whole sectors of the population in plague proportions, mutating strains of cancer cutting wide swathes through each new generation, and surprising reversals in undeveloped nations of once-conquered foes like smallpox, malaria, and polio.

But that's not the worst of it. Horror story after horror story—a veritable litany of abuse—has begun to emerge from the hallowed halls of medicine in our land: fetal harvesting, women serving as breeders in surrogate motherhood programs, euthanasia, genetic manipulation in test tube baby experiments, infanticide, preprogrammed implants and brain-to-computer interfacing for intelligence enhancements, genetic engineering, viral memory manipulation to control psychotic episodes in mental patients, algeny, the development of frighteningly powerful forms of biological warfare, the exclusive commercialization of services by health care corporations, biocleatics, poor patients serving as guinea pigs in bizarre particle bombardment experiments, neuroclatology, handicapped patients facing compulsory sterilizations, artificial natalization, and racially motivated Eugenic programs. They are stories that make the Nazi medical atrocities pale in comparison.

How could this come to be? How could modern medicine—fresh on the heels of the Golden Age—have gone so wrong?

The fact is, medicine has always been a special legacy of God's people. Whenever and wherever Biblical faithfulness has been practiced, the medical arts have flourished. But whenever and wherever Biblical faithfulness has been shunned, medicine has given way to superstition, barbarism, and shamanism.

The earliest medical guild appeared on the Aegean island of Cos, just off the coast of Asia Minor. Around the time that Nehemiah was organizing the post-exilic Jews in Jerusalem to rebuild the walls, another refugee from the Babylonian occupation, Aesculapius, was organizing the post-exilic Jews on Cos into medical specialists—for the first time in history, moving medical healing beyond folk remedies and occultic rituals. It was not long before this elite guild had become the wonder of the Mediterranean world under the leadership of Hippocrates, the son
of Panacea, the son of Hygeia, the son of Aesculapius, the son of Hashabia the Hebrew, an exile of fallen Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{115}

In other words, the great \textit{Greek} school of healing that gave us the Hippocratic oath, that gave us the scientific standards for hygiene, diagnosis, and systematic treatment that form the basis for modern medicine, wasn’t \textit{Greek} at all. It was Hebrew, the fruit of Biblical faith.\textsuperscript{116}

And so the story goes, all throughout history.

Medicine always has been and always will be a special legacy of God’s people—provoked by Scriptural compassion, fueled by Scriptural conviction, and guided by Scriptural ethics.

When plague and pestilence convulsed the peoples of the past, it was Christians who stood steadfast amidst the terrors, establishing hostels, clinics, and Basileas. It was the \textit{Church} that pioneered the concept of hospitals. For instance, in 372 Basil the Great, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, founded the first non-ambulatory hospital, attended by both nurses and doctors.\textsuperscript{117} John Chrysostom opened a similar facility adjacent to his Church in Antioch in 389.\textsuperscript{118} And Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, dedicated a hospital modeled on those first two in his diocese in 393.\textsuperscript{119} Thereafter, wherever the Good News of Jesus Christ penetrated the darkness of paganism, the light and life of the medical arts were quickly established.\textsuperscript{120}

The emergence of medicine’s Golden Age came in direct correspondence with the advancement of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{121} Christian nations are havens of medical mastery, guarding the sanctity of life. Where the Church of Jesus Christ is weak and faltering, however, medical technology degenerates to crude and barbaric superstition. It becomes just one more bludgeon to exploit the weak, the poor, and the helpless. When Asia Minor and Eastern Europe converted to the faith throughout the first millennium after Christ, a revolution of compassionate and professional care blanketed those regions with a tenacious respect and protection of all human life, from the womb to the tomb.\textsuperscript{122} But when successive waves of paganism, first the Ottomans and Tartars and then later the Fascists and Communists, snatched those realms from the fold of Christendom, medicine was reduced to a morbid and medieval malapropism of genocide, triage, atrocity, and perversion.\textsuperscript{123}
Where true Christianity is not practiced, true medicine cannot be practiced. Where faith degenerates into faithlessness, healing of necessity degenerates into killing. Where there are no moral or ethical standards, there can be no basis for the nurture and protection of life.

The great lesson of history is that Proverbs 8:35-36 is absolutely and inescapably true: all those who hate God love death, but he who finds God loves life.

**Sexual Balance**

Sex is good.

In its proper place. And in its proper perspective.

God created it. He endowed it with great value and benefit. He filled it with beauty, dignity, glory, honor—and, of course, life. He made it a multi-dimensional blessing, a lavish gift, and a gracious inheritance for all those who have entered into the lifelong covenant of marriage.

Sex is good because it affirms and confirms that covenant with intimacy and joy. The marriage bed is rich with pleasure. It is romantic. It is lush with merriment and celebration. And this recreational aspect of marital sex is never to be despised.

Sex is also good because it anoints the covenant with perpetuity. The great blessing of children is a special inheritance bestowed by God's own sovereign hand. This procreational aspect of marital sex is never to be despised.

Sex is good. It is a celebration of life.

Of course, sex can be defiled. When it is ripped out of its covenant context to be used and abused as an end in itself, it is corrupted and polluted. Outside of the marriage covenant, sex becomes a rude and crude parody of itself. It is sullied and putrefied. It becomes a specter of death. The fact that Planned Parenthood’s abortion and birth control programs create incentives for premarital sex should be indictment enough.

But not only is sex defiled when it is stolen from the sanctity of marriage, it is also defiled when it loses its delicate balance between recreation and procreation. Any attempt to drive an absolute wedge between those two God-ordained dynamics diminishes the glory of the marriage bed.¹²⁴
Sex is not fruitful just because it’s fun—just because it enhances intimacy and communion. Some couples who enjoy extraordinary bedroom exploits never know the fullness of fruitfulness.

Neither is sex fruitful just because it produces babies. Some couples who are never able to have children are nonetheless blessed with abundant fruitfulness.

Fruitfulness is a wholistic concern. It encompasses both recreation and procreation through a careful stewardship of faith, hope, love, time, money, resources, and circumstances. It balances them, like sovereignty and responsibility, in a life of covenant faithfulness.

But Planned Parenthood is not too terribly interested in balance. Instead, it promotes dangerous drugs and surgical procedures that guarantee—or at least purport to guarantee—an absolute division between recreation and procreation. It promotes contraceptive methods that attempt to usurp God’s design for sex. It promotes birth control measures that reduce sex to mere sport.

Abortion, then, is nothing but a recreational surgery. A dangerously lethal recreational surgery. Similarly, the Pill—along with most of the other forms of prescription birth control—is nothing but a recreational drug. A dangerously toxic recreational drug. Neither qualify as legitimate “health care.”

Isn’t it about time we told American teens and single adults to “just say no”? Isn’t it about time we told them that there is a better way—God’s way? Isn’t it about time modern medicine stopped toying with the minions of perversion and death and returned to the sanctity of life? Isn’t it?

Conclusion

“Abortion in America is a commodity,” argues author David Reardon, “bought and sold for the convenience of the buyer and the profit of the seller. Though abortion utilizes medical knowledge, it is not medical—that is, abortions are not being prescribed in order to heal the body or cure illnesses. . . . Even in the rare cases where serious medical problems do exist because of the pregnancy, abortion is still not good medicine.”

Amazingly, this dangerous and brutal procedure is the only surgery which is legally protected from any sort of governmental
regulation. There are laws that dictate how tonsils may and may not be removed. There are laws that dictate how broken bones may and may not be set. But there are no laws that dictate how abortions may or may not be performed. Even tort liability restraints upon the abortion industry are being dismantled by the child-killing zealots in government—from the White House to the courthouse.

Similarly, prescription birth control has attained the status of a sacred cow. Anyone who questions its viability is instantly vilified as a violator of civil liberties and an imbalanced Victorian snoot. But the fact is that the Pill, the IUD, Norplant, Depo-Provera, Ovral, RU-486, and a large number of spermicidal jellies, creams, and foams are dangerous. They are not medical—they are not being prescribed in order to heal bodies or cure illnesses. They are recreational drugs. Dangerous recreational drugs.

Clearly, the medical practices of Planned Parenthood are not medical at all. They are scandalous.
F I V E

A RACE OF THOROUGHBREDS: THE RACIAL LEGACY

*homo homini lupus*¹

Time after time mankind is driven against the rocks of the horrid reality of a fallen creation. And time after time mankind must learn the hard lessons of history—the lessons that for some dangerous and awful reason we can't seem to keep in our collective memory.²

_Hilaire Belloc_

It was a very good year. America was boisterously happy. With Calvin Coolidge in the White House in Washington, Duke Ellington at the Cotton Club in Harlem, and Babe Ruth at home plate in New York, things could hardly be better. It was 1927, and Cecil B. DeMille was putting the finishing touches on his classic film, _The King of Kings_, Henry Ford was rolling his fifteen-millionth Model T off the assembly line, Abe Saperstein was recruiting the razzle-dazzle players that would become the Harlem Globetrotters, Al Jolson was wowing the public in _The Jazz Singer_, and Thornton Wilder was garnering accolades for his newest book, _The Bridge of San Luis Rey_. The Great War was an already distant memory and the Great Depression was still in the distant future. It was a zany, carefree time of zoot suits and flappers, speakeasies and dance-a-thons. It was indeed a very good year.

For most folks, anyway.

It wasn't a very good year for Carrie Buck. In a decision written by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, the Supreme Court upheld a Virginia State Health Department order to have the nineteen-year-old girl sterilized against her will.
Carrie had recently been committed to a state institution for epileptics, where her mother Emma was also a patient. Upon admission she had been given an I.Q. test and was found to have "a mental age of nine years." Emma was said to have "a mental age of slightly under eight years," and Carrie's seven-month-old baby was said to have "a look" that was "not quite normal." That was evidence enough for the state health officials. They invoked a Virginia Law that required sterilization in families where "hereditary mental deficiency" and "feeblemindedness" could be demonstrated over three successive generations.

Medical experts supplied the court with depositions claiming that Carrie's alleged "feeblemindedness" was "unquestionably hereditary"—without ever having examined Carrie, her mother, or her daughter in person. One of these long-distance experts, a renowned genetic biologist, asserted that Carrie's family belonged to "the shiftless, ignorant, and worthless class," that "modern science and beneficent social legislation is obligated to eradicate for the greater good of the White Civilization."

Apparently the court agreed. In his opinion, Justice Holmes wrote, "We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the State for these lesser sacrifices. . . . in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetence." He concluded, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough."

So, one fine day in 1927, when most of the rest of the world seemed to be celebrating Babe Ruth's record-setting sixtieth home run of the season, Carrie Buck entered a hospital in Lynchburg, Virginia, and had her fallopian tubes severed.

Carrie, now seventy-nine, lives near her sister Doris in Charlottesville, Virginia. Doris had been sterilized under the same law, only she never knew it. "They told me," she recalled, "that the operation was for an appendix." Later, when she was married, she and her husband tried to have children. They consulted with a number of specialists at three hospitals throughout her child-bearing years, but none of them detected the tubal ligation. It wasn't until 1980, fifty-two years after the fact, that Doris finally uncovered the cause of her lifelong sadness. It was only then that she was given access to Carrie's medical records, where a cryptic marginal note revealed that she shared her sister's fate. "I broke down and cried," she said. "My husband
and me wanted children desperately. We were crazy about them. I never knew what they'd done to me."\(^9\)

The Buck family tragedy has been repeated thousands of times over the years. To this day, twenty-two states have sterilization laws on the books, and young women like Carrie and Doris are subjected to the humiliation of coercive barrenness.\(^10\)

Those laws are the fruit of a philosophical movement called Eugenics—a movement that Planned Parenthood is very much a part of.\(^11\)

**White Supremacy**

Eugenics—like Darwinism, Marxism, Fascism, Freudianism, and any number of other revolutionary pseudo-sciences—was an offshoot of Malthusianism.\(^12\) Through his writings, Thomas Malthus had convinced an entire generation of scientists, intellectuals, and social reformers that the world was facing an imminent economic crisis caused by unchecked human fertility.\(^13\) Some of those Malthusians believed that the solution to the crisis was political: restrict immigration, reform social welfare, and tighten citizenship requirements.\(^14\) Others thought the solution was technological: increase agricultural production, improve medical proficiency, and promote industrial efficiency.\(^15\)

But many of the rest felt that the solution was genetic—restrict or eliminate "bad" racial stocks, and gradually "aid" the evolutionary ascent of man.\(^16\) This last group became known as the Eugenicists. The Eugenicists unashamedly espoused White Supremacy. Or to be more precise, they espoused Northern and Eastern European White Supremacy.\(^17\) This supremacy was to be promoted both positively and negatively.\(^18\)

Through selective breeding, the Eugenicists hoped to purify the blood lines and improve the stock of the Aryan race. The "fit" would be encouraged to reproduce prolifically. This was the positive side of Malthusian Eugenics.\(^19\)

Negative Malthusian Eugenics on the other hand, sought to contain the "inferior" races through segregation, sterilization, birth control, and abortion. The "unfit" would thus be slowly winnowed out of the population as chaff is from wheat.\(^20\)

By the first two decades of this century, according to feminist author Germaine Greer, "the relevance of Eugenic considerations was accepted by all shades of liberal and radical opinion, as well as by conservatives."\(^21\) Some forty states had enacted
restrictive containment measures and established Eugenic asylums. Eugenics departments were endowed at many of the most prestigious universities in the world. Funding for Eugenic research was provided by the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations. And Eugenic ideas were given free reign in the literature, theater, music, and press of the day.

The crassest sort of racial and class bigotry was thus embraced against the bosom of pop culture as readily and enthusiastically as the latest movie release from Hollywood or the latest hit tune from Broadway. It became a part of the collective consciousness. Its assumptions went almost entirely unquestioned. Because it sprang from the sacrosanct temple of "science"—like Aphrodite from the sea—it was placed in the modern pantheon of "truth" and rendered due faith and service by all "reasonable" men.

Of course, not all men are "reasonable," and so Malthusian Eugenics was not without its critics. The great Christian apologist G. K. Chesterton, for example, fired unrelenting salvos of biting analysis against the Eugenicists, indicting them for combining "a hardening of the heart with a sympathetic softening of the head," and for presuming to turn "common decency" and "commendable deeds" into "social crimes." If Darwinism was the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest," then he said, Eugenics was the doctrine of "the survival of the nastiest." In his remarkably visionary book *Eugenics and Other Evils*, Chesterton pointed out, for the first time, the link between Neo-Malthusian Eugenics and the evolution of Prussian and Volkish Monism into Fascist Nazism. "It is the same stuffy science," he argued, "the same bullying bureaucracy, and the same terrorism by tenth-rate professors, that has led the German Empire to its recent conspicuous triumphs."

But singular voices like Chesterton's were soon drowned out by the din of acceptance. Long latent biases heretofore held at bay by moral convention were suddenly liberated by "science." Men were now justified in indulging their petty prejudices. And they took perverse pleasure in it, as all fallen men are wont to do.

**The Planned Parenthood Connection**

Margaret Sanger was especially mesmerized by the scientific racism of Malthusian Eugenics. Part of the attraction for her was surely personal: her mentor and lover, Havelock Ellis, was the
beloved disciple of Francis Galton, the brilliant cousin of Charles Darwin who first systemized and popularized Eugenic thought. Part of the attraction for her was also political: virtually all of her Socialist friends, lovers, and comrades were committed Eugenicists as well—from the followers of Lenin in Revolutionary Socialism, like H. G. Wells, George Bernard Shaw, and Julius Hammer, to the followers of Hitler in National Socialism, like Ernest Rudin, Leon Whitney, and Harry Laughlin.

But it wasn’t simply sentiment or politics that drew Margaret into the Eugenic fold. She was thoroughly convinced that the “inferior races” were in fact “human weeds” and a “menace to civilization.” She believed that “social regeneration” would only be possible as the “sinister forces of the hordes of irresponsibility and imbecility” were repulsed. She had come to regard organized charity to ethnic minorities and the poor as a “symptom of a malignant social disease” because it encouraged the prolificacy of “defectives, delinquents, and dependents.” She yearned for the end of the Christian “reign of benevolence” that the Eugenic Socialists promised, when the “choking human undergrowth” of “morons and imbeciles” would be “segregated” and “sterilized.” Her goal was “to create a race of thoroughbreds” by encouraging “more children from the fit, and less from the unfit.” And the only way to achieve that goal, she realized, was through Malthusian Eugenics.

Thus, as she began to build the work of the American Birth Control League, and ultimately, of Planned Parenthood, Margaret relied heavily on the men, women, ideas, and resources of the Eugenics movement. Virtually all of the organization’s board members were Eugenicists. Financing for the early projects—from the opening of the birth control clinics to the publishing of the revolutionary literature—came from Eugenicists. The speakers at the conferences, the authors of the literature and the providers of the services were almost without exception avid Eugenicists. And the international work of Planned Parenthood were originally housed in the offices of the Eugenics Society—while the organizations themselves were institutionally intertwined for years.

The Birth Control Review—Margaret’s magazine and the immediate predecessor to the Planned Parenthood Review—regularly and openly published the racist articles of Malthusian Eugenicists. In 1920, it published a favorable review of Lothrop Stoddard’s...
frightening book, *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy*. In 1923, the *Review* editorialized in favor of restricting immigration on a racial basis. In 1932, it outlined Margaret’s “Plan for Peace,” calling for coercive sterilization, mandatory segregation, and rehabilitative concentration camps for all “dysgenic stocks.” In 1933, the *Review* published “Eugenic Sterilization: An Urgent Need” by Ernst Rudin, who was Hitler’s director of genetic sterilization and a founder of the Nazi Society for Racial Hygiene. And later that same year, it published an article by Leon Whitney entitled, “Selective Sterilization,” which adamantly praised and defended the Third Reich’s racial programs.

The bottom line is that Planned Parenthood was self-consciously organized, in part, to promote and enforce White Supremacy. Like the Ku Klux Klan, the Nazi Party, and the Mensheviks, it has been from its inception implicitly and explicitly racist. And this racist orientation is all too evident in its various programs and initiatives: birth control clinics, the abortion crusade, and sterilization initiatives.

**Racism and Birth Control Clinics**

Margaret Sanger’s first birth control clinic was opened in 1916. It was located in the impoverished and densely populated Brownsville section of Brooklyn. The ramshackle two-room storefront was a far cry from Margaret’s plush Greenwich Village haunts. But since the clientele she wished to attract—“immigrant Southern Europeans, Slavs, Latins, and Jews”—could only be found “in the coarser neighborhoods and tenements,” she was forced to venture out of her comfortable confines.

As her organization grew in power and prestige, she began to target several other “dysgenic races”—including Blacks, Hispanics, Amerinds, and Catholics—and set up clinics in their respective communities as well. Margaret and the Malthusian Eugenicists she had gathered about her were not partial; every non-Aryan—Red, Yellow, Black, or White—all were noxious in their sight. They sought to place new clinics wherever those “feeble-minded, syphilitic, irresponsible, and defective” stocks “bred unhindered.” Since by their estimation as much as seventy percent of the population fell into this “undesirable” category, Margaret and her cohorts really had their work cut out for them.
They wasted no time in getting started.

In 1939, they designed a “Negro Project” in response to “southern state public health officials”—men not generally known for their racial equanimity.53 “The mass of Negroes,” the project proposal asserted, “particularly in the South, still breed carelessly and disastrously, with the result that the increase among Negroes, even more than among Whites, is from that portion of the population least intelligent and fit.”54 The proposal went on to say that “Public Health statistics merely hint at the primitive state of civilization in which most Negroes in the South live.”55

In order to remedy this “dysgenic horror story,” the project aimed to hire three or four “Colored Ministers, preferably with social-service backgrounds, and with engaging personalities” to travel to various Black enclaves and propagandize for birth control.56 “The most successful educational approach to the Negro,” Margaret wrote sometime later, “is through a religious appeal. We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population and the Minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members.”57 Of course, those Black ministers were to be carefully controlled—mere figureheads. “There is a great danger that we will fail,” one of the project directors wrote, “because the Negroes think it a plan for extermination. Hence, let’s appear to let the colored run it.”58 Another project director lamented, “I wonder if Southern Darkies can ever be entrusted with . . . a clinic. Our experience causes us to doubt their ability to work except under White supervision.”59 The entire operation then was a ruse—a manipulative attempt to get Blacks to cooperate in their own elimination.

The project was quite successful. Its genocidal intentions were carefully camouflaged beneath several layers of condescending social service rhetoric and organizational expertise. Like the citizens of Hamelin, lured into captivity by the sweet serenades of the Pied Piper, all too many Blacks all across the country happily fell into step behind Margaret and the Eugenic racists she had placed on her Negro Advisory Council. Soon clinics throughout the South were distributing contraceptives to Blacks and Margaret’s dream of discouraging “the defective and diseased elements of humanity” from their “reckless and irresponsible swarming and spawning” was at last being fulfilled.60
The strategy was of course racial and not geographical. The Southern states were picked simply because of the high proportion of Blacks in their populations. In the 1970s, expansion to the North and West occurred. But the basic guidelines remained: the proportion of minorities in a community was closely related to the density of birth control clinics.

During the 1980s when Planned Parenthood shifted its focus from community-based clinics to school-based clinics, it again targeted inner-city minority neighborhoods. Of the more than one hundred school-based clinics that have opened nationwide in the last decade, none have been at substantially all-White schools. None have been at suburban middle-class schools. All have been at Black, minority, or ethnic schools.

Fortunately, a number of Black leaders have seen through these Eugenic machinations and have begun a counterattack. In 1987, for instance, a group of Black ministers, parents, and educators filed suit against the Chicago Board of Education. The plaintiffs charged that the city’s school-based clinics not only violated state fornication laws, but that they also were a form of discrimination against Blacks. The clinics are a “calculated, pernicious effort to destroy the very fabric of family life among Black parents and their children,” the suit alleged. They are “designed to control the Black population” and are “sponsored by the very governmental agency charged with the responsibility of reaching and promoting family life values.”

Tanya Crawford, one of the parents in the group, was shocked when her daughter Dedrea came home from school with several pieces of Planned Parenthood literature. “I never realized how racist those people were until I read the things they were giving Dedrea at the school clinic. They’re as bad as the Klan. Maybe worse, because they’re so slick and sophisticated. Their bigotry is all dolled up with statistics and surveys, but just beneath the surface it’s as ugly as apartheid. It’s as ugly as anything I can imagine.”

**Racism and Abortion**

Again and again Planned Parenthood has asserted that its birth control programs and initiatives are designed to “prevent the need for abortion.” Its claim that contraceptive services
lower unwanted pregnancy rates is entirely unfounded, however. A number of studies have demonstrated that as contraception becomes more accessible, the number of unwanted pregnancies actually rises, thus increasing the demand for abortion. And since minority communities are the primary targets for contraceptive services, Blacks and Hispanics inevitably must bear the brunt of the abortion holocaust.

A racial analysis of abortion statistics is quite revealing. According to a Health and Human Services Administration report, as many as forty-three percent of all abortions are performed on Blacks and another ten percent on Hispanics. This, despite the fact that Blacks only make up eleven percent of the total U.S. population and Hispanics only about eight percent.

A National Academy of Sciences investigation released more conservative—but no less telling—figures: thirty-two percent of all abortions are performed on minority mothers.

Planned Parenthood's crusade to eliminate all those "dysgenic stocks" that Margaret Sanger believed were a "dead weight of human waste" and a "menace to the race" has precipitated a wholesale slaughter. By 1975, a little more than one percent of the Black population had been aborted. By 1980 that figure had increased to nearly two and a half percent. By 1985, it had reached three percent. And by 1992 it had grown exponentially a full four and a half percent. In most Black communities today abortions outstrip births by as much as three-to-one.

Milly Washington, Lanita Garza, and Denise Rashad attended high school together in Minneapolis. Two years ago, the district installed an experimental school-based clinic on their high school campus. "At first I thought it was a real good idea," Denise told me.

"Yeah. Me too," Lanita chimed in.

"I mean, there's been lotsa girls that's left school 'cause they got in trouble," said Denise, "and I believed this might help some."

"But it hasn't," Milly said. "All it's done is make it so gettin' in trouble is normal now."

"And with an easy out," Denise added.

"Yeah. Abortion. It's weird, but you know, a couple of years ago I didn't know anybody who'd had an abortion," said Milly. "Now it's like everybody's had at least one. Lots have had two. Or even more than that."
"I get scared sometimes," Lanita said "It's like we've opened up this Pandora's Box or something, you know?"

"Really, man, that's it," Milly agreed. "Pandora's Box. One giant mess."

**Racism and Sterilization**

In order to realize Margaret Sanger's Eugenic ideal of eliminating the "masses of degenerate" and "good-for-nothing" races, Planned Parenthood has not only emphasized contraception and abortion, it has also carried the banner of sterilization. And, of course, that sterilization vendetta has been primarily leveled against minorities.

The sterilization rate among Blacks is forty-five percent higher than among whites. Among Hispanics the rate is thirty percent higher. As many as forty-two percent of all Amerind women and thirty-five percent of all Puerto Rican women have been sterilized.

As was the case with Carrie and Doris Buck, many of these sterilizations have been performed coercively. "Women in the United States are often pressured to accept sterilization in order to keep getting welfare payments," says feminist writer Linda Gordon. And non-White welfare recipients are apparently pressured at a significantly higher level than Whites, resulting in a disproportionate number of sterilizations.

The Association for Voluntary Sterilization has estimated that between one and two million Americans a year are surgically sterilized. But there may be another two hundred fifty thousand coercive sterilizations disguised in hospital records as hysterectomies.

A hysterectomy—the removal of the female reproductive system—should only be performed when its organs and tissues become severely damaged, diseased, or malignant. Never should it be performed to achieve sexual sterilization, says Dr. Charles McLaughlin, president of the American College of Surgeons. That would be "like killing a mouse with a cannon." It is also much more lethal than simple tubal ligation sterilization operations. Currently, some twelve thousand women a year die receiving hysterectomies.

Nevertheless, since Planned Parenthood's Eugenic hysteria was unleashed, the annual number of hysterectomies has sky-
rocketed, so that the operation now ranks with abortion, appendectomy, and tonsillectomy as one of the most frequently performed surgical procedures in the land.89

Predictably, the chief victims of these medically needless hysterectomies are poor and minority women. Over a decade ago, the *New York Times* reported that:

A hysterectomy which renders a patient sterile costs up to eight hundred dollars, while a tubal ligation, which does the same thing, pays only two hundred fifty dollars to the surgeon, increasing the motivation to do the more expensive operation. Medicare, Medicaid, and other health plans—for the poor and the affluent both—will reimburse a surgeon up to ninety percent for the costs of any sterilization procedure, and sometimes will allow nothing for abortion. As a consequence, hyster-sterilizations—so common among some groups of indigent Blacks that they are referred to as *Mississippi Appendectomies*—are increasingly popular among surgeons, despite the risks.90

Lydia Jones, a Title X and Medicaid-eligible welfare mother of four, went to the Planned Parenthood clinic near her home and discovered that “free” government programs can be a good news-bad news proposition. “They told me that if I wanted to take advantage of their medical services I would have to undergo sterilization,” she said. “The counselor just kept lecturing me about how I needed to do this, and that I should have done it a long time ago. She told me that my children were a burden to society. Well, let me tell you, I love my children. And they’re a burden to no one. My two oldest are in college, working their way through. The other two are straight-A students and bound for scholarships. I may be poor, and I may be Black, but I’m not gonna be bullied by these people into despising the heritage God has given me.” Lydia walked out—a rare exception.

In Houston, Planned Parenthood distributes discount coupons to minority women in order to lure them into their clinics.91 In Fort Wayne, it distributes pop records and sponsors dances.92 In other cities, clients are bribed with cash or prizes.93 Almost every gimmick in the book has been tried to keep the Eugenic designs of Margaret Sanger on track.

“I really don’t know how Planned Parenthood ever got the reputation for being an advocate for poor and minority women,”
says Marla Cefuentes, a social worker in Albuquerque. “Every chance they get, the clinic personnel here remind poor and Hispanic women that they can’t raise a family, that to have children is irresponsible, and that they aren’t capable of deciding for themselves. They are constantly pushing for sterilization, even for very young girls. It’s reprehensible to see that kind of racism go unchallenged.”

“There is no way you can escape the implications,” argues Black financial analyst William L. Davis. “When an organization has a history of racism, when its literature is openly racist, when its goals are self-consciously racial, and when its programs invariably revolve around race, it doesn’t take an expert to realize that the organization is indeed racist. Really now, how can anyone believe anything about Planned Parenthood except that it is a hive of elitist bigotry, prejudice, and bias? Just because the organization has a smattering of minority staffers in key positions does nothing to dispel the plain facts.”

**Scientific Racism**

Fact: Blacks, Jews, Hispanics, and other ethnic minorities are well represented in the upper echelons of the Planned Parenthood organization.

Fact: Even the high-profile former president of the American Federation is Black.

Fact: Aggressive minority hiring practices have been standard operating procedure for Planned Parenthood at every level for more than two decades.

Fact: The vast majority of our nation’s ethnic leadership solidly and actively supports the work of Planned Parenthood.

Therefore: The charge of racism in the organization is anecdotal at best, entirely ludicrous at worst.

Right?
Wrong.

Because Planned Parenthood’s peculiar brand of prejudice is rooted in *Scientific Racism*, the issue is not “color of skin” or “dialect of tongue” but “quality of genes.” As long as Blacks, Jews, and Hispanics demonstrate “a good quality gene pool”—as long as they “act white and think white”—then they are esteemed equally with Aryans. As long as they are, as Margaret Sanger said, “the best of their race,” then they can be accounted as val-
uable citizens. If, on the other hand, individual Whites demonstrate "dysgenic traits," then their fertility must be curbed right along with the other "inferiors and undesirables." 98

Scientific Racism is an equal opportunity discriminator. In other words, anyone with a "defective gene pool" is suspect. And anyone who shows promise may be admitted to the ranks of the elite.

**The Theology of Racism**

Racism is a vile and detestable sin (Deuteronomy 23:7). According to the Bible, bigots are "wicked" and "proud" (Psalm 94:1-6). They are accursed (Deuteronomy 27:19). They are under the judgment of God (Ezekiel 22:7, 29-31). And they face His stern indignation (Malachi 3:5).

The stranger, the alien, and the sojourner are to be cared for and sustained (Deuteronomy 24:20), not vexed and oppressed (Exodus 22:21). They are to be loved (Deuteronomy 10:19) and protected (Exodus 23:9). They are to be relieved (Leviticus 25:35) and satisfied (Deuteronomy 14:29). They are to receive equal protection under the law (Exodus 12:49, Leviticus 24:22, Numbers 15:16) and special attention in times of need (Leviticus 23:22, Deuteronomy 24:17-19). They are to share fully in the blessings that God has graciously poured out on us all (Deuteronomy 14:29, 16:11-14).

When Jesus was asked what men must do to inherit eternal life, He responded by guiding His interrogator to the Scriptures (Luke 10:26). On the question of eternal life the Scriptures are quite explicit: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind; and you shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Luke 10:27).

"Do this," Jesus said, "and you will live" (Luke 10:28).

Not satisfied with this answer, the interrogator pressed the Lord to clarify: "And who is my neighbor?" he asked. "No sense in loving someone I don't have to," he must have thought (Luke 10:29).

Ever patient, ever wise, Jesus responded with a parable—the beloved parable of the Good Samaritan:

A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho; and he fell among robbers, and they stripped him and beat him,
and went off leaving him half dead. And by chance a certain priest was going down on that road, and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. And likewise a Levite also, when he came to the place and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, who was on a journey, came upon him; and when he saw him, he felt compassion, and came to him, and bandaged up his wounds, pouring oil and wine on them; and he put him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And on the next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper and said, “Take care of him; and whatever more you spend, when I return, I will repay you” (Luke 10:30-35).

Jesus then concluded His lesson saying: “Go and do likewise” (Luke 10:37).

Certainly this was not what the interrogator was expecting. A Samaritan! How odd!

Seven hundred years earlier, Assyria had overrun and depopulated the northern kingdom of Israel, including Samaria. The conquerors had a cruel policy of population-transfer that scattered the inhabitants of the land to the four winds. Then, the empty countryside was repopulated with a ragtag collection of vagabonds and scalawags from the dregs of the Empire (2 Kings 17:24-41). Instead of regarding these newcomers as prospects for Jewish evangelism, the people of Judah, who continued in independence for another full century, turned away in contempt, and the racial division between Samaritan and Jew began its bitter course.

Samaritans were universally despised by good Jews. They were racial “half-breeds” who observed a “half-breed” religious cultus. Worse than the pagan Greeks, worse even than the barbarian Romans, the Samaritans were singled out by Jews as a perfect example of despicable depravity.

And now, Jesus was elevating a Samaritan, of all things, to a position of great respect and honor. A Samaritan was the good neighbor, the hero of the parable.

Jesus was slapping the religious leaders of Israel in their collective faces.

After demanding a clarification of Christ’s textbook answer, the interrogator might have expected a parable that encouraged
him to show condescending justice to all men, even to Samaritans. But never in a thousand years would he have guessed that Christ would show how such a despised one could actually be his neighbor—to be loved even as he loved himself! Even for eternal life, this surely was asking too much!

Jesus shattered the pretense of pious prejudice once and for all. "God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10:34) and so, neither should men be (1 Timothy 5:21, James 3:17). He breaks the barriers between "Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female" (Galatians 3:28). In Him there is neither "circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian" (Colossians 3:11).

There are no "bad stocks," no "dysgenic races," and no "choking human undergrowth." No matter what Planned Parenthood says or does, "all men are created equal," and are endowed "with certain inalienable rights."99

Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brothers to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious oil upon the head, coming down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, coming down upon the edge of his robes. It is like the dew of Hermon, coming down upon the mountains of Zion; for there the Lord commanded the blessing—life forever (Psalm 133:1-3).

**Conclusion**

Recently, Republican political organizer and cable television mogul Pat Robertson caused a nationwide stir when he charged that the long-range goal of Planned Parenthood is the creation of a "master race."100 He also asserted that Margaret Sanger was an advocate of Eugenics and various coercive sterilization programs.101

Planned Parenthood's response was immediate. And vehement. Faye Wattleton, who was at the time the stunningly attractive and articulate Black president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, said that "All the charges are unfounded and, frankly, ridiculous."102 She said that Robertson's contentions were "without any basis, any substance, or even any remnants of facts."103 Margaret Sanger's "philosophies were not based on Eugenics," she argued. "Her philosophy was based on people being allowed to choose for themselves."104 She then dismissed the charges of racism as "the same rhetoric we've heard from televangelists for ten years."105
Interestingly, just four years earlier in an interview with *Washington Times* journalist John Lofton, Wattleton admitted that Sanger did indeed advocate “Eugenics and the advancement of the perfect race.”\(^{106}\) And though Wattleton tried to distance herself and her organization from those views, she was forced to confess that Planned Parenthood had never *officially* repudiated them. And interestingly, she did not make use of the opportunity to do so then.\(^{107}\)

It appears that Robertson was right after all. The cloud of rhetoric from Planned Parenthood notwithstanding.
SELLING SEX: THE EDUCATIONAL SCANDAL

Hilaire Belloc

The accursed everyday life of the modernist is instinct with the four sins crying to heaven for vengeance, and there is no humanity in it, and no simplicity, and no recollection.

Set into the midst of an urban Negev, the school backed up to an old weather-stained overpass in a grimy tangle of narrow streets and alleyways. It was a preposterous oasis of quiet, surrounded by the garish cacophony of the inner city. Parents, pupils, and would-be visitors had to turn sharply just at the base of the overpass, and then carefully negotiate their fat Pontiacs past dilapidated apartments and convenience stores to reach the crumbling asphalt drive that circled the flagpole and swept up toward the grand red brick facade.

Four successive generations had sent their children through that ill-tempered neighborhood, around the turn, up the drive, past the flagpole, and into the school to learn. Catherine Toleson reflected on that long unbroken lineage as she stood at her locker between classes. The crowded halls reverberated with the wheedling jive of the eighties. But it smelled of powerful floor wax and disinfectant—the age-old smell of tradition. And there were inscriptions scratched into the small metal door of the locker that several layers of repainting over the years had failed to erase: “John L. loves Gaye Lynn,” “Go Raiders, beat Jefferson!” “Seniors ’67,” “Jesus saves, Moses invests,” “90210,” and “Frodo lives.” Catherine had always before felt that she was participating in a sacred and undisturbed continuity when she heard those
sounds, smelled those smells, and saw those sights. It was as if she had been in the topmost branches of the deeply planted tree of time, resting on its gigantic girth and reveling in its unobstructed vantage. Knowing that fathers and forbearers had walked the same dim and dingy halls she did, that they had sat in the same marred and wobbly desks, and that they had stared out the same tall, double-glazed windows, had given her a sense of security and stability.

But that was before.

Now, Catherine was terribly unsettled. She was confused. She was embarrassed. She felt isolated and alone. Connected to nothing—past, present, or future—she had been torn from the free and easy continuum she had known. The school’s ancient reminders had suddenly become mocking, deceiving ghosts.

Second period on Tuesdays and Thursdays was her “Health” class. Her teacher, a matronly woman in her late fifties, often brought in outside speakers to discuss various topics of interest with the students. This week, a representative from Planned Parenthood had come to talk about sex, contraception, pregnancy, and abortion.

“I was shocked,” Catherine told me later. “Not by the facts of life, but by the way those facts were presented. My parents had already had plenty of discussions with me about the birds and bees stuff. I figured I knew just about all a fifteen-year-old should need to know.”

Apparently, Catherine’s “Health” teacher and the Planned Parenthood speaker disagreed. Their brazen disregard of decorum was unconscionably unctuous.

“The woman from Planned Parenthood was so sleek and sophisticated,” Catherine recalled. “She was beautiful and soft-spoken. Her clothes were gorgeous. Like a model almost, only really professional looking. And she was kinda funny and very articulate. When she walked in, she had our attention immediately—I mean, she was so confident and assured and relaxed, the whole class just fell under her spell.”

With her disarming presence, she stripped away the youngsters’ inhibitions. Sitting on the edge of the teacher’s desk, she joked, kidded, winked, and bandied with them.

“At first, I couldn’t tell where all this was leading,” Catherine said. “But then it became really obvious. She started asking us
personal questions. *Very* personal questions. Like about our feelings. About sex. And even about . . . well, about . . . masturbation! It was *so* disgusting. All the boys were kinda giggling. But you could tell, even *they* were embarrassed."

If that had been all, it would have been bad enough. But the speaker didn’t stop with mere titillating and perverse conversation. She pulled a stained and mottled screen down over the old dusty blackboard, closed the long-tattered shades over the windows, turned off the bright, humming fluorescent lights, and put a short film on the school’s wheezing, rattling projector.

“I’ve never seen pornography before,” Catherine admitted. “But this film was worse than what I could have ever imagined hard-core pornography to be.”

The film was extremely explicit. An unashamedly brash couple fondled each other in preparation for intercourse. At appropriately prurient moments of interest, the camera zoomed in for close-up shots—sweaty body parts rubbing, caressing, kissing, stroking, clasping, petting, and embracing. At the height of passion, the camera fixed on the woman’s hands, trembling with ecstasy, as she tore open a condom package and began to slowly unroll its contents onto her partner.

“I wanted to look away or cover my eyes, but I couldn’t,” Catherine said. “I just stared at the screen—in horror.”

When the lights came back on, the entire class was visibly shaken. With eyes as wide as saucers, the youngsters sat speechless and amazed.

But their guest was entirely unperturbed.

“She began to tell us that everything that we’d just seen was totally normal and *totally* good,” Catherine remembered. “She said that the couple obviously had a *caring, loving, and responsible* relationship—because they took proper precautions against conception and disease.”

At that, the speaker passed several packages of condoms around the room—one for each of the girls. She instructed the boys to hold up a finger so that the girls could *practice* contraceptive application.

Already shell-shocked, the students did as they were told. Afterwards, several of the girls began quietly sobbing, another ran out of the room and threw up, still another fainted. Mercifully, the class ended just a moment later.
"I have never been more humiliated in all my life," Catherine said. "I felt dirty and defiled after seeing the film. But then, when I had to put *that thing* on Billy's finger—well, that was just awful. It was horrible. It was like I'd been *raped*. Raped in my mind. Raped by my school. Raped by Planned Parenthood. I think I was—that we all have been—betrayed."³

**The Shocking Betrayal**

Planned Parenthood-style sex education is shocking. It seems to be designed to break down sexual inhibitions, invalidate sexual taboos, and undermine sexual values.⁴ It is almost as if it purposefully betrays parental and community trust, inciting youngsters to an emotional and sensual frenzy.⁵

Spawned out of the psycho-sexual morass—the bastard child of Havelock Ellis,⁶ Sigmund Freud,⁷ Bertrand Russell,⁸ Alfred Kinsey,⁹ William Masters,¹⁰ Virginia Johnson,¹¹ Alex Comfort,¹² Alan Guttmacher,¹³ Wardell Pomeroy,¹⁴ Mary Calderone,¹⁵ Shere Hite,¹⁶ Ruth Westheimer,¹⁷ Sol Gordon,¹⁸ Sheri Tepper,¹⁹ and, of course, Margaret Sanger²⁰—Planned Parenthood's sex education programs and materials are brazenly perverse. They are frequently accentuated with crudely obscene four-letter words²¹ and illustrated by explicitly ribald nudity.²² They openly endorse aberrant behavior—homosexuality, masturbation, fornication, incest, and even bestiality—and then they describe that behavior in excruciating detail.²³

Catherine Toleson's dreadful classroom experience was by no means an isolated incident.²⁴ This, the crassest brand of moral hedonism and sexual relativism, is *consistently* presented to millions of teens *every day* in the guise of academic objectivity and cosmopolitan neutrality.²⁵ Any resistance their consciences may offer at first is, thus, slowly but surely overwhelmed.

"Our goal," one Planned Parenthood staffer wrote, "is to be ready as educators and parents to help young people obtain sex satisfaction before marriage. By sanctioning sex before marriage, we will prevent fear and guilt."²⁶

According to a Planned Parenthood pamphlet for teens: "Sex is too important to gloop up with sentiment. If you feel sexy, for heaven's sake, admit it to yourself. If the feeling and the tension bother you, you can masturbate. Masturbation cannot hurt you and it will make you feel more relaxed."²⁷
Another Planned Parenthood publication for teens asserts: “There are only two kinds of sex: sex with victims and sex without. Sex with victims is always wrong. Sex without is always right.”

“Relax about loving,” admonishes still another Planned Parenthood booklet, “sex is fun and joyful, and courting is fun and joyful, and it comes in all types and styles, all of which are Okay. Do what gives pleasure, and enjoy what gives pleasure, and ask for what gives pleasure. Don’t rob yourself of joy by focusing on old-fashioned ideas about what’s normal or nice. Just communicate and enjoy!”

That is a far cry from dispelling childish myths about storks and cabbage patches. But that is what Planned Parenthood’s sex education programs and materials are like. They are not designed to simply provide accurate biological information. Instead, they are designed to change the minds, morals, and motivations of an entire generation. They are designed to completely reshape the positions, perspectives, and personalities of children everywhere—including yours and mine. One former Planned Parenthood medical director, Mary Calderone, has forthrightly admitted that, in sex education, “Mere facts and discussion are not enough. They need to be undergirded by a set of values.”

But whose values? Why, Planned Parenthood’s, of course: the values of Margaret Sanger; the values of Revolutionary Socialism; the values of Eugenic Racism; and the values of unfettered sensuality. Thus, according to Calderone, curricula need to, first, separate kids from their parents; second, establish a new sexual identity for them; third, help them determine new value systems; and, finally, help them confirm vocational decisions.

In addition to utilizing traditional inductive and deductive teaching techniques, Planned Parenthood utilizes several different experimental methodologies in its sex education programs in order to accomplish these four aims: Values Clarification, Peer Facilitation, Sensitivity Training, Role Playing, and Positive Imaging.

Values Clarification. Based on the notion that everyone should “do what is right in his own eyes,” Values Clarification is a strategy designed to help children “choose” their own value system from a wide variety of alternatives. The idea, according to Values Clarification pioneer Sidney Simon, is to stop parents and teachers from defining for children “their emotional and sexual
identities” and to keep them from “fostering the immorality of morality.”

In Values Clarification, “decision-making scenarios” are placed before the children and they are asked to make a series of “life and death decisions” where the “only absolute” is that “there are no absolutes.”

Missy Gallagher and Tom Blatten are “high school sweethearts” who recently endured a Planned Parenthood Values Clarification course in Los Angeles. In one exercise, Missy and Tom were brought to the front of the class and given a “decision-making scenario” that they, and the rest of the class, were supposed to respond to.

“The way the teacher set it up,” Missy explained, “was that Tom was supposed to have gotten me pregnant. On top of that, we both were supposed to have been kicked out of our homes by our parents, threatened with the loss of college scholarships, and facing the possibility of serious physical problems due to venereal disease. On that basis, we were supposed to decide, with the help of the rest of the class, whether or not we should have an abortion.”

“Of course, everyone in the class got a big kick out of all this,” Tom said. “They knew that Missy and I are both Christians and that the whole premise of the silly charade was an insult to us.”

“When Tom explained right off that we’d have to accept the consequences of our sin, if we ever did fall into such rebellion, well the teacher got really mad at us, made fun of us, and then had the gall to give us a failing grade for the exercise,” Missy recalled. “The whole thing was a real eye-opener for me,” Tom said. “It seems there is room in Planned Parenthood’s pluralism for anyone and everyone except Christians.”

Peer Facilitation. If word of mouth is the best advertising and satisfied customers are the best endorsement, then it only stands to reason that the best propaganda is peer propaganda. That is the idea behind Planned Parenthood’s Peer Facilitation strategy. Teens who display “leadership qualities” are recruited to be “sex educators of their peers” and even of “younger children with whom they may come into contact.” These leaders are given “intensive personalized training” so that they will later be able to “facilitate healthy sexual messages and behaviors” among other
teens. In one “learning activity” for these “leaders-in-training,” Planned Parenthood recommends “Brainstorming all the terms used for penis, breast, intercourse, vagina, homosexuality, and VD. . . . This will familiarize group members with all forms of sexual terms they might hear from their peers and should lower their shock value. This exercise also helps set an atmosphere for questions in training sessions, in effect giving students permission to discuss sexuality in whatever terms they are most familiar.”

Walt Maxwell was a teen trainee in a Peer Facilitator program sponsored by Planned Parenthood in Northern Virginia. Briefly. “I only lasted a week in the program,” he told me. “I just couldn’t handle it. Watching porno films and talking dirty is not exactly my idea of a healthy extra-curricular activity.”

After he dropped out of the program, he was called in to talk to his school counselor and two assistant principals. “They wanted to know why I had such a bad attitude about the class, and why I was being so uncooperative. I told them that I thought the whole program was disgusting. They just looked at me like I was from another planet or something.”

Sensitivity Training. Planned Parenthood often uses small, informal discussion groups to “raise the sexuality awareness of children.” Using the “social pressure” of carefully designed classroom situations, teachers are able to break down “home training” and then to instill the precepts of “the new morality” — the amoral morality of Margaret Sanger’s sexual revolution.

In one Sensitivity Training program, the “teacher-change agent” is instructed to divide students into small groups, giving each an envelope containing cards with topics to be discussed: “Virginity, Oral-Genital Sex, Intercourse, Masturbation, Sterility, Group Sex, Homosexuality, Extra-Marital Relations, Abortion, and Nudity—with acquaintances, with family, with the opposite sex, with the same sex, and with close friends.”

The students are “to identify and express their present attitudes and feelings about these matters and to practice active listening and honest self-disclosure.” Once this “self-disclosure” process is complete, the group is to “bring consensus by winning over other members.” Those members of the group who refuse to change “are considered non-conformists or deviants.”
Gloria Frankel was recently suspended from her high school near Dallas because she refused to participate in a Planned Parenthood-sponsored Sensitivity Training class.

"After I was ridiculed for my Christian stance on abortion and pre-marital sex, I just couldn't continue going to the class," Gloria said. "I asked for an exemption. I asked to be placed in a study hall. I asked for anything but the sex class. But the teachers and administration refused. They said the class was mandatory. So I talked to my parents, and they agreed that I would just skip the class. That's when I got in trouble and finally was suspended."

Outraged, Gloria's parents took the issue up with school administrators and with the school board. "They were told," Gloria said, "that the law is the law and everyone has to obey it whether they like it or not." The family's only recourse was to sue. That is an awfully high price to pay for moral purity and familial liberty.

Role Playing. Another psycho-therapeutic technique Planned Parenthood uses to effect "personality changes" in students is role playing. According to one psycho-educator: "Role playing is a natural method of learning and unlearning various reactions to complex life problems. . . . It seems to have some advantages . . . over other methods of psychotherapy since it simultaneously attacks modes of thinking, feeling, and behavior—the entire province of psychotherapy."45

Thus, sex education expert Sandalyn McKasson says that role playing "is an indirect, manipulative method of transforming attitudes and behavior. Hence, it is a method of coercion, not instruction."46

In fact, she argues that it is a methodology that "has its roots in the occultic manipulation. It bypasses the will and relies on spontaneous reactions."47 To illustrate, she cites a typical sex ed role-playing exercise from *Values in Sexuality*, a widely recommended resource for Planned Parenthood teachers and counselors.48 In the exercise, seven students are asked to act out a particular pre-determined role:

Roommate 1: You have invited a lover to spend the weekend with you in your room. You tell your roommates.49

Roommate 2: You are a devout Catholic and feel homosexuality is a serious sin.50
Roommate 3: You feel whatever anyone does sexually is their business, but you feel very sad that your friend has closed off lots of options.\footnote{51}

Roommate 4: You're a psychology major, and try to help by giving advice and diagnosing why your roommate might be gay.\footnote{52}

Roommate 5: You feel threatened by the knowledge that your roommate is gay. You try to reason with him and argue him into heterosexual good sense.\footnote{53}

Roommate 6: You are shocked by the announcement and outraged that a fag will be on your dorm floor.\footnote{54}

Roommate 7: You already know about your friend's gay lifestyle. The two of you have talked some about it. You have no serious difficulties with this and still feel comfortable with him.\footnote{55}

After playing their roles, the seven students are then asked to “come to a consensus” about which of the roommates’ attitudes is “the most constructive.”

Martin Campbell was forced to participate in that very scenario in a Planned Parenthood-sponsored class at his high school near Chicago. “After we played our parts,” he told me, “we had to de-role and then analyze our feelings in a group discussion. The teacher asked us what stereotypes of homosexuality had emerged in the skit. And then we were supposed to talk about why those stereotypes were wrong and based on ignorance and fear. Well, I was really hacked off by the whole deal. I felt like I was being set up.”

When the teacher found that Martin was acting a bit recalcitrant, she began to lecture him about being open, tolerant, accepting, mature, respectful, and honest. “I just kept telling her that I didn’t agree, and wouldn’t agree, but she wouldn’t let up on me,” Martin said. “It’s pretty bad when a teacher isolates one kid like that. I felt like I was getting ganged up on. It wasn’t at all fair.”

Positive Imaging. Very similar to role-playing techniques is Planned Parenthood’s fantasy, or Positive Imaging, methodology. According to one school “mental health” proponent: “The concept of educational imagery is used to approximate a described behavior, decision or outcome through guided imagination or fantasy in the conscious mind of the individual. In
theory, educational imagery can bridge the gap between making
the decision and behaviorally incorporating the decision. The
theory is that if the decision is clearly imagined and acted out re-
peatedly, then when the opportunity comes to enact the decision,
the process will be facilitated.”56

And what fantasies and decisions are the curricula facil-i-
tating? One government-sponsored program used widely by
Planned Parenthood educators told teens that they could have
fantasies which involved “sexual feelings about people of the
same or opposite sex, parents, brothers and sisters, old people,
animals, nature, inanimate objects, and almost anything you
can imagine. It is unusual for a person not to have some strange
sexual fantasies.”57

Carrie Lipscombe and Laura Gibbs participated in a Posi-
tive Imaging exercise in a Planned Parenthood-sponsored class
at their neighborhood YWCA. “The teacher told us to close our
eyes,” Carrie remembered. “We were to imagine ourselves stand-
ing on the end of a diving board.”

“She went into a lot of detail, helping us to imagine the crys-
tal clear water, the bright blue sky, and the warm, dry sunshine
on our skin,” Laura said. “She asked us to feel ourselves bouncing
off the board and splashing into the cool, refreshing pool.”

“Then she told us that that feeling was very much like an
orgasm,” Carrie said. “After that, we were supposed to imagine
all kinds of situations where we could relive that feeling of going
off the diving board sexually.”

“I was pretty shook up by that,” admitted Laura.

“Me, too,” Carrie said. “The whole deal was pretty manip-
ulative. I didn’t like it. Not a bit.”

“The objectionable feature of these programs now being
promoted by Planned Parenthood,” says economist and social
analyst Jacqueline Kasun, “is not that they teach sex, but that
they do it so badly, replacing good biological education with ten
to twelve years of compulsory consciousness raising and psycho-
sexual therapy, and using the public schools to advance their own
peculiar worldview.”58

Like Catherine Toleson, Carrie Lipscombe, and the others,
Rhonda Williams was shocked by the foul and indecent mate-
rials Planned Parenthood was distributing in her junior high
school. She was especially distressed by one brochure that openly attacked Christian morality and the institutional Church. "I can't believe that they can get away with this kind of thing," she told me. "You'd think that someone—a teacher, a principal, a counselor, an administrator, a parent, or someone—would put a stop to it."

Rhonda showed me the brochure. Illustrated with grotesque cartoon caricatures of Christian leaders, it said: "Some religious and semi-religious groups dominated by elderly men, simply cannot deal rationally with sex. They can't talk about it rationally, can't think about it rationally, and, above all, can't give up the power which controlling other people gives them. They control other people through sex."59

"Did you know that they were handing stuff like this out in the schools?" Rhonda asked me.

"Yes," I had to admit. "I did."

"Then why don't you do something?"

"I'll try," I told her.

"I'm not sure that just trying is good enough. A whole generation is at risk here."

Indeed, it is.

**The Business of Revolution**

Planned Parenthood *sells sex.*60 Its *business* is to assault youngsters like Catherine Toleson, Carrie Lipscombe, and Rhonda Williams with an unholy barrage of vulgar and licentious temptation.61 Its *avocation* is to lure them into dependence on its lucrative contraception and abortion services.62

And it does what it does very well.

With a passionate, evangelistic zeal and a shrewd entrepreneurial effectiveness, Planned Parenthood has translated its sordid sex business into a multi-million dollar monopoly: it publishes sex-ed books, pamphlets, and curricula;63 it develops model sex-ed programs for communities, schools, and affiliates;64 it creates pre-service, in-service, and enrichment programs for sex-ed trainers;65 it provides a national resource clearinghouse as a conduit for the dissemination of sex-ed information and materials;66 it distributes journals, magazines, and newsletters to sex-ed professionals;67 it catalogues and evaluates
all available sex-ed materials and publications; it produces films, videos, and advertisements that broadcast sex-ed themes far and wide; it advocates unrestricted sex-ed propagation—kindergarten through twelfth grade—through political lobbying and the courts; and it sends an army of sex-ed speakers into schools, churches, and public forums every day—day in and day out.

Planned Parenthood has not gone unrewarded for all its efforts. With all the hype of a Wild West Miracle Medicine Show—claiming that sex education would cure virtually every societal ailment: from child abuse to teen pregnancy, from juvenile delinquency to infant mortality, from birth defects to welfare dependency, from drug abuse to venereal disease, and from sexual abuse to academic decline—Planned Parenthood has hawked its wares to a ready market of concerned parents, educators, and civic leaders. And they have proved to be ready buyers.

As a result, virtually every man, woman, and child in America has been exposed to Planned Parenthood's luridly immoral notions of love, sex, and intimacy. Almost seventy-five percent of the nation's school districts have institutionalized sex-ed programs. And untold millions of tax dollars have been poured into Planned Parenthood's already overstuffed coffers. It has done such a convincing job of selling its obscene services and products that, now, anyone who dares to question the value of Planned Parenthood's sex-ed monopoly is immediately castigated as "some sort of unenlightened crank."

But, like the old medicine show potions, elixirs, and tonics, Planned Parenthood's programs don't actually do what they are advertised to do. They don't solve the problems posed by the teen sexuality crisis. If anything, they aggravate them—stirring up unhealthy passions, inspiring unnatural affections, suggesting untamed concupiscence, and defiling naive innocence. The fact is, the proliferation of Planned Parenthood-style sex education all across the country has coincided with an unprecedented increase in teen promiscuity. For nearly two decades, the nation's schools have faithfully followed Planned Parenthood's prescriptions only to see the number of teen pregnancies swell to more than a million each year—an increase of almost ninety percent. The number of teen abortions has risen
to nearly half a million each year—an increase of more than 230 percent. And the number of reported cases of venereal disease has sky-rocketed to almost fourteen million each year—an increase of nearly 140 percent. Study after study has shown that sex education is anything but an effective remedy for the teen sex epidemic.

As a result, a number of voices have begun to cry out in the wilderness. Scott Thompson, executive director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, has said that such programs are a "charade," bordering on "educational fraud." William Leatherton, president of the American Bureau of Educational Research, has called them "a scandal of immense proportions." They are simply a "failure," according to Jackie Manley, a program associate at the Center for Population Options. And Senator Jesse Helms has argued:

One and a half billion dollars in the hands of terrorists could not have inflicted the long-term harm to our society that these programs' expenditures have. . . . No one can deny the fact that they do indeed subsidize teenage sexual activity. It is on the basis of this fact that some argue that the programs directly and positively increase the incidence of venereal disease, teenage pregnancy, and abortion. At a minimum, they tend to create an atmosphere in which teenage promiscuity is viewed as normal and acceptable conduct and which in turn fosters the very problems we are trying to solve.

Despite this, Planned Parenthood remains unconcerned. As long as it can keep its customers lining up with don't-confuse-me-with-the-facts grins spread across their faces, it can blithely ignore the negative figures and fulminations. Business is its business. And business couldn't be better. Sex sells.

From its inception, Planned Parenthood's goal has been to change the world. And to do it at a substantial profit. To foment the revolution is good. To do it at a forty percent mark-up is even better. So forget the statistics, the studies, and the statements—from Planned Parenthood's perspective, the "failure" of its sex education programs has been its greatest "success."

This Phoenix-like ability of Planned Parenthood—to not only survive, but thrive, in the face of its programs' impotence and incompetence—is due almost entirely to its skill in controlling and defining the terms of the debate.
Defining the Terms

The irrepressible John Selden once quipped that "syllables govern the world." If that is true, then the definers of words are the most powerful of men.

George Orwell explored that notion, with chilling effect, in his classic *1984*. The book tells the story of a society where a repressive bureaucratic elite attempts to manipulate the very thoughts of men by controlling their language. Old words, with comfortable, familiar meanings, are either scuttled into disuse, or are redefined to fit the elite's pernicious perspective. They are either slyly sidled, or are emptied of their common significance, only to be filled with some alien denotation. Thus, according to this Newspeak, words like honor, justice, morality, science, and religion cease to exist altogether, while words like war, peace, freedom, slavery, and ignorance have their meanings completely transposed.

Orwell meant the book to be a warning. Like Rudyard Kipling, he believed that "words are the most powerful drugs used by mankind." Like Tristram Gylberd, he believed that "whoever controls the language controls the culture." And, like John Locke, he believed that "whoever defines the words defines the world." Thus, he implored his readers to beware of logogogues—word tyrants. He warned us to resist the seductive allure of lexographic molesters.

Sadly, we have failed to heed that warning. It seems that we are presently witnessing the emergence of our own Newspeak. Allan Bloom, author of *The Closing of the American Mind*, argues that we have begun to develop "an entirely new language of good and evil, originating in an attempt to get beyond good and evil, and preventing us from talking with any conviction about good and evil."

Not surprisingly, Planned Parenthood has been one of the primary practitioners of this Newspeak. By manipulating certain words, Planned Parenthood has attempted—and, in all too many cases, succeeded—to manipulate reality.

The word responsible was once synonymous with trustworthy. A responsible person could be counted on to uphold his commitments and fulfill his obligations. Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, responsible simply means "to use birth control" during illicit sexual liaisons.
The word *chastity* was once synonymous with *purity*. A person who practiced chastity could generally be considered virtuous and modest.\(^{104}\) Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, *chastity* is just "a stage in life," a temporary "immaturity."\(^{105}\)

The word *neutral* was once synonymous with *objective*. A person who took a neutral position on a subject could be counted on to be impartial and teachable.\(^{106}\) Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, *neutral* refers to an "open-minded," and "amoral" *relativism*.\(^{107}\)

The word *choice* was once synonymous with *freedom*. The right to choose protected men from every assault of life and limb.\(^{108}\) Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, *choice* is "the right" of one person "to prevail" over another—even to the point of death—whenever the fancy strikes.\(^{109}\)

The word *fetus* was once synonymous with *unborn child*. A fetus was universally recognized as a baby, a blessing from Almighty God.\(^{110}\) Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, *fetus* is nothing more than "disposable tissue," or, worse, a unique form of "venereal disease."\(^{111}\)

The word *gay* was once synonymous with *happy*. If someone was gay, he was cheerful, jolly, and content.\(^{112}\) Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, *gay* is a noun, not an adjective, meaning a sodomizing *homosexual*.\(^{113}\)

The word *morality* was once synonymous with *virtue*. A moral person could be counted on to act uprightly and with all *integrity*.\(^{114}\) Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, *morality* is an "outdated" and "judgmental" value system rooted in "fear," "prejudice," and "ignorance."\(^{115}\)

The word *relationship* was once synonymous with *friendship*. A person who had a relationship with another simply had a *rapport* with them.\(^{116}\) Now, though, according to Planned Parenthood's Newspeak, a *relationship* is an adulterous affair, or an occasional opportunity for *fornication*.\(^{117}\)

This is the vocabulary that Planned Parenthood has grafted into their sex education programs and literature.\(^{118}\) Even if those books, pamphlets, films, and curricula did not openly endorse perversion, promiscuity, and prurience, they would still be dammingly destructive just because of the way they use and control the language.
According to Orwell, the original purpose of Newspeak was "to make all other modes of thought impossible." Certainly, Planned Parenthood's sex-ed Newspeak has accomplished that. What teenager wouldn't rather be responsible and open-minded than immature and ignorant? How do you tell your son or daughter not to be fulfilled? Does the Bible ever say: "Thou shalt not evacuate uterine tissue"? The fact is, the language of sex education—the language that has been systematically taught to our children—makes it impossible to entertain any other mode of thought than Planned Parenthood's mode of thought.

Mark Twain once asserted that "the difference between the right word and the almost right word is like the difference between lightning and the lightning bug." There can be little doubt that Planned Parenthood has chosen its words very carefully and, as a result, it has struck an entire generation dumb, like a bolt from the blue. Not content to rake and strafe our children's bodies with dangerous drugs, devices, and procedures, Planned Parenthood has launched a blitzkrieg against their minds as well.

Backwards Deal

Lucy Lommers, Deborah Sullivan, Sarah Bakker, and Jackie Landry were all chosen to participate in a unique educational experiment at their school in the nation's capital. Sponsored by Planned Parenthood, the "Peer Education in Human Sexuality" program was designed to train teens to become "peer facilitators" and "responsible information givers.”

"The idea," Lucy told me, "was to take a few of us and really teach us everything that a sex education teacher knows. All the techniques, all the methods, all the ideas, all the strategies: we got all of it. And then we were supposed to lead group discussions with our friends so that we could influence them."

"The training was mostly just discussion between ourselves," Sarah said. "And they were usually pretty wild discussions."

"Wild is right," Jackie interjected.

"Yeah, see, the Planned Parenthood counselors who worked with us would open up a topic and get us to share our personal experiences and feelings about it," Deborah explained. "Sometimes we'd see a film—man, were they ever explicit—and then
we’d talk about our reactions.” “I always felt a tremendous amount of pressure in those sessions,” Jackie said. “I thought that maybe I was the only one in the group that wasn’t hopping into the sack with some guy every weekend. Listening to the stories my friends started telling made me wonder if I really knew them at all. And if I really fit in with them.”

“Course, what none of us realized at the time,” Lucy said, “was that we were all feeling the same things. We were just too scared to admit it. I mean, who wants to come right out and say that they’re really not all that keen on sex! That’s just not normal. Nobody wants people to think that they’ve got some sort of weird hang-ups or that they’re some sorta prude.”

“So we all just lied,” Sarah said. “We made up all these kinky stories about wild sex parties and stuff.”

“Well,” admitted Lucy, “we didn’t just lie. We also started fooling around some. I got on birth control. Most of us did. But we were doing it mostly to be normal and accepted.”

“And to live up to the reputations we were creating for ourselves in the training session,” added Sarah.

“Yeah, that, too,” Deborah piped in.

“The thing was, the dirtier our discussions got, the more bizarre our stories were, the better the Planned Parenthood counselors seemed to like it,” Jackie said.

“I know! Isn’t it weird?” Lucy said. “They would say stuff like, ‘Now we’re really getting somewhere,’ or ‘It’s very important to be able to communicate like this.’ I’d always think to myself, Yeah. Right. What a pile of crock. But then, of course, I wouldn’t say anything.”

“The whole mess began to fall apart, though, when one of the other girls in our group got pregnant and had to have an abortion,” Deborah said.

“She was probably the quietest person in the program,” Lucy explained. “Real pretty. Got great grades. But she kinda just kept to herself. Tina was her name. Anyway, she was on the Pill. She told me that she was pretty freaked out that she could do something as radical as take birth control without her parents ever finding out. I mean, we have to call home and get permission to get an aspirin from the school nurse, but we can get an IUD, or birth control pills, or even an abortion, without anybody knowing
about it. Kinda crazy, isn't it? Well, the point is, Tina was a little amazed by the whole deal."

"When she found out she was pregnant, she seemed to take it real well. All in stride," Sarah noted. "She even talked about it in our group meeting. The Planned Parenthood counselors set up an appointment for her to get an abortion and that was that."

"Only that wasn't the end of the story," Jackie said.

"Not by a long shot," agreed Lucy.

"No, after the abortion, we all got together for our regular meeting. And Tina was there. She'd had the abortion three days earlier," Lucy said.

"She really looked awful," commented Jackie.

"The counselor asked her to talk about it," Lucy went on. "But she just sat there not saying anything at all. The counselor then went into this long lecture about how important it is to get all your feelings out, to communicate, to be honest—you know, all that psycho-therapy stuff. Well, before any of us knew what was happening, Tina just went berserk."

"Yeah, she started screaming and crying and throwing stuff around," Jackie said.

"She said that the 'peer' training project had pushed her into sex, filled her mind with all sorts of obscene ideas, and then forced her into an abortion," Deborah remembered. "She said she'd learned everything except the right things and that she hated what she'd become."

"After a while, she was just sobbing uncontrollably," Lucy said. "And none of us knew what to do."

"I think we were all pretty confused," agreed Jackie.

"And, what was worse, for me anyway," Sarah said, "was that I knew she was right. We'd been sold a bill of goods. None of us wanted to learn all that stuff about lesbianism and masturbation and orgies and abortion and birth control and kinky fetishes and stuff. And the things we did need to know we never even talked about—things like a baby's development, guilt, venereal diseases, the health hazards of birth control, alternatives to abortion, PMS, and depression. None of that."

"After a minute or two, Tina left," Jackie continued with the story. "We were pretty stunned. But one of the Planned Parenthood counselors, well, she just started rattling on about how good
it was that Tina was ‘able to ventilate her frustrations,’ and how the group was ‘obviously growing in honesty toward one another,’ and all that stuff.”

“That night, Tina committed suicide,” Lucy concluded.

The girls were all quiet now. Heads bowed in sadness and shame.

“When that happened, we all got together,” Deborah said finally, “without anybody from Planned Parenthood to look over our shoulders. And we just talked.”

“And cried,” added Lucy.

“For all that hype about honesty,” Jackie admitted, “that was the first time we actually were honest.”

After another long pause, Deborah noted, “I think we learned a lot of lessons out of this, but two really kinda stand out. First, Planned Parenthood was trying to force us to learn about—and think about, talk about, and experiment about—things none of us wanted to. And, second, Planned Parenthood skipped over the stuff that we did want—and need—to know.”

“Yeah, the whole deal was really backwards, wasn’t it?” Lucy said.

“I’m just glad it’s over, and I’m glad that I’m out of it—that we’re all out of it,” Deborah sighed.

“Really!” the other girls nodded. “Really!”

According to Planned Parenthood’s own national survey, conducted by the Louis Harris pollsters, most teens agree with Lucy, Deborah, Sarah, and Jackie. More than eighty-seven percent said that they did not want comprehensive sexuality services in their schools. Sixty percent said they didn’t even want such services near their schools. Only twenty-eight percent of the teens had actually become involved in sexual activities, but ninety percent of those admitted that they had become promiscuous simply because of a perceived peer pressure. Nearly eighty percent of them felt that they had been drawn into sexual activity far too soon. The teens in the poll admitted that their comprehensive sex education courses had affected their behavior. There was a fifty percent higher rate of sexual activity for them after the classes. Sadly, their understanding of the consequences of such activity was not correspondingly enhanced.
According to another national study, no less than ninety percent of all women who receive abortions experience moderate to severe emotional and psychiatric stress following the procedures. Up to ten percent require psychiatric hospitalization or other treatment. Teens are not told that.

Almost eighty percent felt that their teachers and counselors discouraged, avoided, or trivialized their questions about important issues—the hard issues—especially the truth about abortion. Eighty-nine percent confessed that their Planned Parenthood contacts were “strongly biased.” The organization’s claim to offer girls “good, non-directive counseling and education” was overwhelmingly denied by the girls who actually used those services. Ninety-five percent said that the counselors gave them “little or no biological information,” and over eighty percent said that they gave “little or no information about the potential health risks” inherent in birth control and abortion products and procedures. Over sixty percent said they had yearned for an alternative to the Planned Parenthood programs, but did not know where to turn.

It appears that Planned Parenthood’s sex education programs are, as Lucy Lommers and the other girls from Washington put it, “a backwards deal.” Wicked ideas, couched in wicked terms, to achieve wicked ends—that is the educational scandal of Planned Parenthood. That is how Planned Parenthood sells sex.

Brazen Lips

The wicked are not only unsavory, they are unreliable as well.

There is nothing reliable in what they say; their inward part is destruction itself; their throat is an open grave; they flatter with their tongue (Psalm 5:9).

Perversity and deceit go hand in hand (Proverbs 17:4). You can’t have one without the other (Proverbs 6:12; Isaiah 59:3). That is why men are warned again and again to avoid at all costs froward speech and obscene lips (Job 27:4; Proverbs 4:24; Psalm 34:13; Ephesians 4:2; Colossians 3:8; 1 Peter 3:10).
There are six things which the Lord hates, yes, seven which are an abomination to Him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked plans, feet that run rapidly to evil, a false witness who utters lies, and one who spreads strife among brothers (Proverbs 6:16-19).

Although indiscreet talk is "sweet in the mouths" of fallen men (Job 20:12), it is terribly destructive (James 3:6). It defiles the flesh (Jude 1:8). It invites corruption, untowardness, crookedness, and perversity (Deuteronomy 32:5). It contributes to the delinquency of minors (Proverbs 7:6-23). It creates strife and dissension (Proverbs 16:28). It devises evil in the midst of innocence (Proverbs 16:30). It unleashes mischievous destruction (Proverbs 17:20). It perverts justice (Deuteronomy 16:19). And it wrecks havoc, "like a sharp razor, working deceitfully" (Psalm 52:2), even to the point of overthrowing an entire culture (Proverbs 11:11). "A soothing tongue is a tree of life, but perversion in it crushes the spirit" (Proverbs 15:4).

Foul speech is inescapably fraudulent (Psalm 10:7), just as it is inescapably violent (Proverbs 10:11; 12:6).

Because such brazenness is an abomination to both God and man (Psalm 109:2; Proverbs 4:24; 8:7), all men who indulge in it, of necessity "have their consciences seared as with a hot brand" (1 Timothy 4:2). Their hearts are hardened (Proverbs 28:14). Their necks are stiffened (Proverbs 29:1). Their souls are impoverished (Matthew 16:26). And, their lives are cheapened (Proverbs 6:26).

Planned Parenthood claims to teach our children the "facts of life." But details about unspeakable perversions, concealed horrors, and obscene titillations are not the "facts of life."

The "facts of life" can only be found in the Word of Life. And that is one source of inspiration that Planned Parenthood studiously avoids.

With the fruit of a man's mouth his stomach will be satisfied; he will be satisfied with the product of his lips. Death and life are in the power of the tongue, and those who love it will eat its fruit (Proverbs 18:20-21).
Conclusion

In his remarkable article entitled “The Fraud of Educational Reform,” Samuel L. Blumenfeld has stated, “The more I read what secular educators write these days, the more convinced I become that their grasp of reality has slipped beyond retrieval.”143 The schools have failed so miserably in accomplishing their basic tasks—teaching our children how to read and write and compute and complete and compete—that Blumenfeld says those educators know that they will have to reform their precious system. But what will that reform be like? Blumenfeld tells us that we should “expect the next phase of educational reform to be dominated by radical ideas disguised in pedagogic clothes. Such phrases as critical thinking, emancipatory pedagogy, and master teachers will sound benign to the public but will convey the right message to the radicals.”144 Certainly that is what we saw in the now defunct America 2000 reform proposals.145

Thus, reforming the present educational system is not the answer. Planned Parenthood and the other radical educational activists are so deeply entrenched in the public school machinery that reform can only mean more of the same: more debauchery, more brazenness, more humanism, and more wickedness.

The early promoters of public, state-controlled education rallied around the slogan, “It costs less money to build schoolhouses than jails.”146 The great patriot-theologian of the South, Robert L. Dabney, responded to this in 1876, saying, “But what if it turns out that the state’s expenditure in school-houses is one of the things which necessitates the expenditures in jails?”147 To which we might add: What if that expenditure also necessitates the expenditure in AIDS hospitals, nationalized child care, and an ever-burgeoning abortion industry?

The only hope for our children—and their children, and their children’s children—to escape these horrendous hazards are uncompromising, unwavering, unmitigating Christian schools: Christian day schools and Christian home schools.148 Christian educator Robert Thoburn has argued, “Salvation is by grace, not by education.”149 Even so, he says we have a “moral obligation”150 to work hard, building up Christian schools151 and restoring moral sanity to our nation.152
Certainly, we need to battle the blazing concupiscence of Planned Parenthood’s sex education programs by sounding the alarms in PTA meetings, community forums, and school board hearings. But, in the meantime, it is essential that we rescue our own children from the flickering flames of promiscuity and perdition. At all costs.
As always happens to miraculous things, the virtue has all gone out with the lapse of time. 

Hilaire Belloc

Skimming the streets on a razor-sharp high of adrenaline and paranoia, Roxanne Robertson circled the clinic’s concrete fortress half a dozen times before she finally screwed up enough courage to pull into the parking lot. An acid rain, the sins of her fathers, blew down hard and cold, etching obscure messages into the surface of the graceless asphalt. As she stepped out of the car and moved toward the building, a scrap of rubbish, plucked up by the wind, did a careless pirouette before being carried away.

She stepped quickly under the parapet, around the corner, through glass doors, along a carpet mapped with stains shaped like dark continents amid a sienna sea, and into a long narrow lobby. Hunched behind the reception desk sat a gnomish and disheveled woman with a beaked nose and tufts of frowzy brown hair reminiscent of a lark’s nest. It seemed that upon her forehead the engraved word finality would not have been at all inappropriate.

The room was close and warm. From within drifted the smell of bodies pressed together, cigarette smoke, disinfectant, perfume, and something else—the almost metallic scent of fear.

“I believe I have an appointment,” Roxanne said.

The woman handed her a clipboard. “You’ll need to fill this out.” She smiled a ragged smile. It was a hollow, haunting gesture—a feeble attempt to veil her intentions with an unspoken cant of compassion.
Roxanne took a seat next to a petite teen—a girl about her own age, she guessed—and across from an older woman, an unsettling vision of frustrated resignation. Neither of them seemed to notice her as Roxanne sat on the edge of her seat scratching bits of biographical information onto the form on her lap—life, love, and hope hemorrhaging from her soul with each completed line.

Saturday morning at Planned Parenthood. Day of decision. Valley of decision.

Roxanne handed the completed form to the haggard receptionist and returned to her seat. Tossed to and fro on waves of doubt, weak from resisting swells of guilt, and helpless in the face of a flood of loneliness, she felt as if she were drowning.

But then the tide rolled out and resolve rushed in when she heard her name called.

She followed a tall and elegant woman down a dimly lit hall to a small office cubicle. Spare and unfurnished, save for a small round table and two straight-backed chairs, the room bore the unmistakable mark of bureaucratic impersonalism. And the woman's expressionless features did little to dispel that institutional gloom. A shiver ran up and down Roxanne's spine.

After a brief exchange of rote pleasantries the woman turned her attentions to a small folder of paperwork. "Tell me, Ms. Robertson," she intoned without looking up, "what is your actual monthly income?"

"Well, I'm going to school full-time right now," Roxanne replied. "I work at the Student Union about fifteen hours a week—or whenever they need me. That comes out to about $50.00. And then my parents send me about $150.00 a month for other expenses, clothes, supplies, gas for the car, and stuff. Course, they pay tuition, books, and my room and board at the dorm."

"So then, the only money that actually passes through your hands is the $50.00 a week from your part-time job and the $150.00 a month from your parents?" the woman asked.

"Yeah, I guess so."

"Well, then according to state guidelines, you qualify for government subsidy for your care today. You will only be responsible for co-pay of twenty percent."

"Oh well, I don't need to do that. My parents have sent me the money I need."

"You qualify. You might as well take advantage of your benefits."
“Gee, I don’t know. I’d feel kinda dishonest doing that.”
“Oh don’t be silly, hon. It’s for just this kind of thing we all pay our taxes.”
“Hmmm. Well . . .”
“Besides, from the looks of your chart here, you’re going to need a full battery of tests and services. That can get to be quite expensive.”
“But . . . all I need is a pregnancy test. And a uh . . . uh . . .”
“I know, hon. Don’t worry about it.”
“But . . .”

The conversation went back and forth like that for almost ten minutes: the Planned Parenthood counselor doing everything she could to sign on Roxanne as a government-subsidy client, Roxanne weakly resisting the offer of “charity.” In the end, though, the counselor prevailed.

“All right then. What do I have to do?” Roxanne finally said in surrender.

“Just sign here.” The woman handed a sheet across the table. Her eyes quickly took in the two rings that adorned Roxanne’s hands—one with rubies and diamonds, the other with a large fire opal set in an ornate gold band. As those hands took the sheet and signed, the woman smiled for the first time. The deed was as good as done.

Hours later, Roxanne stepped out into a still damp, brownish haze that made a ghost of the horizon, and began rushing after an ever-receding destination—her child now dead, her conscience now seared, and her worth now reduced to a jingle in the till.

“I never could understand,” she recently told me, “why the counselor was so insistent. She refused to take no for an answer. It was almost like I was gonna sign up for Title XX benefits whether I wanted to or not. I only wish that I’d resisted her arguments and walked out the door. I’d have saved myself a lot of grief. And of course, I’d have saved a lot of money—tax money—that went to pay for my foolish sin.”

Soaking the Taxpayer

Roxanne Robertson is just the kind of customer that Planned Parenthood is looking for: young, Black, uninformed, frightened, unmarried, pregnant, and best of all, government subsidy eligible.
Nearly forty years ago Congress began pouring millions of dollars into Planned Parenthood's draconian programs in a desperate attempt to hold down the burgeoning costs of welfare dependency.⁴ Lobbyists for Planned Parenthood argued that without a comprehensive, nationwide, tax-funded abortion and birth control network, thousands, if not millions of girls like Roxanne would be abandoned to an irrevocable spiral of poverty.⁵ They would become a chronic strain and drain on the system. “Every dollar invested in family planning,” they argued, “would save two to three dollars in health and welfare costs.”⁶

That logic—you’ve got to spend money in order to save money—sounded logical enough to Congress. So, anxious to demonstrate a fiscal responsibility heretofore inimicable to its character, it authorized several well-heeled family planning measures.

In 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act was passed, which included a number of birth control and maternal health and hygiene provisions for the very poor.⁷ For the first time the federal government became involved in regulating families and policing their bedroom behavior.

In 1968, the Center for Population Research was established in order to coordinate federal activities in “population-related matters.”⁸ A significant appropriations commitment was passed at that time to provide for contraceptive and abortifacient research, placement, and service.⁹

In 1970, President Richard Nixon signed into law the Tydings Act, consolidating the funding base for the Center, and granting service contracts and subsidy support for independent providers.¹⁰ The bill created Title X of the Public Health Service Act and set funding precedents for Title V, Title XIX, Title XX, and a whole host of other family planning and social welfare spending programs that came along in later years.¹¹

Interestingly, Section 1008 of the Tydings legislation stipulated that “none of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used in programs where abortion is a method of family planning.”¹² The strong wording of this provision indicates that Congress not only wished to prohibit the use of tax dollars for abortion procedures, but to exclude the funding of programs and organizations that counseled or referred for abortion as well.¹³ Such wording became essentially moot as successive “pro-life” Republican administrations allowed family planning entitlements to grow to
Babylonian proportions. Of course, now that explicitly pro-abortion Democrats control the budgetary process, even such moot restrictions have become utterly extinct.

But even the most pro-abortion negation of the original Tydings intent makes it clear that the grants, investments, awards, gifts, and service contracts provided by the entitlement are to be spent exclusively on programs for low- and marginal-income adults.

Planned Parenthood has been quick to note that even those minimal restrictive provisions are virtually unenforceable.

It has also discovered that dipping into the deep well of public funding could be phenomenally profitable. The mind-boggling growth of Planned Parenthood since the heady days when the Great Society was just being launched is a lesson on how to exploit appropriations for personal and institutional gain—or how to turn the hard-earned tax dollars of the average American into what the Bible calls “filthy lucre.”

A comprehensive statistical, clinical, and demographic analysis of several thousand randomly selected Planned Parenthood client records recently provided evidence that the organization was not only sidestepping the Tydings provisions as a matter of policy, but that it was deliberately inflating government charges. The fact is, “Planned Parenthood bills more services and charges more fees when taxpayers are footing the bill than when a client pays cash.” As demographer Robert Ruff has said, “To put it bluntly, Planned Parenthood is soaking the taxpayer.”

For example, if a young girl goes to a Planned Parenthood affiliate for a simple pregnancy test and pays cash, her bill will total, on the average, just over sixteen dollars. If, however, she qualifies for a government subsidy, her bill will total, on the average, just over fifty-seven dollars. For the very same service! In the very same clinic! At Planned Parenthood, a procedure that is free at most crisis pregnancy centers and community health clinics, and which can be done at home for less than ten dollars, has become a remarkably profitable enterprise, thanks to government funding.

But it is not just subsidized pregnancy tests that Planned Parenthood has inflated beyond the stratosphere. It bills more services and charges higher fees for government-paid clients than for cash clients in every area of its repertoire. The average
cost of an initial cash-paid birth control visit is just over thirty-two dollars. But when the taxpayer foots the bill, Planned Parenthood charges an average of just over seventy-seven dollars. An annual birth control check-up costs a cash client approximately forty dollars. But when the government pays, Planned Parenthood charges more than eighty-five dollars. A repeat visit costs a cash client just over twenty-five dollars. For the same service, the taxpayer is charged almost thirty-six dollars. A birth control supply visit costs an average of under eleven dollars cash. But when that same visit is paid for out of public funds, the cost averages more than thirty-five dollars. When public hospitals, local communities, school districts, county health departments, and state governments contract with Planned Parenthood to perform abortions, the same pattern of price inflation holds true. The cost of family planning services at Planned Parenthood is directly related to who pays the bill—the client or the taxpayer. When the taxpayer pays, the services are between two and four times more expensive.

If a defense contractor can get two hundred dollars out of the Pentagon for a common ball peen hammer, then by golly it will—all moral compunction aside. It is simply a matter of supply and demand. Likewise, if Planned Parenthood can get sixty dollars out of the welfare establishment for a cheap little rabbit test, be assured it will. And just as the defense contractor robs the treasury in the name of patriotism, so Planned Parenthood soaks the taxpayer in the name of philanthropy.

Is it any wonder then that Planned Parenthood is so intent on qualifying girls like Roxanne Robertson for government grants and subsidies?

**Highway Robbery Made Easy**

Prior to 1981, states and organizations that wanted to participate in the various federal family planning programs provided by the Tydings legislation and its prolific progeny were required to submit a detailed spending proposal to the Department of Health and Human Services. Only if and when they could demonstrate legitimate need were funds approved. In addition, they were obligated to report back to the department on a regular basis how they spent the funds and how effective those expenditures were.
A number of conservative spending watchdog groups fought those strict accountability requirements on the basis that they were fiscally counterproductive. They argued that the states and organizations were only using the restrictions as an annual excuse to request ever-higher funding levels. Providers like Planned Parenthood would report that they spent two hundred million dollars on family planning but that teen pregnancy rose another ten percent. And thus, according to their convoluted logic, more federal funding was needed to combat the teen sexuality crisis. Such pleas became an inescapable hurdle at the annual budget negotiations. Not surprisingly program costs began to skyrocket.

The solution proposed by the watchdog groups was to eliminate accountability altogether. The funds would be dispensed as no-strings-attached gifts known as block grants. There would be no federal supervision. No federal control. No federal evaluation. There would not even be federal requirements to establish eligibility guidelines: the states and organizations would be free to dispense the funds to anyone—rich or poor—for any purpose, however they saw fit. The Department of Health and Human Services would only be able to recommend that the funds be used in a particular fashion.

Remember, family planning programs began as a “money saving” strategy for the welfare system. Now, in order to save the economy from that “money saving” strategy, a new “money saving” strategy had to be devised. Congress couldn’t resist. Deficit conscious, it rushed to implement the new measures. And in so doing, it gave Planned Parenthood what was for all intents and purposes a blank check.

Now, thoroughly obscured within the bellyfolds of Washington’s ponderous social services bureaucracy, Planned Parenthood quickly transformed Congress’ new “money saving” strategy into a tax-dollar black hole. Its metabolism was such that it was constantly in search of new kingdoms to consume, and Washington was only too happy to comply. In short order, Title X funding for family planning services rose from about one hundred thirty million dollars to almost one hundred forty-three million dollars. And then in the hyper-inflationary last days of the Republican rule, the entitlements actually tripled. Maternal and child health funding programs rose from about sixty-eight million dollars to nearly seventy-two million dollars. Social Services block grant
funding rose from just over two and one half billion dollars to nearly three billion dollars.\textsuperscript{45} Population Research funding rose from about eighty-seven million dollars to more than one hundred four million dollars.\textsuperscript{46} And Community Services Block Grant funding rose from three hundred twenty million dollars to three hundred thirty-five million dollars.\textsuperscript{47} Without exception, Planned Parenthood has pressed for, and won increases in each of its federal tax entitlements including Title V, Title XIX, and Title XX.\textsuperscript{48}

Planned Parenthood has been able to have its cake and eat it too.

A reputation for conscientious economy and humanitarian philanthropy—however well deserved or undeserved—is a most effective means of overcoming resistance to the use of vast unchecked power for looting the public treasury.\textsuperscript{49} To this day, Planned Parenthood's spending juggernaut remains unchecked.\textsuperscript{50} And to this day, it has a free hand in determining how that spending is to be misappropriated.

Program eligibility is determined at the clinic level, by clinic personnel, according to clinic standards, at clinic prices, governed by clinic guidelines.\textsuperscript{51} Thus, almost anyone can qualify for the subsidies.\textsuperscript{52} If Planned Parenthood says you are poor, then you are poor. If Planned Parenthood says you qualify, then you really do qualify. And Uncle Samuel has to ante up—at a premium rate. No questions asked. No verification process required. No accountability necessary. No checks. No balances. No rules. No regulations.

It's a perfect con game.

Just ask Roxanne Robertson.

\textbf{If At First You Don't Succeed . . . Sue}

Admittedly, Planned Parenthood's path to bureaucratic \textit{Nirvana} has not been without its trials, tribulations, and temporary \textit{Bodhisattvas}. Despite its tenured place on the liberal legislative agenda of Congress, pro-life and pro-family forces have not yielded the ideals of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" without a fight. In 1976, the \textit{Hyde Amendment} prohibited Planned Parenthood's use of Medicaid funds for abortions.\textsuperscript{53} In 1981, a comprehensive federal audit revealed that the organization had misused public funds and engaged in illegal activities, jeopardizing
its tax exempt charitable status. In 1982, the National Eligibility Committee for the Combined Federal Campaign, which solicits charitable contributions from federal employees, was able to temporarily remove Planned Parenthood from its list of beneficiaries. In 1983, the Hatch Amendment was introduced in the Senate and came within eighteen votes of overturning Roe v. Wade's legalized abortion. In 1984, funding for international abortion programs in developing countries was temporarily curtailed by President Ronald Reagan's Mexico City Policy. In 1986, conservatives nearly ambushed Planned Parenthood's IRS non-profit exemption with the Tax Exemption Equity Act. In 1987 and again in 1991, Title X regulations were temporarily stiffened to exclude any and all programs that performed, counseled for, or referred for abortion—what the media and the abortion industry derisively dubbed the "gag rule.

In almost every instance, however, Planned Parenthood was able to reverse its setbacks through a masterful use of the courts. It filed innumerable lawsuits, restraining orders, briefs, tactical delays, and judicial ploys, and, as a result, was able to emerge victorious time after time after time. Regardless of what executive orders the administration handed down, or what managerial decisions the program coordinators made, Planned Parenthood was able to control the outcome through the courts.

George Will has said that "when political movements become anemic, they abandon legislation for litigation, using courts as shortcuts around democratic processes. . . . As liberalism became lazy and arrogant, and then weak and unpopular, it retreated from political arenas to courts." In any case, the combination of flabby and unrestricted family planning appropriations and brilliant judicial maneuvering has enabled Planned Parenthood to hold the American taxpayer hostage and to indulge its every whim and fancy. The combination of legislative and litigal manipulation has enabled it to continue and even expand its medical, racial, and educational malpractice. The combination of Congressional and Court contumacy has, very simply, made it rich. And that is a financial scandal that makes Charles Ponzi's famous "Roaring Twenties Securities Sting" pale by comparison.
At Mammon's Shrine

From its earliest days, the Planned Parenthood movement has been involved in financial scandal. Despite the fact that she received generous donations from some of the richest philanthropies in the world, Margaret Sanger kept her organization on the brink of bankruptcy for years, failing to pay her bills and refusing to give an account of her mismanagement.63

Financial disclosure would have brought disaster upon Margaret and her fledgling operation. She often spent Planned Parenthood money for her own extravagant pleasures.64 She invested organizational funds in the black market.65 She squandered hard-won bequests on frivolities.66 And she wasted the money she'd gotten “by hook or by crook”67 on unrestrained vanities.68

Because of her wastrel indiscretions, she was removed from the Planned Parenthood board several times,69 but the organization found that it simply could not survive without her.70 In the end, Planned Parenthood was forced to take on the character and attributes of its founder. “The love of money is the root of all evil” (1 Timothy 6:10). Violence and greed are inseparable (Proverbs 1:8-19). Thus, Planned Parenthood's evil agenda of violence to women and children cannot be cut loose from the deep tap root of avarice and material lust that Margaret planted.

Sexual immorality, theft, adultery, covetousness, greed, malice, wickedness, deceit, lewdness, lasciviousness, arrogance, blasphemy, pride, ruthlessness, and folly are all related sins (Mark 7:21-22). They commonly coexist (Romans 1:29-31). Certainly they did in the tortured concupiscence of Margaret Sanger. And they still do, in the organization that honors her as pioneer,71 champion,72 and patron saint.73

For example, in 1981, the congressional auditing agency, the General Accounting Office, investigated the financial records of Planned Parenthood and uncovered numerous glaring discrepancies.74 Following in the footsteps of its founder, the organization had abused the public trust, spending tax dollars with a total disregard for decorum, discretion, or legality. It had used public funds to engage in partisan politics.75 It had misappropriated federal money to pay dues to lobbying organizations.76 And it had diverted tax dollars to advocate its legislative and judicial
It appears that graft and corruption are endemic to the Planned Parenthood movement. They always have been. Apparently, they always will be.

Today, government funding provides the majority of revenues at more than half of Planned Parenthood's affiliates. Nineteen different federal appropriations measures pour millions of dollars into its cankered coffers every year through dozens of agencies, programs, and projects. And as a result several of those affiliates have accumulated vast holdings in stocks and real estate, and bank accounts with ready cash reserves in excess of a million dollars each. Not bad for a "privately funded," "social services charity organization."

Still, that isn't even the half of it. The real financial legacy of Planned Parenthood becomes evident only as its establishment, expansion, and recruitment scheme is exposed.

Money Laundering: Establishment

Tax dollars are not supposed to be spent for abortions. They can pay for the building where abortions are done. They can pay for the personnel that counsel, refer, and perform those abortions. And they can pay for the programs that teach, protect, encourage, and support those abortions. But, they cannot actually provide for the abortions themselves.

At least, not yet.

In reality, however, tax dollars are used all the time to brutalize women and butcher their children.

Planned Parenthood not only fleeces the American taxpayer for its educational and birth control services, it has cleverly ferreted out ways to fleece them for abortion as well. Dozens of ways. You see, many of the federal family planning programs are administered through the states and through local communities. Sometimes Washington offers matching funds to those lower magistrates. Sometimes its bequests are simple grants. But either way, how the funds are to be spent is determined locally.

In effect, Planned Parenthood is able to funnel federal appropriations through state bureaucracies, county health departments,
community school districts, and city council administrations for its abortion programs.

In eleven states the use of tax dollars for abortion is quite open and up front.\textsuperscript{89} In others it is rather clandestine.\textsuperscript{90} In only a very few is it completely outlawed.\textsuperscript{91} But in all, Planned Parenthood is actively involved in funneling new tax income sources into its bank accounts.

Mac Lawton lives in North Carolina where state matching funds and service provider grants to Planned Parenthood have been cut off. Despite innumerable lawsuits brought by the five affiliates in the state, lawmakers have stood firm in denying access to state-controlled tax dollars.

But last year when Mac was elected to a county commissioners seat he made a startling discovery. His county had been coerced into a revenue sharing program that benefited Planned Parenthood to the tune of eighty-five thousand dollars a year.

"I just couldn't believe it when I first saw those figures," he told me. "Here we are in the middle of the most conservative section of the most conservative state in the whole country. Who'd have ever guessed that we'd be pouring any money into that abortion business? Much less that much money? Frankly, I was shocked. And outraged."

Mac went to work right away to defund the county's family planning program. "The more I got into it the more I realized that the whole thing was a wicked perversion of the law," he said. "Deals had been struck. Favors had been called in. Heads had been turned. Money had been exchanged under the table. It was a mess."

Needless to say, when Mac began to turn over a few stones and ask a few questions, he began to feel a good deal of political heat. "Several of my colleagues were up to their eyeballs in graft, and my investigations were a real threat to them," he explained. "Their political survival was on the line. They were afraid that I was going to blow the whistle on them. Then all their dirty little deeds would be exposed and the public would discover that their taxes were being used to support Planned Parenthood and to skirt the law."

When he began to receive threatening phone calls and letters, Mac only stepped up his efforts. "If they wanted to play hardball I was ready," he said. "Or at least I thought I was."
A coalition of pro-abortion groups began a public smear campaign, designed as much to stymie Mac's efforts as to mire his character in controversy and conflict. In less than three months he decided to resign rather than to subject his family to any further harassment. "I hated to back out of the fight," he admitted, "but I was out there practically on my own. The thing is, they've got so much money and so many people on the abortion side that it just doesn't seem to matter any more what is right, what is true, what is legal, or what is moral. Money is power. Of course, the maddening thing is that the money they used to drive me out of office was my own money. It was tax money."

Two months after Mac resigned, the other county commissioners voted to increase their funding of the program.

Sadly, Mac Lawton's experience is all too typical.

That is the financial legacy of Planned Parenthood.

**Planned Parenthood and Parents: Expansion**

As many as one third of Planned Parenthood's clients are youngsters living at home. Most of them are not the least bit needy, but because they do not have incomes independent of their parents, they are classified as needy by clinic personnel. Verification is verbal only, so the matter is left entirely to the discretion of Planned Parenthood. Not surprisingly then, ninety-seven percent of them are approved for government subsidies, thus providing a massive infusion of new income for the clinics.

By funneling federal money through state and local governments behind the taxpayers' backs, Planned Parenthood is able to establish its programs. By applying it to teens behind their parents' backs, it is able to expand those programs.

That is why over the years, Planned Parenthood has been the single most vigorous opponent of parental consent laws for birth control and abortion services. It has fought the right of parents to know in the courts and in the media, through lobbying and through legislation, with curriculum in the schools and with campaigns in the communities.

This despite the fact that again and again, parental consent laws have been shown to be an effective deterrent to teen promiscuity, pregnancy, abortion, and venereal infection.
After it enacted a parental notification law, Minnesota saw a twenty-three percent decline in the number of teen births. It saw a forty percent decrease in the number of abortions.

In Rhode Island the abortion rate dropped forty-four percent and the number of teen pregnancies declined thirty percent after the state enacted a parental consent law.

Massachusetts saw a fifteen percent decline in both its total teen pregnancy rate and its total teen abortion rate following the enactment of a parental consent statute.

Planned Parenthood's opposition to parental consent then is purely selfish. As demographer Robert Ruff has argued, "Planned Parenthood simply cannot afford to have parents interfere with its secretive provision of birth control and abortion to their children. To allow such parental intrusion upon its fundamental right to profit from teen promiscuity would cripple it financially."

Only a handful of states have been able to pass parental consent laws that have effectively stood the test of Planned Parenthood's judicial barrage—despite the supposed boost that the Webster, Rust, and Casey Supreme Court cases afforded state staus. But as Leslie Forrester recently discovered, even those "victories" may ring hollow.

Leslie fought hard to get the parental consent law passed in her home state, Rhode Island. Pro-lifers there, anxious to just get anything on the books, compromised the bill to include a judicial bypass clause. "Our lawyers and lobbyists told us that without the clause, the bill simply couldn't pass, much less stand judicial inspection," Leslie told me. "So we put it in as an exception. Basically it said that teens had to get their parents' permission to receive birth control or abortion services unless a judge signed a hardship waiver for her."

When the bill passed and then succeeded in getting through the courts unscathed, most pro-lifers, including Leslie, were ecstatic. "We all felt like we'd won a tremendous victory," she said.

Then about three months later, Leslie received a disturbing phone call. "It was my neighbor down the street," she told me. "Her thirteen-year-old daughter had gotten a three-month supply of birth control pills at Planned Parenthood without her permission, consent, or knowledge. The girl had gotten her judicial bypass with a simple phone call in less than fifteen minutes. It is almost as if law doesn't matter any more. Groups like Planned
Parenthood always seem to find a way to do whatever they jolly well please. And to make a buck while doing it.”

Sadly, Leslie Forrester’s experience is all too typical. And that is the financial legacy of Planned Parenthood.

**Through the Back Door: Recruitment**

Planned Parenthood does not offer comprehensive health care at any of its eight hundred clinics, two hundred affiliates, or fifty chapters in this country. It is in the sex business. It does not treat the flu, or give hearing tests, or perform vaccinations, or set broken bones, or clean teeth, or check for heart murmurs, or assuage coughs. If a treatment, or procedure, or prescription, or therapy, or examination, or remedy, or medication, or regimen, or cure is unrelated to sex, then Planned Parenthood doesn’t offer it. It wants nothing to do with it.

Which makes its latest strategy to place sex clinics in high schools all the more intriguing.

Since it is tough to sell parents at the local PTA or school board meeting on confidential birth control and abortion services for their children, Planned Parenthood has resorted to other tactics. Instead of asking those parents to ante up several hundred thousand additional tax dollars every year to corrupt community standards and teen morals, it simply asks them to provide “good comprehensive health care.” Then later, when no one is looking, it slips its sex services in on the sly.

One school-based sex clinic supporter writing in Planned Parenthood’s journal reported: “Most school-based clinics begin by offering comprehensive health care, then add family planning services later, at least partly in order to avoid local controversy. . . . A clinic limited to providing family planning services, pregnancy testing, prenatal, and post-partum care, and testing for and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases will be unacceptable even to many of the students.”

Another clinic advocate wrote: “The most common strategy adopted to avoid controversy is to maintain a low profile—generally by keeping programs out of sight . . . by relying on word of mouth for recruitment, and by giving names to programs that obscured their functions.”

Thus, to the students, to the parents, and to the taxpaying community at large, the “clinics generally are presented as com-
prehensive, multi-service units that emphasize physical examinations and treatment of minor illnesses."\textsuperscript{117}

But that is hardly their real purpose. Planned Parenthood remember, isn't interested in scrapes and bruises or sniffles and sneezes. It is interested in sex.

That is why Planned Parenthood advises that “when a student comes to the clinic ostensibly for other reasons, the clinic staff can take that opportunity to see if the student wants to discuss sexual behavior and birth control.”\textsuperscript{118}

Planned Parenthood’s former medical director Louise Tryer urges that, “every medical contact should be utilized as an opportunity to offer the option of contraception.”\textsuperscript{119}

The plan is to encourage the clinic personnel “to become aggressive counselors to young women. If, for example, a young patient comes in for \textit{tennis elbow}, the physician should manage to introduce birth control. . . . The conversation should then be directed to use of abortion in the first trimester if traditional methods fail.”\textsuperscript{120}

This kind of deception is the third prong of Planned Parenthood’s scheme to scalp the American taxpayer. By funneling federal money through state and local governments behind the taxpayers’ backs, it is able to \textit{establish} its programs. By applying the money to teens behind their parents’ backs, it is able to \textit{expand} those programs. And by planting covert clinics in the schools behind \textit{everybody’s} back, it is able to \textit{recruit} for those programs.

Without the school-based clinic network, Planned Parenthood’s ambitious plan to achieve “the perfect contraceptive society” becomes little more than a pipe dream.\textsuperscript{121} Without that recruitment program, the financial foundations that the organization has laid over the years through arduous injustice would be washed away by the tides of time.

So the deception is essential. For both the short run and the long run.

Kelley Frias and Roma Ratiglia are classmates in the ninth grade at a large high school in the upscale Orange County suburbs of Los Angeles. When they both decided to try out for the school’s swim team, they went together to the health clinic for a mandatory physical exam.

“One of the first things the nurse asked me,” Kelley related “was whether I was on birth control. When I told her I wasn’t she
proceeded to lecture me about responsibility and health and hygiene and all that.”

“It was really embarrassing,” Roma agreed. “I mean, here I was, just trying to get an okay to swim, and this lady I’ve never even seen before starts to talk about all this really private stuff.”

“Yeah, and then it was like we were some kinda bad kids if we didn’t get on the Pill,” Kelly said.

“I went ahead and took a whole bunch of Planned Parenthood brochures and stuff, just to get her off my back,” Roma said. “Man, you shoulda seen my parents’ reaction when I showed it all to ’em. They hit the roof.”

“Mine did too,” Kelly said.

“But then when they went to talk to the principal,” Roma said, “they just got the run-around.”

“Yeah, well, that’s pretty typical,” Kelly interjected.

“Its pretty weird to think we had to go through all that mess just to get a physical for the swim team,” Roma said. “Remind me never to do that again.”

Sadly, the experience of Kelly Frias and Roma Ratiglia is all too typical.

And that is the financial legacy of Planned Parenthood.

The Day Draws Nigh

Planned Parenthood has plotted its course carefully. It has developed foolproof strategies. It has put together an ironclad get-rich-quick scheme. It has made every contingency. It has covered every base.

But like the rich fool who built ever-larger storehouses to contain his wealth only to discover afterward that his soul was required of him that very night, Planned Parenthood’s day is quickly coming to an end (Luke 12:15-21). In one hour their riches will come to nought (Revelation 18:17). For their judgment shall not long linger, nor will their damnation slumber (2 Peter 2:3).

The Bible makes it clear that the wicked are “greedy dogs,” they “never have enough” (Isaiah 56:11). They are “like wolves ravaging their prey to shed blood, and destroying souls to get dishonest gain” (Ezekiel 22:27). They oppress the poor (Proverbs 22:16) and exploit the weak (Proverbs 22:22), choking out
the truth (Matthew 13:22) and trusting in a lie (Mark 4:19). And yet their gold and silver quickly becomes cankered, the rust of them becomes a witness against their unrighteousness (James 5:3). For God Himself will smite them (Ezekiel 22:13). He Himself will avenge all those who have been defrauded (1 Thessalonians 4:6).

"Riches profit not in the day of wrath" (Proverbs 11:4). And "He that trusts in riches shall fall" (Proverbs 11:28).

The best laid plans at Planned Parenthood will come to ruin simply because ill-gotten gain cannot, will not, and does not last. The organization may attempt to fix prices, manipulate legislation, initiate litigation, launder money, expand markets, and develop recruitment, but in the end, the whole scandalous affair will be exposed. And the people of God will arise and be exalted in their stead.

Give to them according to their deeds, and according to the wickedness of their endeavors; give to them according to their hands; render to them what they deserve. Because they do not regard the works of the Lord, nor the operation of His hands, He shall destroy them and not build them up (Psalm 28:4-5).

**Conclusion**

Honore de Balzac once quipped that "behind every great fortune there is a crime." That is certainly true of Planned Parenthood's great fortune. Its vast wealth has been built not only on the broken bodies of its unborn victims and the ghoulish tortures of its unsuspecting clients, but on the perverse manipulation of the American family and the American taxpayer as well. In short, it has committed unspeakable crimes.

Exposed to the light of day, these crimes would surely elicit a public outcry—a cry for justice, a cry for restitution, and a cry for repentance. Exposed to the light of day, these crimes would surely provoke a groundswell of indignation against Margaret Sanger's cause.

The only question is, will we demonstrate the courage necessary to actually expose Planned Parenthood's crimes? Will we bring its financial legacy to the light of day? Or will we continue to allow it to cower under the dark shade of the forbidden tree?
Beyond the tall, eighth-floor windows, the Houston city-scape darkened to a drab December twilight, then blossomed into the glittering and sparkling gem that is the city's trademark. Below, the crowds had begun thinning along Milam Street. The light changed at Rusk and headlights began moving again, poking through the thin, slanting winter rain. Across the street, a long, weary line of pedestrians dodged puddles and potholes—some straggling home after a full day's grind, some catching a bite to eat before taking on the snarled freeways, others going to assignations over cocktails in boisterous corner bistros. They moved past the endless upward thrust of new, grimly skeletal constructions that seemed to punctuate each block. Stopping, even in the rain, to peer through holes cut into the wooden walkways, they stared at now-quiet earthmovers and watched the arcs, pink and orange, of the helmeted welders up among the girders.

Dana Meier squinted into the night. Rain blew streaks against the window. The nervous glare of neon and halogen refracted a pulsing nimbus of come-on colors.

It was a familiar scene—a daily ritual for her. Over the last several months, Dana had watched the Republic Bank complex, directly across from her window, rise magnificently from the
deep square excavation pit, foot by foot, taking its shape—a guild-hall rakishness in fire-flecked Italian granite. Fascinated by the odd mix of Old World appointments and space-age technology, she noted each day's progress on the building with a cat-like curiosity and a child-like ardor.


"That's the first sign of the onset of senility, you know—talking to yourself into the wee hours of the night." Bill Maxwell, from accounting, had poked his head through the doorway of her office. "Positively foreboding."

"Senility!" she chuckled, taking off her smart, horn-rimmed glasses and turning slowly away from the window. "Thanks a lot, Bill. You know, you have an unfailing ability to inflict a venial wound in passing whenever I least expect it. Charming."

"Well, you know what Wodehouse used to say. When he was past ninety?"

"I'm not sure I'm in the mood. I doubt I'll find this too terribly amusing."

"Oh, sure you will. He said that as long as you're going to get old, you might as well get as old as you can."

"Very funny."

"I thought so."

She turned toward her desk. A drilling lease and several contracts lay there, lounging in a puddle of soft light.

"Come on," Bill beckoned. "Enough already. You've been at it all day. Let's go grab some supper at Ninfa's. Maybe see if we can get tickets for the theater after. What do you say?"

"Thanks, but no thanks, Bill. I've got a couple of things to tie together and then I've got to get home. I'm utterly bushed."

"Oh, baloney. Come on. Loosen up a little, will ya?"

"Really, I'm sorry, Bill. Another time."

"Okay, okay. Try not to make it a late one." He pulled on his trench coat. "Good night. And don't forget to lock up." He went away whistling.

She heard the door close out in the reception area and breathed a deep sigh of relief. She just wanted to be alone. To think.
She shoved the contracts and the lease aside and pulled out the memo she’d received just before lunch. “One hundred percent participation this year,” it read. “No exceptions.”

Apparently, the battle that she’d been waging for the past year was lost. Corporate management had handed down a decree from on high. No ifs, ands, or buts about it.

She wandered through the empty rooms. The small gas pipeline subsidiary that she supervised occupied most of one floor in a handsomely decorated Shell Oil property. And she loved it. The comfortable jumble of rooms, the winking computer terminals, the sagging, over-burdened bookcases on tatty Oriental carpets—it was home away from home. Work was her life. Life was her work.

That memo put a kink in all that, though.

Five years ago, Dana had had an abortion. At Planned Parenthood. A botched abortion. For half a decade, she’d struggled with the physiological effects of a torn cervix. But worse, she’d struggled with the psychological effects of a seared conscience.

Her therapy had been her work. It was all she’d had left. Pro-abortion rhetoric had driven her out of her church. Pro-abortion sentiment had cooled most of her relationships. And pro-abortion politics had dampened her enthusiasm for social activism. So, she had invested everything in her work—her hopes, her dreams, and her passions.

But, now, even her work was threatened—haunted by the morbid and spectral shade of abortion. Company policy dictated that every employee be “strongly encouraged” to participate in the annual donation drive for United Way. And since in many states United Way donations directly benefit Planned Parenthood affiliates as member agencies, those employees were being subtly coerced into financing its birth control and abortion activities.

That was something that Dana just couldn’t tolerate.

At first, she’d tried to simply ignore the policy. She’d explained her personal position to her superiors. But since she was in senior management, they felt that she simply had to set an example for the other employees.

She had fought the policy then. For a year. All the way to the highest corporate level. All the way to the Board of Directors.

The memo was their answer.
“And this is my answer,” she said aloud, reaching across the desk to scan once more, for the thousandth time that day, her letter of resignation. As much as she loved her job, as much as she depended on it, she would not sacrifice her integrity for it. She would not sacrifice the children for it.

She walked out into the night. The Houston streets glistened like blood on gold.

**Looking a Gift Horse in the Mouth**

It is bad enough that Americans *unwillingly* give millions of dollars every year to Planned Parenthood with our taxes. But that we *unknowingly* give millions more with our charitable giving is tragic.

We are a generous people. Every year we give almost fifty billion dollars to various private charities. And that doesn’t even count the nearly forty billion dollars in support we lend to our local churches and synagogues, and the additional five billion dollars we ante up in foundation and corporate giving.

We give to schools, to hospitals, to relief agencies, to research institutes, to social service providers, and to community projects. No people has ever given more freely to the needy, the suffering, or the oppressed. Of course, we give out of great wealth and comfort. And, often, we give foolishly, hastily, and unthinkingly. Still, we give. And we give freely.

When thousands and even millions languished in hunger and desperation in Communist Ethiopia, we responded with more than three hundred million dollars in emergency aid. When the Soviet-occupied Ukraine faced calamity and disaster following the Chernobyl nuclear accident, we dispatched teams of medical workers and nearly twelve million dollars in relief. When the oppressive regimes of Nicaragua, Viet Nam, Cambodia, Zimbabwe, Cuba, and Angola slaughtered thousands of their citizens and drove thousands of others into exile, we fed them, clothed them, housed them, nursed them, and trained them, spending millions of dollars in refugee camps and immigration centers all around the globe.

We support everything from the March of Dimes to the PTA, from the United Way to the YMCA, from Hands Across America to UNICEF, simply because we want to help.

And that is good.
Unfortunately, we are so willing to give, that we fail to ask enough questions. Or we fail to ask the right questions. And that is bad.13

The fact is, huge sums of the money we faithfully donate every year to those charitable organizations wind up in the hands of Planned Parenthood.14 To the tune of seventy million dollars.15 About one-third of that comes from United Way and other community chest combined charities.16 Another one-third comes from corporate grants and foundation bequests.17 And the final one-third comes from miscellaneous endowments, matching gifts, individual donations, and direct-mail solicitation.18

Most people simply don’t realize that when they give they are actually aiding and abetting Planned Parenthood’s Eugenic agenda. Only occasionally does someone—like Dana Meier—ask questions, raise objections, and voice concerns. Only occasionally is the conventional wisdom—that donations will be applied where most needed—actually challenged. And, thus, only occasionally do charitable contributions end up going where they were originally intended.19

Program Sweepstakes

From its earliest days, Planned Parenthood wooed corporations, foundations, celebrities, and charities in the hopes of securing operating capital.

Margaret Sanger rubbed shoulders and shared beds with the radical chic in the roaring twenties—the artists, actors, writers, musicians, and activists in New York’s Village and London’s Fabian Enclave.20 She shrewdly used her proximity to them to promote her revolutionary ideas.21 And she carefully networked with them to gain contacts in the political and financial world.22

Single-minded in her commitment to the cause, her persistence and unflagging enthusiasm began to open doors. She was tireless and driven. Some even said she was “possessed”—which, no doubt, she was.24 At any rate, her crusade quickly became a cause célèbre. By the thirties, corporation grants and foundation bequests began to pour the money into her coffers.25 By the forties, she had won the endorsements of such notables as Eleanor Roosevelt26 and Katherine Hepburn.27 By the fifties, she had attained international renown and counted among her supporters Julian Huxley,28 Albert Einstein,29 Nehru,30 John D.
Rockefeller, Emperor Hirohito, and Henry Ford. The sixties brought her tremendous fame and acceptance. Before her death, she received the enthusiastic endorsements of former Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower. She won over arch-conservatives like Mrs. Barry Goldwater, and arch-liberals like Margaret Mead—ideology didn't seem to matter.

In addition, Margaret Sanger was a tenacious organizer. Her days with the Socialist Party and the Communist Labor movement not only trained her in effective propaganda techniques, they taught her how to solicit, train, and activate volunteers. Using these skills, Margaret literally combed the country, and ultimately the world, searching for donors. She left no stone unturned. She applied for every grant, appealed to every foundation, made presentations to every corporation, and appealed to every charity. She wanted a piece of every philanthropic pie, and she would go to great pains to make her case to any who would listen. She was a dogged promoter. And, like the persistent widow in Christ's parable, she was so unrelenting, she prevailed more times than not (Luke 18:1-8).

Perhaps Margaret's greatest coup came when she was able to gain for her organization an IRS charitable tax-exempt status. That move put Planned Parenthood in the same legal category as a local church or a philanthropic society. All donations became tax-deductible, and that made solicitation and donor development all too easy.

The fund-raising apparatus that she set in place has only grown in size and sophistication in the years since she died. It has garnered hundreds of celebrity endorsements. It has affiliated with every major national and international professional and educational association even remotely related to Planned Parenthood's work. And it has tapped into the fiscal lifeblood of virtually every major charitable resource available.

The United Way

Founded in 1918, United Way of America is the world's largest cooperative coalition of charity organizations in the world. Its multi-million dollar annual effort not only distributes much needed cash to local private-sector service providers, but it provides program support and consultation in the areas of "fund-raising, budgeting, management, fund distribution, planning,
and communications." It conducts major national media cam­
paigns, produces films and audio-visual presentations, adminis­
ters staff and volunteer development training, and publishes
dozens of booklets, pamphlets, and directories every year. It
assists local service groups by conducting company-wide and
community-wide campaigns and cultivating increased corporate
giving through donor development programs. United Way
funds help organizations like the Salvation Army, Goodwill, the
Red Cross, and Big Brothers do what they do best: care for the
needy. Though recent charges of misappropriation of funds,
strong-arm tactics, and management skimming has sullied its
image, the philanthropic legacy of United Way is unquestionable.
Millions of dollars every year are used to strengthen the work of
drug rehabilitation, medical research, emergency food relief,
sheltering the homeless, crisis counseling referrals, legal services
to the poor, and job re-training for the unemployed.

But they also go to Planned Parenthood—millions of dollars
worth every year. Even those few local United Way groups that
have yielded to pro-life pressure over the years, and removed
Planned Parenthood as a direct recipient of funds, continue to
support hot lines, family counseling centers, health service agen­
cies, and community associations that counsel for abortion and
refer clients to the organization's abortuaries.

Nationally, United Way, over the years, has strongly defended
its commitment to Planned Parenthood and has consistently upped
its share of the annual fund-raising bounty. It has even gone so
far as to entangle itself in Planned Parenthood's political spats,
even to the point of risking its own tax-exempt status.

Jim Singleton is an executive with an international oil tool
manufacturing company based in Oklahoma City. Always ac­
tive in civic affairs and community development, he has long
been an enthusiastic sponsor for United Way's corporate pro­
gram. "I would personally go to each of our employees," he said,
"and encourage them to give. I would help executives in other
companies set up incentive programs. I even did some volunteer
work at the regional United Way office."

Jim's enthusiasm was dampened significantly when he dis­
covered that the funds he had worked so hard to raise were being
used for Planned Parenthood's abortion and birth control
crusade. "I went to several of the directors and board members
to see if there was any possibility of dropping that support," he said. "But they were all thoroughly committed to maintaining the status quo. The thing is, they were very defensive. It was like this subject had already been driven into the ground and they weren't even willing to discuss it any more."

Of course, they didn't want to lose Jim altogether, so they proposed an alternative. "They told me that if I didn't want my donation to go to Planned Parenthood," he remembered, "all I had to do was to ask for a negative designation. They really wanted me to stay with the program. The trouble with negative designations, though, is that Planned Parenthood gets a set percentage of the United Way total. That is pre-arranged. So, no matter how I designate or don't designate, the very fact that I've made a United Way contribution raises the total that Planned Parenthood gets. Negative designations are, thus, a sham. My protest would be irrelevant."

Frustrated, Jim pulled his company out of the program. "The whole reason I worked so hard for years to raise money was to help people. To learn that my efforts were actually having the opposite effect was terribly sobering. Now, every time I see one of those United Way ads during football games, I have to wonder how many other folks there are in the same boat—wanting to help, but doing it in a completely misbegotten fashion. It is tragic."

The March of Dimes

Founded in 1938 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the March of Dimes is one of the world's premier private-sector health and medical associations. Dedicated to the prevention of birth defects, it raises nearly millions of dollars each year for education, research, and service. It works to improve maternal and newborn health. It makes basic clinical grants to hospitals and universities for perinatal and genetic study programs. It sponsors medical conferences, coordinates symposia, and publishes literature. Since it successfully led the fight to cure polio during the early fifties, the March of Dimes has become a symbol of hope for millions of parents all around the globe.

But it has also placed itself at the forefront of the Planned Parenthood movement.

Since the early sixties, it has increasingly turned its attentions away from curing genetic disorders and birth defects to
detecting and eliminating them. And, as a result, amniocentesis and abortion have become its chief concerns, consuming a vast majority of its funding. Instead of trying to solve the problem of birth defects, the March of Dimes now disposes of those problems by funding "search and destroy" missions.

Eighty-eight percent of all March of Dimes geneticists favor abortion-on-demand. Seventy-one percent argue that if amniocentesis diagnostic tests prove a child to be defective, he should be terminated regardless of the stage of pregnancy. A large number even revealed that they were involved in live fetal experimentation and fetal harvesting. This despite the persistent claims of the organization that it is "abortion neutral."

The connection between the March of Dimes and Planned Parenthood is not just philosophical. Many faithful donors would be shocked to discover that the money they have given over the years to "help fight birth defects" has actually wound up in Planned Parenthood coffers.

In 1980, for instance, the March of Dimes gave more than one-half million dollars to a Planned Parenthood abortionist for a major research project. The results of the study, published in Obstetrics and Gynecology, have been widely heralded in pro-abortion circles and selectively circulated by Planned Parenthood affiliates all around the country.

In response to pro-life criticism of its close relationship with Planned Parenthood, the national office of the March of Dimes called its critics "ideological zealots eager to invent new enemies."

Today, the kinship between the two groups is friendlier than ever. They display and distribute each other's literature. They refer clients back and forth to each other's programs. They cooperate in sponsoring genetic research and perinatal medical conferences. And they support each other in their political lobbying efforts.

Joseph Resnick was for years a dedicated March of Dimes fund-raiser. And for good reason. "I felt that I owed a deep, personal debt to the March of Dimes," he told me. "See, in 1954, when I was fourteen-years-old, an epidemic of polio myelitis was sweeping across America. My mother and my younger sister both were stricken. For weeks, both of them lingered near death."
Then they were both confined to an iron lung for months on end. Today, though, thanks to the March of Dimes, they are both healthy, productive citizens. My mother uses a cane to walk, but my sister shows no effects of the disease at all.”

Joseph’s mother and sister were both a part of a March of Dimes therapy program for almost a year and a half. “Without the March of Dimes, neither of them would have had a chance of recovery,” he said.

Not surprisingly, Joseph tried to show his gratitude to the organization by working hard every year in its fund-raising drive. “My wife and I ran our local campaign six out of seven years in the seventies,” he said. “But then, around 1978 or 1979, I began to detect a major shift in the organization’s interest and concern. Then, in 1981, my pastor showed me a number of surveys and studies that implicated the March of Dimes in major abortion and amniocentesis research, in cooperation with groups like Planned Parenthood. Well, I was outraged. Not at the March of Dimes. But at my pastor! I was angry that he would even entertain the thought that the organization I’d worked so hard to support was compromised morally.”

Joseph immediately set out to vindicate the organization and prove his pastor wrong. “The next couple of weeks were very painful for me. I made a number of calls. I wrote letters. I read articles. I made inquiries. And, in the end, I was forced to admit that my pastor was right. I was devastated. Here was an organization committed to life, promoting death. It broke my heart. I felt ashamed, embarrassed, and humiliated.”

For some time, Joseph tried to work within the organization to change the Planned Parenthood orientation. But all to no avail. “I finally had to come to the conclusion that the March of Dimes was just not going to change. That it was unchangeable and unredeemable.”

Fortunately, Joseph’s commitment to fighting birth defects did not end with his break with the March of Dimes. Today, he is actively involved with The Michael Fund, an internationally respected pro-life genetic research foundation. “Now, I feel like I’m actually accomplishing what I’d been trying to do all those years,” he said. “Now, I’m actually helping kids live and live better.”
Corporate Philanthropy

For some time, America's biggest companies have been involved in an almost suicidal mission to underwrite radical and leftist causes. Overseas, their trade support is virtually the only thing that has kept the Communist dictators in the Soviet bloc afloat economically. Their diplomatic meddling has toppled Western Alliance regimes on four continents. And, at home, their charitable giving has bankrolled the febrile militants in innumerable anti-business, anti-family, and anti-life groups.

In a remarkable study of the Forbes 100 companies, a University of Texas professor, Marvin Olasky, found that seven of every ten corporate dollars contributed for public policy purposes go to such liberal groups. For instance, he reported that grants from Aetna, Allied Stores, AT&T, Atlantic Richfield, Dayton Hudson, Exxon, General Motors, RCA, and Westinghouse help support "social and recreational events" for lesbians, and programs designed to "eradicate homophobia.

Chevron, Travelers, Standard Oil, Cigna, U.S. West, Bell Atlantic, Ford, and the Sun Company all have made major grants to groups "teaching aggressive use of federal regulatory agencies to extort concessions from business." Defense contractors like Honeywell support leftist peace organizations that disseminate false propaganda against itself and its industry.

Although virtually all of the organizations of the left—from the Urban League to Peace Child, and from the NAACP to Kinheart—benefit from free enterprise's generosity, pro-abortion feminist groups seem to be the big winners. Nineteen of the top twenty-five companies support radical feminist organizations. The revolutionary National Organization for Women, with fewer than 250,000 members nationwide, received large bequests from American Express, Ameritech, Bell South, Burlington Northern, Chrysler, Coca-Cola, Dart & Kraft, Eastman Kodak, Goodyear, Johnson & Johnson, Manufacturers Hanover, Merrill Lynch, J. C. Penney, Philip Morris, R. J. Reynolds, and Xerox.

Of course, amidst this morass of confusion and corruption, Planned Parenthood has found a way to profit, and profit handsomely. Companies such as AT&T, Citicorp, Dayton Hudson, Morgan Guaranty Trust, Standard Oil, and Union Pacific gave more than one hundred thousand dollars to the organization's...
abortion and birth control crusade. Corporate giving has proven to be so lucrative over the last several years that several Planned Parenthood affiliates have full-time corporate development staffs that do nothing but wine and dine executives in the hopes of wooing more dollars into its Midasized vaults. Efforts by organizations like Life Decisions International have done much to educate the public and corporate boards alike—the result has been that several major companies have dropped their support of Planned Parenthood—but millions of dollars every year still travel from board rooms to abortion clinics.

Ruth Demmik is a systems engineer for a large Silicon Valley manufacturing company. She is also very active in the pro-life movement, donating ten hours a week to counsel battered women and abused children at her church’s crisis outreach center. Last year, she was instrumental in helping her pastor organize a community-wide protest of Planned Parenthood.

To her dismay, she discovered just two weeks before the march that her company was actively cooperating with a National Organization for Women and Planned Parenthood effort to diffuse the effects of the picket. “The pro-abortion people went around to business and civic leaders soliciting donations,” she said. “But they didn’t just ask for donations straight out; instead they asked contributors to pledge a certain amount for every pro-lifer that turned out for the picket. In other words, the bigger our turnout, the greater their gain. When they came to our company, they asked for a corporate matching grant: however much they could raise out in the community, matched dollar for dollar by the company. Double or nothing. Well, our board said yes. I was flabbergasted.”

Ruth went from boss to boss all the way up the corporate ladder, trying to get the board to reverse their decision. “They had their minds made up, though,” she said. “They didn’t want me to confuse them with the facts. I don’t think I’ve ever been more frustrated in all my life. Here I was, working for a company that was working against everything that I believe in. That’s a tension that will have to be resolved soon. One way or another.”

Family Foundations

During the first three decades of this century, a number of family-controlled philanthropic foundations were established. The era of the industrial tycoon and the manufacturing monopoly
was also the era of graduated taxes and heavy governmental regu-
lation.\textsuperscript{95} Family foundations were, thus, not merely altruistic,
they were very pragmatic hedges against high tax rates and
magisterial interference.\textsuperscript{96} In other words, they provided the
rich with exemptions and loopholes.\textsuperscript{97}

That is not to say, of course, that the foundations did not ac-
complish great things that contributed to the public good. They
did, and often still do.

The Carnegie Foundation, established in 1911 by Andrew
Carnegie, almost single-handedly endowed the public library
movement in the United States.\textsuperscript{98} With assets of nearly half a
billion dollars at work every year funding universities, hospitals,
and community development projects, it has been a remarkable
institution of help and hope.\textsuperscript{99}

The Rockefeller Foundation, established in 1913 by John D.
Rockefeller, likewise has endowed, over the years, innumerable
worthy philanthropic projects.\textsuperscript{100} It has endowed hunger relief
projects worldwide.\textsuperscript{101} It has established hospitals and health care
facilities on every continent.\textsuperscript{102} And its support of educational
progress has led to the development of research centers, the pub-
lication of academic advances, and the subsidizing of private in-
stitutes and universities.\textsuperscript{103} With assets of almost a billion dollars
at work every year, it has been a powerful force for good.\textsuperscript{104}

The Ford Foundation, established in 1936 by Henry Ford,
has greatly advanced the public welfare by trying to identify and
contribute to the solution of significant national and international
problems.\textsuperscript{105} Interested primarily in improvement of educational
quality and opportunity in schools, colleges, and universities, it
has endowed alternative learning projects, scholarship pro-
grams, and research management seminars.\textsuperscript{106} With assets of
nearly three billion dollars at work every year, it, too, has wrought
tremendous grace around the world.\textsuperscript{107} Dozens of other family
foundations—established by the Mellons, the Astors, the Morgans,
the Johnsons, the Roosevelts, the Kennedys, the Vanderbiltts,
and many lesser-known clans, like the Kelloggs, the Dukes, the
Watumuuls, the Motts, and the Kaufmans—have similarly exer-
cised considerable charitable effect.

Sadly, though, much of the good work that these foundations
have done has been at best minimized, at worst nullified, by their
counterproductive contributions to organizations like Planned
Parenthood. Instead of supporting organizations, institutions, services, charities, and ministries that strengthen the family, lower taxes, produce individual initiative, and promote health and justice, they tend to endow the narrow, sectarian, and destructive programs and pogroms of the Left.

The Rockefellers began funding Planned Parenthood in 1952 when Margaret Sanger charmed John D. Rockefeller at a lavish tête-à-tête in her Tucson mansion. In 1959, the Fords began giving and, before long, virtually all the others had followed suit. Since then, millions of dollars have been pumped into the organization by their foundations. As nimble as a dry leaf in the whirlwind, Planned Parenthood has been able to sidestep its ideological commitment to Revolutionary Socialism long enough to stretch a supplicating hand toward America’s greatest capitalists. And, often enough, to make it as rich as they.

Gerald Wilson is an heir to a multi-million dollar privately held business. For years, he fought the patronage of the Left, generally, and Planned Parenthood specifically, in his family’s philanthropic foundation. But the task turned out to be both thankless and fruitless. In the end, he was forced to endow his own foundation, one that he could control. “It is terribly frustrating,” he told me, “to see so much opportunity for good translated into so much opportunity for evil.”

He especially bemoaned the vanity, graft, and manipulation that is almost inherent in the endowment process. “In many ways,” he said, “the system is just a series of unholy alliances, meant for right, destined for wrong.”

**Unholy Alliances**

Throughout the Bible, warnings against entering into unholy alliances are abundant and clear:

> “Woe to the rebellious children,” declares the Lord, “who execute a plan, but not Mine. And make an alliance, but not of My Spirit, in order to add sin to sin” (Isaiah 30:1).

Do not enter the path of the wicked, and do not proceed in the way of evil men. Avoid it, do not pass by it; turn away from it and pass on. For they cannot sleep unless they do evil; and they are robbed of sleep unless they make someone stumble. For
they eat the bread of wickedness, and drink the wine of violence. But the path of the righteous is like the light of dawn, that shines brighter and brighter until the full day. The way of the wicked is like darkness; they do not know over what they stumble (Proverbs 4:14-19).

How blessed is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked, nor stand in the path of sinners, nor sit in the seat of scoffers! But his delight is in the Law of the Lord, and in His Law he meditates day and night (Psalm 1:1-2).

Whenever men have violated this basic principle, catastrophe has resulted. What was originally intended for good, for security, and for justice, ended in evil, destruction, and oppression.

Lot entered into an unholy alliance with Bera, king of Sodom and, as a result, lost all his wealth, his position, his home, and, finally, his family (Genesis 19:1-26).

Asa entered into an unholy alliance with Ben-Hadad, king of Aram and, as a result, emptied both the royal and the temple treasuries, virtually bankrupting the kingdom (1 Kings 15:16-19).

Jehoshaphat entered into an unholy alliance with Ahab the apostate king of Israel and, as a result, nearly lost his life to deception and intrigue (1 Kings 22:24-33).

Having failed to learn his lesson, Jehoshaphat entered into still another unholy alliance, this time with Ahab's son, Ahaziah, and, as a result, the entire royal fleet was lost in Ezion-geber (2 Chronicles 20:35-37).

Ahaz entered into an unholy alliance with the kings of Assyria despite the dire warnings of the prophet Isaiah and, as a result, the nation became impoverished and subject to pagan pilfering and perfidy (2 Chronicles 28:1-19).

The first century Church at Thyatira entered into an unholy alliance with the wanton prophetess Jezebel and, as a result, sickness, tribulation, and pestilence befell the people in great waves of judgment and retribution (Revelation 2:18-29).

Again and again, this truth is driven home. When men ally themselves with the wicked and their causes and their institutions, heartache and calamity are the only possible outcomes.

All the good that the United Way or the March of Dimes or corporate benevolences or family foundations attempt is com-
pletely subsumed in impotence and failure due to their unholy alliance with Planned Parenthood. One bad apple spoils the whole batch. One bad recipient spoils the whole fund.

Do not be bound together with unbelievers; for what partnership have righteousness and lawlessness, or what fellowship has light with darkness? Or what harmony has Christ with Belial, or what has a believer in common with an unbeliever? Or what agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the temple of the living God; just as God said, “I will dwell in them and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. Therefore, come out from their midst and be separate,” says the Lord. “And do not touch what is unclean; and I will welcome you. And I will be a father to you, and you shall be sons and daughters to Me,” says the Lord Almighty. Therefore, having these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1).

**Conclusion**

Katharine Hepburn usually does not attend gala fundraisers, but when Planned Parenthood recently decided to honor the actress and her late mother for their outspoken support of the organization, she was more than willing. Proceeds from the star-studded dinner, priced at five hundred to one thousand dollars a ticket, benefited Planned Parenthood’s abortion and birth control programs.¹¹¹

With all the rich and famous, the chic and sophisticated, the high and the mighty, and the best and brightest in tow, Planned Parenthood once again demonstrated its ability to attract the support of the very people who should know better. The very people who should be using their power, privilege, and prestige to impact the world for good, side instead with the minions of darkness.¹¹²

But Planned Parenthood likes them all the better for it.
THE CAMERA BLINKED:
THE MEDIA LEGACY

Note that pendants lose all proportion. They never can keep sane in a discussion. They will go wild on matters they are wholly unable to judge. Never do they use one of those three phrases which keep a man steady and balance his mind; I mean the words (1) After all it is not my business. (2) Tut! Tut! You don’t say so! And (3) Credo in Unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Factorem omnium visibilium atque invisibilium; in which last, there is a power of synthesis that can jam all their analytical dust-heap into such a fine, tight, and compact body as would make them stare to see.  

Hilaire Belloc

Always in wanton pursuit of the new, the costly, and the conspicuous, New York City is a paragon of haute. Ironically, though, a stroll through its streets always yields a king’s ransom of Proustian memories as well.

Like Venice and Genoa, it is a sea city. And like the Venetians and Genoans of old, its leaders have always been eager to display their wealth, puissance, and aplomb by building the avante—grand polazzi and campanili—as monuments to themselves. But, they—again, like the Venetians and Genoans—also have a fine eye for preserving the ephemera that define bygone eras. It is almost as if, seeking connections in an “insecure country,” they clutch at the relics of a stable and secure nostalgia. It is almost as if, still groping for the ever-elusive “radiant way,” they belay against the rock-solid certainty of the past.

And so the view of Central Park is shared equally by the Citicorp Center, the Seagram Building, and the Waldorf-Astoria. The crooked little streets of Greenwich Village are shared
equally by the Bobst Library, the Provincetown Playhouse, and the Washington Mews. The grand promenade down Fifth Avenue is shared equally by the Empire State Building, the Trump Tower, and St. Patrick's Cathedral.

The city's gestalt of raw tension and hungry ambition calves its persona like an Arctic berg—splinters drifting away. The eclecticism is everywhere evident. It is a bright matrix of contradiction unfolding across a tantrum of logic and illogic, of antiquity and modernity, of substance and illusion, of objectivity and bias, of bondage and freedom, and of honesty and deception.

That odd juxtaposition, that almost schizophrenic New York yin-yang, is nowhere more evident than in its mid-town information agribusiness. With a proud legacy dangling like a medallion upon its chest, the New York media—which is the national media—simultaneously belies that legacy with a brash bravado of contemporaneity.

In other words, it ain't what it seems to be.

Why Don't We Know?

"This kind of country can't work," says television journalist Charles Kuralt, "unless people have a reliable way of finding out what's going on."3

The news media is supposed to be that reliable source of information.

But it's not.

And, perhaps, that is part of the reason why this country doesn't work very well right now.4

Much of the information in this book is probably surprising, even shocking, to you. "Could this possibly be true?" you may be asking yourself. "If it is, then why haven't I heard it before? Why don't I already know about it?"

The answer is that the media has acted as a filter, screening out most of the information that could "damage" groups like Planned Parenthood "in the public view."5 Instead of helping people find out what is going on, it is insuring that they don't. And won't. And can't.

The media has an agenda. It imposes its values on its audience. As Herbert Gans, renowned media analyst, has argued, "Journalism is, like sociology, an empirical discipline. As a result, the news consists not only of the findings of empirical
inquiry, but also of the concepts and methods which go into that inquiry, the assumptions that underlie those concepts and methods, and even a further set of assumptions, which could then be tested empirically if journalists had the time.\textsuperscript{6}

In other words, the media operates according to its own perspectives and presuppositions. It retells the news according to its bias, according to its worldview.

That, in and of itself, is not necessarily bad. That, in and of itself, does not make the media "unreliable." All of us have inescapable presuppositions that make genuine objectivity impossible. We all have worldviews.

Our worldview is simply the way we look at things. It is our perspective of reality. It is the means by which we interpret the situations and circumstances around us. Whether we know it or not, we have a worldview. Everyone does. Alvin Toffler, in his landmark book \textit{Future Shock}, said, "Every person carries in his head a mental model of the world, a subjective representation of external reality."\textsuperscript{7} This mental model is, he says, like a giant filing cabinet. It contains a slot for every item of information coming to us. It organizes our knowledge and gives us a grid from which to think. Our mind is not open and our viewpoint is not impartial. "When we think, we can only do so because our mind is already filled with all sorts of ideas \textit{with which} to think," says economic philosopher E. F. Schumacher.\textsuperscript{8} These more or less fixed ideas we think with make up our mental model of the world, our frame of reference, our presuppositions—in other words, our worldview.

"A worldview is a map of reality," author James Sire tells us. "And, like any map, it may fit what is really there or it may be grossly misleading. The map is not the world itself, of course, only an image of it, more or less accurate in some places, distorted in others. Still, all of us carry around such a map in our mental make-up, and we act on it. All of our thinking presupposes it. Most of our experience fits into it."\textsuperscript{9}

When writers write, when journalists report, and when broadcasters go on the air, they communicate from the peculiar perspective of their own worldview. From the stories they select, to the way they present them, from the evidence they show, to the time they afford them, newsmen not only slant the news, they \textit{make} the news. They decide what we know. And what we don't know.
Investigative reporter Geraldo Rivera has said that objectivity “was invented by journalism schools. It has very little to do with real life.”\textsuperscript{10}

Robert Bazell, of NBC, proclaims that “objectivity is a fallacy. Journalism almost always is about a point of view.”\textsuperscript{11}

Ace reporter Linda Ellerbee agrees: “We report news, not truth. There is no such thing as objectivity. Any reporter who tells you he’s objective is lying to you.”\textsuperscript{12}

And NBC’s senior analyst, Irving R. Levine, asserts that it is “the reporter who has to determine ultimately what is valid and what is not, whose arguments are the most persuasive and whose are not.”\textsuperscript{13}

There is no such thing as news free of editorial comment.\textsuperscript{14}

To accuse the media of bias has become an almost indisputable truism. Christian media pioneer Marlin Maddoux stated the obvious when he said that after a comprehensive analysis of American network news coverage, he was forced to conclude that:

There wasn’t a nickel’s worth of difference among the Big Three—ABC, CBS, and NBC. The stories were basically the same; the bias in their coverage was the same. It became frighteningly clear that the television screen was dominated by the radical left. And opposing views were virtually closed out.\textsuperscript{15}

The reason for this is actually quite simple: the media—like any other discipline or profession—operates according to its own perspectives and presuppositions. It has its own unique agenda. Herbert Gans, a renowned media analyst has said that:

\begin{quote}
Journalism is, like sociology, an empirical discipline. As a result, the news consists not only of the findings of empirical inquiry, but also of the concepts and methods which go into that inquiry, the assumptions that underlie those concepts and methods, and even a further set of assumptions, which could then be tested empirically if journalists had the time.”\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Again, that, in and of itself, is not necessarily bad. What \textit{is} bad is the \textit{way} that the media slants the news. What \textit{is} bad is \textit{how} the media decides what news becomes the news. What \textit{is} bad is
the "unreliable" perspective that the media has. What is bad is its worldview.

God's condemnation of ancient Israel came because "their ways were not His ways, and their thoughts were not His thoughts" (Isaiah 55:8). They did not have a worldview shaped and informed by God's Truth. Instead, they "did what was right in their own eyes" (Judges 21:25).

Similarly, the news media today is driven by a worldview that is entirely alien to the Biblical standards of truth, justice, mercy, and integrity. Its ways are not His ways, and its thoughts are not His thoughts. Instead, it does what is right in its own eyes. And, having eaten from the forbidden tree, it has become like a god in its own sight, knowing good and evil (Genesis 3:5, 22).

According to the now famous study of the media conducted by three political scientists, Linda Lichter, Robert Lichter, and Stanley Rothman, the overwhelming majority of newsmen in major media outlets are hostile to Biblical values. 17 Only eight percent are regular church-goers. 18 Eighty percent believe that homosexuality is a perfectly acceptable alternative lifestyle. 19 Eighty-four percent said that they did not have strong aversions to adultery. 20 Ninety-two percent oppose traditional family structures. 21 And a full ninety-seven percent take a clear pro-abortion stand. 22

Meanwhile, nearly seventy percent endorse the idea that the media should actively promote its ideas, values, and perspectives. 23 As Frank Schaeffer has argued:

With such widespread agreement about basic issues, which can only stem from the same philosophic outlook, it hardly takes a conspiracy for the media machine to speak with one smothering voice. 24

Even if we had not been told that the media was overwhelmingly pro-abortion, 25 we might have guessed it—after all, if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it probably is a duck.

Thus, as the Los Angeles Times reported:

It's not surprising that some abortion-rights activists would see journalists as their natural allies. Most major newspapers support
abortion rights on their editorial pages, and two major media studies have shown that eighty to ninety percent of U.S. journalists personally favor abortion rights. Moreover some reporters participated in a big abortion rights march in Washington last year, and the American Newspaper Guild, the union that represents news and editorial employees at many major papers, has officially endorsed freedom of choice in abortion decisions.\textsuperscript{26}

The article went on to assert:

Responsible journalists do try to be fair, and many charges of bias in abortion coverage are not valid. But careful examination of stories published and broadcast reveals scores of examples, large and small, that can only be characterized as unfair to the opponents of abortion, either in content, tone, choice of language, or prominence of play.\textsuperscript{27}

The fact is, the media’s Milli Vanilli lip-synching of the Planned Parenthood party line provides stark evidence that it has tossed any semblance of impartiality or objectivity to the four winds.

But that is not the most disturbing aspect of the media’s coverage of Planned Parenthood. Bias is a fairly straightforward vice. What is even more insidious than an absence of factual objectivity is an absence of professional integrity—journalists have been ventriloquists instead of orators.

The essence of science is precision. The essence of sentiment is presumption. Because the media has difficulty distinguishing one from the other, it is both precise and presumptuous—but about exactly the wrong things. When it comes to their coverage of Margaret Sanger’s Eugenic dystopianiam, the media has been very scientific and sociological about sentimental things, but very sentimental about scientific and sociological things.

They have, in short, not checked the facts, not verified the data, and not understood the issue. They have invariably taken the easy way out by retrofitting news releases from pro-abortion lobbyists and publicists and simply adding their byline.

Instead of working harder, they shouted louder. Instead of striving for professional excellence, they have settled for professional expediency. Instead of attempting to grasp their subject matter, they have grasped at straws—and straw men.

That kind of dull dishonesty is either a sign of faulty discipline or faulty ethics—or maybe both.
The Seven Deadly Sinners

Along with the "corporatization" of American culture in general has come the "corporatization" of the media in particular. Amazingly, almost half of the national news and information outlets are concentrated in the hands of just seven corporate monoliths: CBS, RCA, CapCities, the New York Times, the Washington Post, Gannett, and Time-Life. And this despite the explosive growth in recent years of alternative networks, cable systems, and satellite technology.

All seven of these communications monopolies have maintained a consistent pro-abortion editorial policy over the years. Their strict advocacy of Planned Parenthood's agenda has become as much a hallmark of their profile as their slick promotions and high-tech imagery.

CBS. Founded in 1928 by William Paley, the Columbia Broadcasting System operates one of the country's three major commercial television and radio networks. With two hundred-sixteen affiliated television stations and four hundred twenty-eight affiliated radio stations, it is able to spread its message to all fifty states, reaching as much as ninety-six percent of the United States population.

In addition to that, CBS, in partnership with Sony, is the world's largest producer, manufacturer, and marketer of recorded music. It makes and distributes computer software and on-line databases. It publishes magazines and books for educational, consumer, and professional markets. It publishes music, produces music videos, develops and produces motion pictures, makes and distributes videocassettes, programs cable television, and develops videotext services. If it has to do with communications, CBS is in it. And it is in it with a vengeance.

Sadly, this vast power and influence has been marshalled to Planned Parenthood's cause. Besides the consistently slanted newscasts by the likes of Walter Cronkite and Daniel Rather, and documentaries by Mike Wallace and Ed Bradley, CBS has even used prime-time entertainment programming to bolster its propaganda predilection. Forget "family values." CBS is simply not interested.

RCA. One of the great electronics pioneers, RCA is, today, a formidable global communications giant. Besides engaging in
the research, manufacture, distribution, sale, lease, and servicing of everything from television receivers to electro-optic devices, from video-cassette equipment to audio records, tapes, and CDs, and from commercial communications satellites to military electronic hardware, the company operates the NBC network, with two hundred affiliated television stations and more than five hundred radio stations. In addition to that, the company operates a system of satellite and submarine cable circuits linking the continental United States directly with numerous foreign countries and overseas points. It offers telex services, data transmission programs, telegram transmissals, teleprinter circuits, and high speed multi-point line data communications services for terminal communication and point-to-point lines to host computers.

For years, the NBC network has dominated radio and television broadcasting. It has more often than not controlled the airwaves and dictated programming fashions. And, not surprisingly, it has imposed its leftist perspective on virtually everything that it broadcasts. News reporting under the aegis of Tom Brokaw has constantly reinforced the Planned Parenthood party line. Its entertainment programming has fallen in line as well with rabid pro-abortion pieces profiled on numerous prime-time sitcoms and dramatic series. During the 1992 elections, when his network's cheerleading for the pro-abortion Democratic ticket became obvious to even the most epistemologically unconscious observer, Brokaw quipped, "Bias, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder." But it has gotten so bad that now, we all behold it.

CapCities. For many years, ABC was the stepchild of national radio and television broadcasting. A distant third in ratings, earnings, and affiliates throughout the sixties and seventies, the network perpetually lagged behind CBS and NBC, exerting little influence in either news or entertainment. But, then, a series of dramatic events in the eighties, including a merger with the vast Capital Cities Communications Group and a bold and innovative programming twist, catapulted the network into the number one position. It grew to more than two hundred affiliated television stations and nearly two thousand affiliated radio stations.

With its new-found strength, the company began to build its own communications empire. It invested in cable and subscription
television programming, buying ESPN, the Arts and Entertainment Network, and Lifetime. It began publishing nine big-city daily newspapers and forty smaller community papers. It branched out into home video markets, magazine publishing, institutional investing, and music recording, distribution, and sales. For a time, it even owned one of the world's largest Christian publishing companies, in an attempt to cash in on that market as well.

Like the other networks, though, ABC has used its position to catechize its audiences with the Planned Parenthood message. In news reports by Sam Donaldson and Peter Jennings, and documentaries by Hugh Downs and Barbara Walters, the pro-abortion message has been driven home again and again. And although its entertainment programming has tended to be unconscious of social obligations, political ideologies, or moral consequences — focusing almost exclusively on the Nielsen ratings — several shows have regularly portrayed a pro-abortion spirit.

The New York Times. Although not even the best selling paper in New York City, the Times is far and away the most influential newspaper in the country, perhaps in the world. Founded in 1851, the venerable old publishing concern now reaches more than a million homes a day, with a worldwide distribution system.

In addition, it owns and operates eighteen other daily and weekly papers throughout the United States. It publishes five major magazines, including Family Circle, the largest-selling women's magazine in the country. It runs three television stations and is a major force in radio broadcasting. It operates its own news service which has grown to be the leading supplemental news wire in the country, distributing material from the Times to more than five hundred dependent publications around the globe. It owns two publishing companies, an information bank, an editorial syndicate, two companies that manufacture audiovisual materials for schools, colleges, and universities, a microfilm processor and distributor, and four of the world's largest paper mills. As Bernard Nathanson has said: "This is not exactly your average Mom 'n Pop country weekly that James Stewart takes over when he resigns in a sanctimonious huff from the corrupt Big City Daily and turns the weekly into the rural equivalent of the Manchester Guardian after three weeks of Herculean effort and the devoted and adoring efforts of June Allyson."
Over the years, the *New York Times*, and its various ancillary organs, has been the primary forum used by Planned Parenthood to spread its merciless message. Virtually every new campaign, every new strategy, every new rhetorical ploy, and every new emphasis has been launched in its pages. Full-page advertisements, op-ed articles, feature stories, editorial cartoons, literature reviews, public service announcements, and opinion page commentary have been scrupulously exploited for the cause.

*The Washington Post.* Like the *New York Times*, the privately-held *Washington Post* is a communications giant, with annual sales of almost $600 million and more than five thousand employees. Besides its Capitol Hill flagship, it owns three newspapers, including the *International Herald Tribune.* It operates television stations in several major markets. It owns its own paper mill and a newsprint manufacturing company. Most importantly, though, it publishes one of the two most influential news magazines in the world: *Newsweek.*

Both the *Post* and *Newsweek* steered fairly clear of the abortion issue throughout the sixties. With only a few obligatory reports on various court cases and medical developments, the issue was otherwise ignored. But, then, with the dawning of the seventies, they allied themselves unreservedly with Planned Parenthood. They began to laud the heroics of pro-abortion advocates as "humane and compassionate" and to denigrate pro-lifers as rabid "missionaries" and "crusaders." By the nineties, both publications had become overtly pro-abortion and anti-Christian.

*Gannett.* The nation's largest newspaper chain, with some eighty-eight daily newspapers, was founded in 1906 by an upstate New York entrepreneur, Frank Gannett. By the time he died in 1957, he had acquired twenty-three very profitable small-town papers in five states. His successors built the company from that small base into an international phenomenon. Today, the company's local newspapers have a combined circulation of more than six million copies a day. Its shareholders have enjoyed eighty-two consecutive quarterly earnings gains—more than twenty years of uninterrupted growth in profits. It owns thirty-two print sites besides its eighty-eight local news facilities, including one in Switzerland and another in Singapore. It has seven television stations and twelve radio stations. And it runs
the largest outdoor advertising and billboard company in North America. But its greatest asset is USA Today, the phenomenally popular national newspaper known for its bright colors, short articles, breezy, upbeat style, and TV-shaped dispensers. Since it was launched on September 15, 1982, USA Today has exploded onto the American scene, attracting nearly five million readers a day, more than any other newspaper in history.

Even though Gannett has become a new and powerful presence in worldwide communications, it has not carved for itself a unique editorial niche. Thus, despite its attempt to produce news with "an unrelenting cheerfulness" and a "journalism of hope," USA Today, and the other Gannett outlets, have toed the Planned Parenthood line. The militant pro-abortion tack of Gannett's papers have, at times, even surprised Planned Parenthood with their vehemence and intolerance.

Time-Life. With annual sales of nearly three billion dollars, and more than 25,000 employees, Time-Life is the biggest, richest, and most powerful of all the communications monoliths.

It owns and operates six magazines, including Life, Fortune, Money, People, Sports Illustrated, and its flagship, Time. It runs the Book-of-the-Month Club and the Quality Paperback Book Club. Its other publishing ventures include the Little, Brown, and Company, the New York Graphics Society, the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and the Angelina Free Press. It operates the Home Box Office cable network, as well as forty-one local cable TV companies. It has a controlling interest in several transportation businesses, mortgage companies, insurance concerns, steel mills, music publishers, real estate agencies, hotel chains, and computer software manufacturers.

Time first covered the abortion issue in 1965 with an openly sympathetic article in the medicine section. But that was only a hint of things to come. By 1967, it had burst out of the closet and declared itself "unequivocally in favor of the repeal of restrictive abortion laws." From that day forward, Time has remained resolutely in the Planned Parenthood vanguard with the rest of the mega-press.

Frank Schaeffer has said: "Given the concentration of the media's power in relatively few hands, and their shared values,
it's nearly impossible to avoid the conclusion that the media represents a monolithic, unelected force in public life: a self-assured, self-perpetuating elite that relishes its power and would have more."98

**On the Offensive**

The cooperation between the seven major media monopolies and Planned Parenthood was vividly illustrated in a series of coordinated stories during the eighteen months between October 1985 and March 1987 and again during the summer of 1992.99

Concerned that the grassroots pro-life movement was at last gaining an upper hand in the abortion battle, Planned Parenthood put together a well-orchestrated, heavily-financed, no-holds-barred, negative public relations campaign.100 The campaign was aimed at the more than three thousand counseling centers established by pro-lifers in order to offer women, in the midst of crisis pregnancies, abortion alternatives and genuine help.101

The centers, which were typically small, poorly financed, and run by volunteers, apparently had begun to substantially cut into the abortion trade.102 But, perhaps more importantly, they had also begun to steal Planned Parenthood's thunder. The centers were receiving favorable publicity from many quarters for their “helpful contributions to the process of developing informed choice on abortion.”103

Planned Parenthood argued that many women were making appointments at the alternative centers thinking that they were actually abortion clinics. From time to time the volunteers at a few of the centers would allow that illusion to persist in the hopes of gaining a fair hearing on the facts of fetal development and the risks of abortion procedures. Although such tactics were extremely few and far between, Planned Parenthood saw in them a golden opportunity.104

Amy Sutnick, a public information associate for Planned Parenthood of New York City, wrote several news releases and put together a press packet labeling the alternative centers as “bogus” and “deceptive,” luring clients in by “masquerading” as abortion clinics and then “terrorizing” them with “horror stories,” “gory photographs,” and “brainwashing techniques.”105
Sutnick approached a sympathetic reporter at the New York tabloid, the Daily News, with her packet and a proposal for a story. The reporter took the assignment and published a piece written along the lines of Sutnick's news releases, often even using the same wording. 106

With the Daily News article now in hand, Sutnick began to call on other pro-abortion journalists in the city. Before long, she was able to place similar stories on virtually every New York television station, including the network affiliates, and in the other New York newspapers. 107

Soon the strategy began to snowball. Sutnick sent her growing pile of clippings along with her press packet to Planned Parenthood affiliates, clinics, and chapters around the country so that they could contact their local media outlets. Meanwhile, she also contacted all the various women's magazines.


But the big break came when both Newsweek and USA Today translated Sutnick's now-stuffed portfolio into major stories. 110

The author of the two USA Today pieces, entitled "Bogus Abortion Clinics Draw Legal Fire" and "Anti-Abortionists Masquerade as Clinics," later admitted that she had not even visited any of the alternative centers. 111 The only women she talked to were provided by Planned Parenthood. 112 And a full quarter of the material was direct quotation and paraphrase from Sutnick. 113

The Newsweek story was built around dozens of independently verified news reports from all across the country—actually, the incestual progeny of Sutnick's diligent labors. 114 It described the pro-life volunteers working in the alternative centers as "radical" and "militant," but "clever" "fundamentalists" who used "scare tactics" in order to "jolt" women out of the abortion decision. 115 Entitled "Clinics of Deception: Pro-Lifers Set Up Shop," the article's synergism with Planned Parenthood's campaign was perfectly choreographed.
Sutnick’s sleight-of-hand trick triggered an avalanche of concern, stimulated a bevy of lawsuits, and manufactured a major news event.

**RU-Kidding?**

Joseph Schumpeter once asserted, “the first thing a man will do for his ideals is lie.” The media’s Homeric trumpeting of the virtues of the French abortion drug RU-486 is clear evidence that Schumpeter was right.

Speaking at an important contraceptive technologies conference recently, Planned Parenthood’s RU-486 strategist, Marie Bass, crowed that “press coverage really is good, if you think about it—sometimes I worry that it’s almost too good.” The major media outlets, she confided, had, for the most part, entirely misunderstood the safety, complexity, and mechanism of the drug. And ironically, that was good news. Bass said she “almost felt like celebrating.”

She had every right to. That happy misunderstanding, after all, was due in great part to her own expert effort to shape and coordinate press coverage of the drug.

In late 1988, her company, Bass & Howes, a high-powered Washington, D.C., lobbying firm—spun off from Planned Parenthood in the same way that the Alan Guttmacher Institute was—formed the Reproductive Health Technologies Project. A loose coalition of international pro-abortion organizations, it acts as a clearinghouse for information on RU-486 and as the command center for the dissemination of that information to the media.

Marie Bass was at one time the political director of the National Abortion Rights Action League—and thus closely allied with Planned Parenthood. Her partner, Joanne Howes, was actually a Planned Parenthood staffer—serving as the organization’s chief lobbyist in Washington. Together they brought excellent credentials to the task of sanitizing the public perception of pharmaceutical child-killing.

Early on, they developed a five-fold strategy to hasten media acceptance of RU-486:

- Emphasize the possibility that the drug could very well end the whole public abortion struggle by making clinic protests obsolete;
• Emphasize the dearth of other contraceptive options available—particularly in comparison with what is available in other parts of the world;

• Emphasize the issues of privacy, ease, safety, choice, and freedom, rather than of abortion and politics;

• Emphasize the possibility of other medical benefits of the drug, such as treatment of breast cancer and Cushing's Syndrome;

• Emphasize the threat to the freedom of ongoing medical research that a rejection of the drug might bring.  

Apparently, sometime thereafter, Bass and Howes began to supply key media contacts with a series of carefully developed press kits highlighting each emphasis. The kits included sample stories, charts, graphs, photos, and interviews.

Charles Durran, a reporter for a major daily newspaper in the Midwest told me: “Those press kits were impressive. In fact, they were a lazy reporter's gold mine. Everything you needed for a really fantastic story—or series of stories—was right there at your fingertips. I don’t think I’ve ever seen anything like it.”

Before long, stories began appearing in newspapers and magazines all over the U.S. and Britain—many of them were rumored to bear a striking resemblance to the materials in the press kits, while some were copied verbatim.  

_Time, Newsweek, The Economist_, and virtually every major daily newspaper began to trumpet the five emphases that Bass and Howes had outlined. As if on cue, they quoted the various tenets of the credo without a hint of incredulity.

They claimed the drug was safe. They claimed it was easy to use. They claimed it could short circuit all the political animosity. They claimed it could cure all manner of other ills. They claimed it was a litmus test for scientific freedom. And they claimed it was merely an advanced contraceptive—and everybody knows that only religious cranks and impotent curmudgeons could possibly be against that.

Of course, such fictions rank right up there with Elvis sightings, Martian landings, Beatles reunions, and Ginsu knife commercials. But the tragedy is not just that the stories were untrue but that they were cribbed from someone else's script. The media
is so lame and helpless in this matter that it cannot even make up its own lies—it is forced to borrow them from others. The only thing worse than getting a failing grade on an exam is cheating to do it.

Such poor deportment is even beneath hypocrisy. After all, hypocrisy is the homage which error pays to truth. But uninformed sloth pays homage to no one and no thing.

Such power should not be taken lightly. It colors everything it touches. And when that power is cavalierly couched in sluggishly bamboozlery it is all the more frightening:

When pride comes, then comes shame; but with the humble is wisdom. The integrity of the upright will guide them, but the perversity of the unfaithful will ultimately destroy them (Proverbs 11:2-3).

**News and Truth**

The damage inflicted by the machinations of Marie Bass and Amy Sutnick has been tremendous. The momentum that pro-life forces have gained over several years of diligent work and compassionate care has almost immediately been undermined. And Planned Parenthood and its child-killing cohorts have thus been able to embezzle the cultural moral high ground.

The reason for this is that the media, by the sheer force of its smothering dominance, has successfully erased the distinction between *news* and *truth*.

More than half a century ago, Walter Lippman, the godfather of modern journalism, argued that “the function of *news* is to signalize an event; the function of *truth* is to bring to light hidden facts, to set them into relation with each other and make a picture of reality on which men can act.” He concluded that if the public required “a more truthful interpretation of the world they lived in, they would have to depend on institutions other than the press.”

But we have not depended on other institutions. We have accepted the media’s *news* as *truth*. Thus, it has ceased to function as a news reporter and has become, instead, a news maker, or, more to the point, a *truth* maker. In a very real sense, the media actually defines our reality.
James Hitchcock, professor of history at St. Louis University, has said:

What is presented in the media, and the way in which it is presented, are for many people the equivalent of what is real. By determining what ideas will be discussed in public, the media determines which ideas are to be considered respectable, rational, and true. Those excluded from discussion, or treated only in a negative way, are conversely defined as disreputable, irrational, and false. The media has the power almost to confer existence itself. Unless a belief or an institution receives some recognition, it does not exist. Even those who know that the media is fundamentally hostile to their values nonetheless court media recognition as a way of achieving status in the public eye.131

From the media we discover what is important and what is not. We learn what is tragic and what is heroic, what is commendable and what is dishonorable, what is sober and what is humorous.132 We learn how to dress, what to eat and drink, and what kind of car to drive. And, of course, we learn how we should think about public issues, how we should react to personal crises, and how we should live our lives.133

In his scathing critique of ethics in journalism, *The News at Any Cost*, Tom Goldstein suggests that not only are reporters the “kingmakers” and “kingbreakers” of our day, they are the “unacknowledged legislators” of our none-too-pluralistic society.134 They shape cultural mores, he says, affect political contests, create the parameters of public issues, unveil hidden truths—whether true or not—and dictate the social agenda, all on a two-hour deadline! They function not only as the judge, jury, and executioner in the courtroom drama of life, but also as both public defender and criminal prosecutor.135

Such power should not be taken lightly. It colors everything it touches.

When Karen Denney first began to see the news reports and the articles denigrating the pro-life cause, she simply shrugged them off as just one more series of pro-abortion attacks on the truth. As a volunteer counselor at an alternative center, she had seen any number of media distortions and moral tirades aimed at her work. “At the start, it seemed like it was just the same old propaganda,” she said.
But when the reports persisted and even intensified, Karen began to have serious doubts. When she saw the article in *Newsweek*, those doubts became a full-fledged crisis of confidence. “I just began to wonder if I’d gotten myself involved in some sort of fringe group,” she said. “I began to think that we were all just a bunch of kooks or something. I began to question all my presuppositions. I was depressed for days. It was like there was an emotional and theological and intellectual tug-of-war going on inside me. I didn’t want last night’s newscast or last week’s news magazine to determine truth and error for me, but it was hard to overcome the feeling that we pro-lifers were flying in the face of everything reasonable, sensible, sane, and normal.”

Fortunately, Karen had the emotional stamina and the intellectual honesty to weather the storm of confusion and examine the facts rationally. “I finally settled down and reconciled the whole thing,” she said. “In the end, I was thankful that I’d gone through it all. I came away with a new understanding of the power and influence of the media. And I came away with a whole new commitment to stand for the truth that sets us all free.”

Sadly, very few people have the inclination or the determination to wrestle with the issues as Karen Denney did. And so they take the media’s version of reality at face value.

Very few people have the time, the resources, or the ability to ferret out the facts that challenge the media’s version of reality. Dozens of issues could be cited to illustrate this:

*The Birth Dearth.* The media has incessantly harped on the dangers of the “population explosion” for more than a quarter-century. Somehow, though, it has failed to report that all of its earlier estimates have proven to be utterly erroneous. Somehow it has failed to report that, instead of facing a “population explosion,” we are now facing a “birth dearth.” There is, indeed, a “population crisis,” but, instead of having “too many people,” the crisis is that we don’t have enough.

If the media refuses to report the facts, if it continues to bolster its alternate “reality,” how can people ever know the truth?

*The Chinese Holocaust.* Wowed and enamored with the “new” China, the media has somehow overlooked one of the most insidious massacres in man’s long and turbulent history. In its few obligatory passing mentions of the Communist government’s coercive abortion and infanticide programs, the media has, at
best, mumbled incoherently about the “harsh necessities” of reducing the country’s burgeoning birth rate. If hardly the kind of reporting you’d expect of a genocide that claims as many as fifty million lives every year, is it?

If the media refuses to report the facts, if it continues to bolster its alternate “reality,” how can people ever know the truth?

Post-Abortion Syndrome. The media has posed itself as a champion of women’s rights, as an advocate of women’s issues. Somehow, though, it has failed to report the fact that a majority of women who undergo abortions suffer significant psychological distress. One study showed that sixty-two percent had become “suicidal” following the procedure, twenty percent had actually made attempts, thirty percent began drinking heavily, forty percent experienced nightmares, and twenty percent had undergone a “nervous breakdown.” And yet, the most we hear from the media is that women are “ambivalent” towards abortion.

If the media refuses to report the facts, if it continues to bolster its alternate “reality,” how can people ever know the truth?

Fetal Harvesting. The horrors of Nazi Germany are consistently vilified by the media, even today. Somehow, though, it has failed to report that the very kinds of atrocities we roundly condemn Hitler’s doctors for are today practiced routinely by upstanding physicians and researchers in America’s hospitals and universities. Babies that survive abortions are subjected to bizarre and barbaric live experiments. Human tissue is bought and sold on the open market for everything from cosmetics to pharmacology. Fetal organs are often artificially sustained and then later “harvested” for commercial consumption. Somehow we are led to believe that abortion only involves the woman’s body, that the “product of conception” is little more than a “blob of tissue.”

If the media refuses to report the facts, if it continues to bolster its alternate “reality,” how can people ever know the truth?

For all intents and purposes, they can’t.

The Press as a Moral Force

The media scene has not always been a scythe of unrighteousness. Once upon a time, long ago and far away, the press actually took a vital role in quashing the first abortion movement
in America.\textsuperscript{153} It took a strident stand against the racist and Eugenic programs of Margaret Sanger.\textsuperscript{154}

During most of the nineteenth century, abortion was an open commercial enterprise.\textsuperscript{155} In fact, between 1830 and 1880, abortionists advertised their services quite freely.\textsuperscript{156} And they did a booming trade.\textsuperscript{157}

One woman, Ann Lohman, built her abortion business into an incredibly profitable enterprise with clinics in Newark, Providence, Boston, Philadelphia, and five more in New York.\textsuperscript{158} She operated a mail-order business that ranged across the continent, with dozens of salesmen up and down the East Coast peddling her abortifacient pills.\textsuperscript{159} Known professionally as Madame Restell, Lohman spent as much as sixty thousand dollars a year on advertising—an incredible amount in that day—to support her empire.\textsuperscript{160} By the 1870s, she was living in the lap of luxury, with an opulent mansion on Fifth Avenue, a magnificent horse-drawn coach, and a social standing of the highest order.\textsuperscript{161}

Lohman was not alone in her prosperity. Abortion was big business.\textsuperscript{162} Any number of opportunists cashed in. The dogma of Mammon leaked into the whole land, touching the air with benediction.\textsuperscript{163}

At the time, there was not even a semblance of a unified Christian opposition to the trade which claimed as many as a million young lives a year.\textsuperscript{164} A number of doctors complained that the public was apathetic and unaware, and that even the "clergy, with very few exceptions, have thus far hesitated to enter an open crusade against criminal abortions."\textsuperscript{165} One pro-life leader of the day contended that ministers "have been very derelict in handling this subject too delicately and speaking of it too seldom."\textsuperscript{166} He wondered if anyone would ever take leadership in alerting and arousing the public.\textsuperscript{167}

The \textit{New York Times}—then owned and edited by committed Christians—stood in the gap, grasped the ring, and took the leadership. In 1870, it published an editorial entitled "The Least of These Little Ones." Filled with Biblical references, editor Louis Jennings complained that the "perpetration of infant murder . . . is rank and smells to heaven. Why is there no limit of punishment?"\textsuperscript{168} Again, in 1871, he wrote that abortionists "have openly carried on their infamous practice . . . to a frightful extent, and have laughed at the defeat of respectable citizens who have vainly attempted to prosecute them."\textsuperscript{169}
Late that year, he gave one of his top-flight reporters an undercover assignment in order to expose the most prosperous abortuaries and their medical malpractice. The explosive story that resulted, "The Evil of the Age," by Augustus St. Clair, launched the Times into a moral crusade that would not end until pro-life legislation, outlawing abortion and protecting women, was passed in every state in the Union. Not only that, it triggered a wave of support that engulfed much of the rest of the media, and saw to the prosecution of the most offensive abortionists, including Lohman.

Clearly, the media has come a long, long way on the downgrade in the last one hundred years.

**The Cloak of Conspiracy**

Absalom was the passionate third son of David, King of Israel. His personal comeliness and charisma was matched in greatness only by his undisciplined ego and ambition. Thus, he was forever getting himself into trouble and embroiling the palace in controversy and scandal (2 Samuel 13:38-39; 14:28). When finally his father received him back into favor, the old king was repaid by a plot against his throne.

And Absalom used to rise early and stand beside the way to the gate; and it happened that when any man had a suit to come to the king for judgment, Absalom would call to him and say, "From what city are you?" And he would say, "Your servant is from one of the tribes of Israel." Then Absalom would say to him, "See, your claims are good and right, but no man listens to you on the part of the king." Moreover, Absalom would say, "Oh, that one would appoint me judge in the land, then every man who has any suit or cause could come to me, and I would give him justice." And it happened that when a man came near to prostrate himself before him, he would put out his hand and take hold of him and kiss him. And in this manner Absalom dealt with all Israel who came to the king for judgment; so Absalom stole away the hearts of the men of Israel (2 Samuel 15:2-6).

Playing the part of the people's advocate, Absalom stole away their hearts. With delicious whisperings and twisted murmurings he plied circumstances in his favor. With great skill and
evident adroitness he slanted the facts, edited the truth, and filtered the news, always with an eye toward the ratings.

Then, at the peak of the game, he upped the ante.

Now it came about at the end of forty years that Absalom said to the king, “Please let me go and pay my vow which I have vowed to the Lord, in Hebron. For your servant vowed a vow while I was living at Geshur in Aram, saying, ‘If the Lord shall indeed bring me back to Jerusalem, then I will serve the Lord.’” And the king said to him, “Go in peace.” So he arose and went to Hebron. But Absalom sent spies throughout all the tribes of Israel, saying, “As soon as you hear the sound of the trumpet, then you shall say, ‘Absalom is king in Hebron.’” Then a messenger came to David, saying, “The hearts of the men of Israel are with Absalom” (2 Samuel 15:7-10, 13).

Absalom covered his conspiracy with a cloak of righteousness. His conniving, malignant intentions were obscured by a thoroughly benevolent, pious exterior.

And the king, taken as he was by that exterior, didn’t know what was happening until it was too late. By then he was too compromised to arrest the crisis. He was forced to flee (2 Samuel 15:14). He had to learn the hard way—as Eve had before him—that just because someone or something looks “good,” “desirable,” or even “delightful,” is assurance of precious little (Genesis 3:6). He had to learn the hard way, as Paul would after him, that just because someone or something comes disguised as an “angel of light” or a “servant of righteousness,” is no guarantee of anything (2 Corinthians 11:14-15).

What Absalom did was to take very real concerns and issues and blow them out of proportion, twisting the situation to serve his own ends: the overthrow of the reigning administration. He took facts, figures, and anecdotes and molded them and shaped them to fit his own predisposition. He called on all his skill, all his charisma, all his personal attractiveness, and all his inside contacts. He played on the emotions of the people. He showed an impeccable sense of timing. In short, he manipulated the situation masterfully. He exploited an aged king, a complacent administration, and latent discontent, making news and making truth by the sheer force of his proficient willfulness—not at all unlike the modern news media and its masterful manipulation of the facts to give credence to its particular socio-political causes.
Absalom wreaked a lot of havoc. So has the media. But there is one thing that neither of them counted on: The good guys always win in the end. There may be defeats along the way. There may be major setbacks from time to time. Tranquility may be dashed. The faithful may be sent into flight. But only for a time. In the end, the cause of the righteous will be upheld (Job 27:16-17). The true truth will come out (Ezekiel 36:33-36). God's people will prevail (Matthew 6:10). If—and that is a big "if"—if they will only do right, cling to the blessed hope, and stand steadfast on the very great and precious promises of God (Joshua 1:7-9).

Absalom abandoned the good legacy of his past, shielding his wickedness with a cover of sophistication and moral indignation. Similarly, the media has abandoned the good legacy of its past, shielding its tainted advocacy of Planned Parenthood with a smothering cover of professional objectivism and market manipulation.

In the end, though, it will have its due.

A fool's lips bring strife, and his mouth calls for blows. A fool's mouth is his ruin, and his lips are the snare of his soul. The words of a whisperer are like dainty morsels, and they go down into the innermost parts of the body (Proverbs 18:6-8).

Conclusion

Nat Hentoff was at one time a card-carrying establishment media spokesman. He was a board member of the ACLU. He was a renowned advocate of civil liberties and radical liberal causes. And he was a tenured journalist with the left-of-gauche newspaper, the Village Voice.

But then he began to cover several widely publicized infanticide and abortion cases. And he did the unthinkable: he began to deviate from "the orthodox liberal position that women cannot achieve their basic rights without the right to kill inconvenient fetuses."\textsuperscript{172}

Hentoff's colleagues were shocked.\textsuperscript{173} He was quickly dropped from the board of the ACLU.\textsuperscript{174} And pressure from the left beckoned for him to return to the fold. To conform.

It seems that freedom of the press in this country is little more than theoretical these days.

And about that, Planned Parenthood couldn't be happier.
The great cleavage throughout the world lies between what is with, and what is against, the faith.

Hilaire Belloc

When Karl Marx and Frederick Engels began their Communist Manifesto with the eloquent sentence, “A specter is haunting Europe,” they were at least partly right. A specter was indeed haunting Europe—though it was not quite the one that those pampered armchair revolutionaries thought.

In fact, a specter was not just haunting Europe—it was vexing the whole earth. And it still is.

Even apart from the contemporary brutalities of abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia, the twentieth century has been the bloodiest, cruelest, most destructive in all of human history. Genocidal atrocities have hideously pockmarked the best efforts of modern humanistic societies with an unimaginable barbarism: Auschwitz, Campuchea, Gulag Oranov, Entebbe, Tiananmen, Addis Ababa, Tehran, Beirut, Hanoi, and Baghdad.

But the most devastating nightmare of all may yet still be unfolding in the Balkans—in the mountainous territories once forcibly federated together as the Socialist Federation of Yugoslavia.

Long a hot-bed of terrorism, torture, and triage, those stunningly beautiful lands along the Adriatic—just east of Italy, south of Austria, and north of Greece—are even now convulsing under the strain of a bitter ethnic war that has tragically gripped
the world's full attentions. Every week new images of harsh concentration camps, callous racial purging, and ruthless bombing and strafing haunt the morning papers and evening newscasts.

Once described as "a single nation with two alphabets, three religions, four languages, five nationalities, six republics, and seven borders," the erstwhile pluralistic multi-culturalism of Yugoslavia is now little more than "a canker of hatred, war, and devastation." As the predominantly Christian nations of Slovenia and Croatia take in a flood of refugees from Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Dalmatia fleeing from Serbian death squads, the rest of the world watches uneasily and wonders how something this terrible could actually be happening—again.

"In some ways, it was inevitable that such horrors should erupt here," Nada Kovacic told me.

"Anyone who is surprised by the ferocity of this conflict simply has not been paying attention to the many warning signs—all too evident to us for several decades now," agreed Ruza Vejzovic.

A thick morning fog settled into the valley that halved the old city center of Zagreb—the capital of Croatia. From the broad vantage of the Trg Jelacic—a vast open square that had been a hub of commercial activity since the twelfth century—the high medieval Gornji Grad was barely visible. Actually, the great cathedral spires of Sveti Stephen's that pierced the dense shroud were the only indications that beyond the busy Republique business district the city continued to rise sharply toward the ancient twin settlements of Gradic and Kaptol.

Nada and Ruza, both students at the University of Zagreb, were making their way through the narrow streets of Croatia's capital toward those venerable spires for the morning Matins liturgical service. They turned aside momentarily to purchase a few crisp pastries at a quaint shop just off the square. Standing there, across from the oddly modernesque glass crenelations of the Dubrovnik hotel—favored by many of the foreign journalists covering the war—they were once again confronted with the painful plight of their homeland. A film crew was loading equipment into a battered mini-van.

The two women told me that the current obsession of the Western media with "ethnic cleansing," "nationalistic rivalry," "guerilla terrorism," and "entrenched aggression" is in a very real
sense hypocritical. “In the past when the Serbian bureaucrats who controlled the Communist regime targeted certain undesirable and unfit ethnic elements for extermination, the West actually applauded their cutting-edge political-correctness,” said Ruza. “But that was when the operation was carried out by Planned Parenthood. Now that renegade vigilante and para-military groups have taken it over, the West suddenly looks askance.”

“The same ethnic communities that are victimized by genocidal tyranny in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Dalmatia today were long ago targeted by the sanitary totalitarianism of Eugenic abortion and Malthusian social-planning,” said Nada. “In the end, both forms of prejudicial cruelty achieve the same result.”

“When Tito invited Planned Parenthood to join the government in order to form a special division of the Yugoslav Health Service in 1967, immediate plans were made to target certain sectors of our society. Besides troublesome concentrations of Croats and Slovenes, the scattered Moslem, Catholic, Lutheran, and Bohemian Reformed communities in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Dalmatia were especially hard hit,” she explained.

Indeed they were. With a population of only 22 million, Planned Parenthood-run government clinics averaged between four hundred and eight hundred thousand abortions every year during the last decade of centralized rule. The ratio of abortions to births was nearly four to one. And some seventy percent of those were performed on the targeted Yugoslav minorities outside Greater Serbia.

“What people don’t realize is that this awful holocaust has been going on for quite some time,” said Nada. “Now it is executed with bombs and bullets; before it was executed with pills and procedures. But either way, the undesirables are eliminated. They suffer, regardless.”

They had reached the great stone gate of the Kamentia Vrata where a busy shrine was illuminated by a blaze of votive candles. Dozens of peasants, college students, priests, and shopkeepers had gathered—as they did each dawn—for prayer and contemplation. After a brief but tense silence that seemed to bear the weight of untold sorrows, Nada spoke in flat, silent tones. “I remember how my mother was ostracized, how my father was
denied advancement in the factory, how my brother was ridiculed at the gymnasium where he attended classes, all because our family was religious—Bohemian Reformed, or Husite—and thus refused to submit to Planned Parenthood's schemes. We were not a political family, but when it came to the integrity of our family, my father drew the line. I remember only too well the night I saw my mother dragged away by the police to the clinic for coercive abortion and sterilization—because she had already borne the officially sanctioned limit of two children. I remember her agony, her tears afterward. I remember the pallor of death that hung over our home. I remember and shudder.

“It is no worse for army thugs to shoot a child than for medical thugs to poison a child,” Ruza lamented. “But the selective moral outrage of the West has somehow been diverted from the latter and fixed on the former. That kind of ethical relativism will surely be the undoing of countries like America. God is not mocked.”

Evangelistic Zeal

Planned Parenthood has spread its deleterious effects on virtually every continent and in nearly every nation all across the globe. Besides the organization's American federation—which funded 156 projects in some 36 countries around the world—there are an additional 134 indigenous “family planning associations.” Each of these national entities are in turn members of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, headquartered in London.

The behemoth budget requirements for these sundry interrelated organizations—running into the tens of billions of dollars every year—are supplied for the most part by twelve major industrial nations including the United States, Canada, Britain, Sweden, Germany, and Japan. When government policies prohibit direct funding for Planned Parenthood’s Eugenic abortion, sterilization, and contraception programs—as was the case with the United States during the bygone Reagan-Bush years—funds are merely laundered through one of any number of United Nations agencies: WHO, UNICEF, UNESCO, or UNFPA.

This remarkable and lucrative global outreach was spawned in 1925 when Margaret Sanger hosted an “international neo-Malthusian and birth control conference” at the tiny Hotel
McAlpin in New York. She had grown increasingly concerned that societal, civic, and religious pressure might snuff out her nascent Eugenic ideals. As she asserted:

The government of the United States deliberately encourages and even makes necessary by its laws the breeding—with a breakneck rapidity—of idiots, defectives, diseased, feebleminded, and criminal classes. Billions of dollars are expended by our state and federal governments and by private charities and philanthropies for the care, the maintenance, and the perpetuation of these classes. Year by year their numbers are mounting. Year by year more money is expended . . . to maintain an increasing race of morons which threatens the very foundations of our civilization.

She was especially distressed by the dim prospects that democratic suffrage afforded her dystopic plans to implement a universal system of inhuman humanism:

We can all vote, even the mentally arrested. And so it is no surprise to find that the moron's vote is as good as the vote of the genius. The outlook is not a cheerful one.

If there was little for her to cheer about in America, there was even less on the international scene. Europe, decimated by the Great War, was desperate to reverse its dramatic decline in population, while the developing world was no less desperate to stoke the hopeful fires of progress with aggressive population growth. Sanger's message was falling on increasingly deaf ears.

By convening dozens of like-minded "neo-Malthusian pioneers" from around the world, she was hopeful that together they would be able to circle the wagons, to "develop a new "evangelistic strategy," and ultimately to reverse the tide of public opinion and public policy—and thus "to keep alive and carry on the torch of neo-Malthusian truth."

For six days representatives from France, England, Norway, Holland, Austria, Hungary, Germany, Belgium, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, Portugal, India, South Africa, Russia, Mexico, Canada, Japan, and China listened as "experts" delivered papers, made speeches, held workshops, and offered dire prophesies.
They suggested new political tactics. They crafted coy public relations schemes. And they hammered out a bevy of priorities, agendas, and schedules.

In addition to all that, they harked to plenary portents, admonitions, and jeremiads that:

The dullard, the gawk, the numbskull, the simpleton, the weakling, and the scatterbrain are amongst us in overshadowing numbers—intermarrying, breeding, inordinately prolific, literally threatening to overwhelm the world with their useless and terrifying get.

By the end of the conference it was apparent to all of them that unless they took "a course of drastic action the world would face certain eminent disaster." Many had been involved in some sort of subversive sex-activism for quite some time—each of the participants claimed membership in the International Federation of Neo-Malthusian Leagues and most were leaders in the International Eugenics Society. Even so, the time for united purpose and concerted effort was clearly at hand. A loose federation of "race hygiene societies," "birth control leagues," "family planning associations," and "social Eugenics committees" was formalized. Drawing on the heritage of Annie Bessant, Charles Bradlaugh, Charles Drysdale, and Alice Vickery—all radical social reformers from an earlier generation—the new federation took a self-consciously presuppositional anti-Christian, anti-family, and anti-choice bent from the start.

The federation would not be incorporated as International Planned Parenthood until a reorganizational meeting in Bombay shortly after the Second World War, but it remained active during the intervening years nonetheless. Sharing both offices and resources with their kith and kin in the International Eugenics Society, the members did not want to hurry the careful conception of their strategic plan unnecessarily. Thus, it was during that developmental period that Sanger and the other leaders laid the philosophical foundations that characterize the organization and its multifarious programs to this day.

They made certain, for instance, that all national affiliates would adhere to a stridently pro-abortion stance. In fact, they determined that all Planned Parenthood associations—regardless
of social, cultural, or political contexts—make “legal access” to “unrestricted abortion” a “high priority.” As Malcolm Potts, the medical director for the international federation, admitted years later:

The fact is, that no nation on earth has controlled its fertility without abortion. The United States has 1.5 million abortions a year. Why should we expect Indonesia, say, to do better? No matter how good the method is, you can’t get adequate fertility control with contraception alone. You have got to grapple with sterilization and abortion.

They also made certain that the national affiliates pressed for coercive government action to enforce birth limitations and Eugenic sterilizations. They encouraged national organizations to weigh the necessity of “limiting freedom of choice” through the imposition of legal and economic incentives and disincentives. Such sanctions might include the “introduction of a child tax,” “reduction or elimination of paid maternity leave and benefits,” “limitation or elimination of public-financed medical care, scholarships, housing loans, and subsidies to families with more than the allowed number of children,” or even, “compulsory sterilizations and abortions.” In later years, that preferential bent toward totalitarianism led Planned Parenthood to laud the brutal one-child-per-family program of the Communist Chinese as a “stunning success” that was “worth our attention and awe.”

They made certain that each national affiliate would develop and implement “value-free” sex-education curricula and programs. Advocating the kinds of programs that the American affiliate pioneered—using perverse off-the-shelf commercial pornography in elementary classrooms, undermining traditional values, usurping the authority of parents, and encouraging promiscuous activity. Accordingly, the international literature policy asserts:

The broad abstract principles inspired by an antique, repressive morality serve only to confuse us. . . . As hard as it is to admit, sexual precocity is a fact that is present, progressive, and irreversible. . . . Only those who admit, accept, and validate the possibility of an early exercise of sexuality will have placed themselves in a condition to be able to channel it through education.
They even mandated that each national affiliate be willing to sidestep any legal obstacles that might impede the overarching Planned Parenthood agenda of Eugenic cleansing. At times that might mean merely sidestepping the law: in the Philippines where abortions are illegal, Planned Parenthood offers “menstrual extractions” instead—despite the fact that the procedures are, for all intents and purposes, technically the same. At other times clear violation of the law is perpetrated: in Brazil where sterilization is illegal, Planned Parenthood performs as many as 20 million of the procedures every year in its field clinics. According to one internal directive issued from the London office:

Family Planning Associations and other non-government organizations should not use the absence of the law or the existence of an unfavorable law as an excuse for inaction; action outside the law, and even in violation of it, is part of the process of stimulating change.

Though these ideas were more than a little radical, their careful presentation and prudent institutionalization—under the ever watchful management of Sanger and the other neo-Malthusians—eventually paid off. And it paid off in huge dividends.

A New World Order

Ultimately, most of Planned Parenthood's neo-Malthusian ideas found their way into some of the most significant political, cultural, and social programs of the twentieth century as modern presuppositional tenets of an aggressive and universal politically-correct orthodoxy. Unlikely support for the ideas sprang up everywhere. Opposition practically evaporated. Within just a few years, the revolution that Sanger had hoped for and dreamed of had become a veritable reality.

Adolf Hitler, for instance, adopted the neo-Malthusian ideas of Sanger in a wholesale fashion in his administration of the Third Reich—his exterminative “final solution,” his coercive abortion program in Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, and his elitist national socialism. He echoed the Malthusian call to “rid the earth of dysgenic peoples by whatever means available so that we may enjoy the prosperity of the Fatherland.” And he reiterated the Planned Parenthood ideal of eliminating
all Christian mercy ministries or social service programs. "Let us spend our efforts and our resources," he cried in a frenetic speech in 1939, "on the productive, not on the wastrel."\(^62\)

Josef Stalin also wove Planned Parenthood's neo-Malthusian ideal into his brutal interpretation of Marxism—his Ukrainian triage, his collectivization of the Kulaks, and his Siberian genocide. He argued that, "The greatest obstacle to the successful completion of the people's revolution is the swarming of inferior races from the south and east."\(^63\) And the only thing that kept him from eliminating that obstacle was "the foolhardy interference of church charity."\(^64\)

The concessions to Sanger's malignant philosophy did not end there. Before long, the Planned Parenthood planners and prognosticators were riding a veritable tidal wave of success as one political system after another capitulated to the intolerant demands of Eugenicism:

- In 1938, Sweden became the first free nation in Christendom to revert to pre-Christian abortion legislation and to institutionalize Planned Parenthood sex-education and family-limitation programs.\(^65\)
- Between 1949 and 1956, abortion was legalized in eleven other European nations—each at the behest of Planned Parenthood.\(^66\)
- In 1954, Planned Parenthood held an international conference on abortion and called for "reform" of restrictive legislation.\(^67\)
- In 1958, various United Nations agencies began to subsidize Planned Parenthood projects and programs throughout the developing world.\(^68\)
- In 1962, the American Law Institute proposed that abortion laws be decriminalized.\(^69\)
- In 1967, the American Medical Association reversed its century-old commitment to protect the lives of the unborn and also began calling for decriminalization of abortion.\(^70\)
- During that same year, three states—Colorado, California, and North Carolina—loosened restrictions on certain child-killing procedures.\(^71\)
- In 1968, the United Kingdom legalized abortion.\(^72\)
Later that year, Pope Paul VI issued his *Humanae Vitae* encyclical which, among other things, reaffirmed the church's commitment to the sanctity of life. Since this seemed to be the lone Christian voice of dissent during a massive juggernaut of neo-pagan revivalism, the abortion issue quickly came to be viewed in the public arena as "a Catholic issue."73

In 1970, four more American states—Hawaii, Alaska, Washington, and New York—enacted abortion-on-demand legislation.74

By the end of 1971, nearly half a million legal abortions were being performed in the U.S. each year and another two million were performed world-wide.75

Then in 1973, the Supreme Court issued its momentous *Roe v. Wade* decree that changed the abortion laws in all fifty states by sheer judicial fiat, and thus signaled a keen message of moral relativism to the rest of the world.76

And from there, things have only gone from bad to worse. Despite the fact that conservative—and ostensibly pro-life—administrations lead Canada, the United States, and Great Britain for the great majority of the last two decades, Planned Parenthood incursions were only slowed and not stopped altogether.77 Now that the conservative era seems to have passed into extinction—along with the Cold War—the prospects for the future are ominous indeed.

Taking full advantage of its new-found global consensus, Planned Parenthood has launched a massive campaign to construct a New World Order in accord with its own design. A plethora of damming and damned programs has resulted—as Nada Kovacic, Ruza Vejzovic, and millions of other women around the world could readily testify.

**Colonizing the Globe**

The last mandate of Christ to His disciples—commonly known as the Great Commission—was to comprehensively evangelize all the world. He said:

All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy
Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I will be with you always, to the very end of the age (Matthew 28:18-20).

The implications of this mandate are revolutionary and have literally altered the course of world history.

Jesus asserts that all authority in heaven is His (Psalm 103:19). The heights, the depths, the angels, and the principalities are all under His sovereign rule (Psalm 135:5-7). But all authority on earth is His as well (Psalm 147:15-18). Man and creature, as well as every invention and institution, are under His providential superintendence (Psalm 24:1). There are no neutral areas in all the cosmos that can escape the authoritative regency (Colossians 1:17).

On that basis, Christ says, believers all across the wide gulf of time are to continually manifest His Lordship—making disciples in all nations by going, baptizing, and teaching. This mandate is the essence of the New Covenant, which in turn is just an extension of the Old Covenant: Go and claim everything in heaven and on earth for the everlasting dominion of Jesus Christ (Genesis 1:26-28).

It was this mandate that originally emboldened those disciples to preach the Gospel—first in Jerusalem and Judea, then in Samaria, and finally in the uttermost parts of the earth (Acts 1:8). It was this mandate that sustained the faithful church through generations of hardship, persecution, calamity, and privation—provoking it to offer light and life to those ensnared in the miry clay of darkness and death.

It was this mandate that sent Columbus, Vespucci, Balboa, da Gama, Magellan, and Cabot out across the perilous uncharted seas. It was also this mandate that catalyzed a remarkable resurgence of missionary efforts—both in word and in deed—that followed on the heels of the great European expansion and colonization during the nineteenth century.

The accession of the Christian culture of Europe as the world’s dominating socio-political force was actually not assured until well into the nineteenth century. In fact, for the bulk of its first two millennia Christian culture had been strikingly unsuccessful in spreading its sumptuous effects beyond European shores. The Great Commission remained profoundly unfulfilled. In the Far
East, for instance, missionary endeavors were practically non-existent in China and paralyzed by persecution in Japan. In India, the higher castes were virtually untouched by the Gospel, and even the lower castes showed only transitory interest. The Islamic lands were as resistant as always to the inroads of the church. South America’s conversion to the conquistador’s Catholicism was tenuous at best. And tropical Africa had proven to be so formidable and inhospitable that Western settlements were confined to a few small outposts along the coast. Clearly, Christianity was still very much a white man’s religion.

There had been, of course, a few bursts of expansion. In 1453, a series of catastrophic events—both good and bad—freed European monarchs to cast their vision outward for the first time since the early crusades. That year saw the defeat of Constantine XI by Sultan Mohammed II—thus, at long last, bringing to an end the storied Byzantine Empire. In addition, the Hundred Years War between England and France ended, as did the wars between Venice and Milan, Russia and Lithuania, and Prussia and Poland. The Habsburgs and the Medicis were both bolstered in their respective realms. And Guttenberg’s press in Mainz altered the transmission of knowledge and culture forever with the publication of the first printed book—a Bible.

Explorers began to venture out into uncharted realms. Scientists began to probe long hidden mysteries. Traders and merchants carved out new routes, new markets, and new technologies. Energies that had previously been devoted exclusively to survival were redirected by local magistrates into projects and programs designed to improve health, hygiene, and the common good. Africa, India, China, Indonesia, and the Americas were opened to exploration and exploitation. From colonial outposts there, a tremendous wealth of exotic raw resources poured into European cities.

But despite all these advantages, European advances were limited and short lived—and the Gospel made only halting and sporadic progress. Internecine warfare and petty territorialism disrupted—and very nearly nullified—even that much Christian influence. From 1688—when William and Mary concluded the Glorious Revolution in England by ascending to the throne, Louis XIV canonized the iron-fisted notion of “Divine Right,”
and young Peter Romanov became Czar of all the Russias—until 1848—when the calamitous Marxist rebellions in Paris, Rome, Venice, Berlin, Parma, Vienna, and Milan were finally squelched—Europe was racked by one convulsive struggle after another. During those two centuries, the cause of Christian unity, veracity, and temerity wore a Khazar face—buffeted by the Austro-Prussian Wars, the Napoleonic Wars, the American War of Independence, the Persian-Ottoman Wars, the Sino-Russian Wars, the French Revolution, the Greek and the South American Wars of Independence, and the Mogul Invasions. The entire culture seemed to be driven by an Arimathean impulse to bury disparaged truth.

At last though, a hush of peace fell upon the continent during the Victorian Age: Pax Britannia. And within the span of a generation, the message of Christ and the benefits of a Christian culture and law code were impressed upon the whole earth.

Three great revolutions—beginning first in England and then spreading throughout all the European dominions—laid the foundations for this remarkable turn of events. The first was the Agricultural Revolution. The replacement of fallowing with leguminous rotation, the use of chemical fertilizers, and the introduction of farm machinery enabled Europeans to virtually break the cycle of famine and triage across the continent for the first time in mankind’s history. The second was the Industrial Revolution. Manufactured goods and the division of labor created a broad-based middle class and freed the unlanded masses—again, for the first time in human history. The third was the Transportation Revolution. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Napoleon could not cross his domain any more efficiently than Nebuchadnezzar could have six centuries before Christ. By the end of the Victorian age, men were racing across the rails and roads in motorized vehicles of stupendous power, they were crashing over and under the waves of the sea in iron vessels of enormous size, and they were cutting through the clouds in ingenious zeppelins, balloons, and planes.

Suddenly, the earth became a European planet. Whole continents were carved up between the rival monarchs. With a thrashing overheated quality—in which charity and good sense are sometimes sacrificed for the practical end of beating the
Hun—Africa, Asia, Australia, the Far East, Latin America, and the Middle East became the backyard playgrounds of speculative colonists and imperial opportunists.

But just as no corner of the globe was left untouched by the explorers, soldiers, merchants, and colonists bearing up under notions of the “White Man’s Burden” and “Manifest Destiny,” the selfless and sacrificial efforts of missionaries bent on fulfilling at last the mandates of the Great Commission left virtually no stone unturned either. Peoples everywhere tasted their abundant benefits. And, chief among those benefits of course, was a new respect for innocent human life—a respect that was entirely unknown anywhere in the world until the advent of the Gospel.

As missionaries moved out from Christendom to the “uttermost parts of the earth” they were shocked to discover all the horrors of untamed heathenism. They found abortion all too prevalent, infanticide all too commonplace, abandonment all too familiar, and euthanasia all too customary. They were confronted by the specters of endemic poverty, recurring famine, unfettered disease, and widespread chattel slavery—which the Christian West had only recently abolished. Cannibalism, ritual abuse, patricide, human sacrifice, sexual perversity, petty tyranny, paternalistic exploitation, live burials, exterminative clan warfare, and genocidal tribal vendettas all predominated.

Again and again, they had to affirm in the clearest possible way—in both word and deed—that Jesus Christ is the only perfect sacrifice for the sins of the world and that through Him had come the death of death (Romans 5:6-18).

Most of the missionaries knew that such a liberating message would likely be met with strident opposition. And it was. Especially toward the end of the great missionary era—during the sunset of Victorianism—missionaries were often forced into conflicts with Europeans and North Americans who subscribed to the Enlightenment notions of Darwinism, Malthusianism, and Eugenics. As these ideas took a higher and higher profile at home, leaders in government and academia—and gradually even in the church—began to increasingly believe that the vast difference between Christian culture and pagan culture was actually not rooted in religion but in sociology and race. So, Christian soldiers stationed in British colonies, for example,
were often reprimanded for attending the baptisms of native converts because as representatives of the government, they were obligated to be "religiously neutral." Thus, missionaries found it increasingly difficult to persuade the Western governments to abolish heathen customs and impose the rule of humanitarian law.

Thankfully, the vast majority of the missionaries on the field held the line against such latitudinarianism. They continued to sacrifice. They continued to care for the hurting. They continued to succor the ailing. They continued to value the weak. And they continued to stand for the innocent.

In 1893, a Parliament of Religions was held in Chicago. At hand were delegates from dozens of pagan cults and religious sects from around the world to meet and dialogue with Western church leaders in what organizers called the "universal and trans-religious spirit of cooperation, toleration, and empathy that unites all mankind regardless of its sundry religious impulses." A group of Presbyterian missionaries—representative of thousands of faithful men and women who had seen firsthand the horrors of heathen lands and had sacrificed dearly to bring them help and hope—quenched that spirit with a report that stated succinctly the distinctive appeal of the Gospel:

Just as Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius, Krishna, and Zoroaster remain to this day decayed by irrevocable death, so the religions that bear their names carry with them the stench of the grave. Poverty, barbarity, death, and lasciviousness must be the lot of those men and nations that follow after them. The horrors of children left to die, women sacrificed to dumb idols, and the sick given over to their own devices are the fruit of the flesh that no heathen ravings can be rid. Only the Gospel of our Savior Jesus Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, can lend the bequest of life. Only Christ has Himself escaped the shackles of death, and only the faith in Him that comes through grace can free men from the oppressions of the spirit of murder, which we must sadly affirm, is the same as your precious spirit of cooperation, toleration, and empathy.

Another dissenting voice came from a veteran missionary from China who asserted:
When I reached Amoy thirty-two years ago, there was a pond in the center of town known as the Babies Pond. This was the place where unwanted little ones were thrown by their mothers. There were always several bodies of innocents floating on its green and slimy waters and passers-by looked on without surprise. This is what a world without a clear uncompromised Christian Gospel leads irrevocably toward.  

Still another delegate, a converted Mangaian islander, testified that he had been marked out for ritual sacrifice before the coming of missionaries. By some stroke of Providence, he was temporarily spared. He continued:

Still I believed that I must die, and in my turn, be offered. But, blessed be Jehovah, not long after the cultus, the Gospel was brought to Mangaia. I then learned with wonder that the true peace offering is Jesus, who died on Calvary, in order that all the wretched slaves of Satan might be freed. This was indeed Good News to me. God forbid that we should return to the bondage of universal lawlessness.  

Again and again, the faithful concurred, the age old commitment of the distinctive Gospel message must not, can not, and will not be compromised. When it is, not only does heresy sweep through the church, but death sweeps through the land.

As missionaries circled the globe, penetrated the jungles, and crossed the seas, they preached a singular message: light out of darkness, liberty out of tyranny, and life out of death. To cultures epidemic with terrible poverty, brutality, lawlessness, and disease, those faithful Christian witnesses interjected the novel Christian concepts of grace, charity, law, medicine, and the sanctity of life. They overturned despots, liberated the captives, and rescued the perishing. They established hospitals. They founded orphanages. They started rescue missions. They built almshouses. They opened soup kitchens. They incorporated charitable societies. They changed laws. They demonstrated love. They lived as if people really mattered.

These kinds of dramatic activities, rather than being isolated occurrences, were actually quite normative. Wherever missionaries went, they faced a dual challenge: confront sin in men's
hearts and confront sin in men's cultures. That was, is, and ever shall be the very essence of the Great Commission.

The Commission Reversed

The amazingly successful global program of Planned Parenthood is a kind of Great Commission in reverse. The magnificent tapestry of civilization woven by Christendom is even now being unraveled strand by strand unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

Planned Parenthood enthusiasts would have us believe that neo-Malthusian principles, policies, and programs are actually just issues of personal choice. Others say they are simply issues of comprehensive medical care. Still others would argue that they are issues of reproductive freedom, issues of maternal rights, issues of political preference, or issues of individual privacy.

But the profligate taking of innocent lives, the perverting of traditional values, and the defiling of individual families are actually not issues at all.

An issue is something that we can reasonably and rationally discuss around a negotiating table. An issue is something that we can compromise on. It is something that involves give and take. It is something that we can ponder, argue, and debate. Indeed, it is something that good men and women can legitimately disagree on. We can juggle its niggling little points back and forth. Or we can do nothing at all. We can take it or leave it.

Eugenic cleansing is none of those things. Instead, it is a matter of life and death. It is a test of faith. It is perhaps the ultimate test of faith in these difficult and complex times. And thus, it demands uncompromising, unwavering, and unhesitating faithful action.

Through the centuries, Christians have at all times, in all places, and in all circumstances maintained precisely this same conviction. With one voice, they cried out across the gulf of time the Good News of love and life. As one, they proclaimed the Gospel—the victory of Christ Jesus over sin and death. And at great risk, they authenticated that cry in the way they lived their lives. They demonstrated that proclamation in their actions—rescuing the perishing at every opportunity, by every means.

Ruza Vejzovic told me that she believed that the greatest threat that Planned Parenthood posed was "not so much to the
family as to the church." After all, she said, "It is the church that has been commissioned to hold the line against such things—and so when such things continue unchecked, it is the church's authenticity and veracity that must first come under our scrutiny."

**Conclusion**

Political theorist, Ayn Rand, may well have had the chilling international legacy of Planned Parenthood in mind when she said that:

> Every major horror of history has been committed in the name of an altruistic motive. Has any act of selfishness ever equalled the carnage perpetrated by the disciples of altruism? Hardly.84

With the demise of ideological totalitarianism toward the end of the twentieth century, most neo-Malthusians turned to the practical totalitarianism of social control through birth control as the last best hope of their altruism. Undoubtedly, it has become—as Margaret Sanger predicted that it would—their "Love Potion" and their "Holy Grail."85

It is a faith—a kind of mirror-image reversal of Christianity. It cannot be opposed by mere logic, reason, or political savvy. G. K. Chesterton once quipped:

> If you argue with a madman, it is extremely probable that you will get the worst of it; for in many ways his mind moves all the quicker for not being delayed by the things that go with good judgment. He is not hampered by a sense of humor, or by charity, or by the dumb certainties of experience.86

We cannot hope to subdue Planned Parenthood's madness with argument—even with brilliant argument. Instead, its counterfeit evangelism must be overwhelmed with authentic evangelism. And that requires an authentic—and uncompromised—church.
ELEVEN

A DIVINE TRAGEDY:
THE RELIGIOUS LEGACY

anguis in herba

There is a complex knot of forces underlying any nation once Christian; a smoldering of the old fires.

Hilaire Belloc

Easter is the greatest of all the Christian festivals. It is the day when every believer rejoices in the knowledge of His Redeemer's resurrection. Even so, there was precious little joy in the hearts of the people of Constantinople on Easter Sunday, 1453. It fell that year on April the first. After a long and stormy winter, spring was coming at last to the Thracian peninsula. In the lush orchards throughout the venerable city the fruit trees were bursting into flower. The nightingales had returned to sing in the Lycus thickets and the storks were already rebuilding their nests on the peaked rooftops all along the Mese. The sky was mottled with long thick lines of migratory birds flying to their summer havens way away in the north. But the Bosphorus was rumbling with the sounds of war: the men, armaments, and accoutrements of a great and dreaded army.

Hagia Sophia was thronged with the faithful, as were the hundreds of other Churches throughout the city. They culminated Holy Week surrounded by a millennium of glory and majesty. Within eight weeks all of them would be exiled, captive, or dead. The infidel Turks that began gathering outside the great Theodosian Walls that day would soon be upon them. The glory and majesty was doomed. And everyone knew it.

The fall of the greatest city in all of Christendom would send devastating quakes throughout the West, shaking the foundations
of life and hope and truth. The civilized world would never be the same.

Back in the days when historians were but simple men, the catastrophic conquest of Constantinople was believed to mark the end of the Middle Ages. In these more complex and cosmopolitan times we know only too well that "the stream of history flows on relentlessly and there is never a barrier across it." As discontinuous as the events in 1453 were, we must say that there is no sudden or precise point at which the medieval world was transformed into the modern world. Long before 1453, the Renaissance had begun in Florence, Venice, Genoa, and Paris. Long after 1453, the feudal life persisted in Flanders, Bavaria, and Russia. Long before 1453, the great navigators and discoverers had begun to explore the ocean routes that would ultimately alter the economy of the whole world. Long after 1453, vast, vast uncharted realms were still left for the stout of heart to claim.

As calamitous as the events in 1453 were, they were largely symbolic. They were neither the beginning nor the end.

Since Calvary there have been no absolute divisions in history, only benchmarks.

Thus in 1973, when another citadel of majesty fell, the stream of history, though disturbed, continued to flow ever onward. As in the sack of Constantinople, this modern assault on life and hope and truth would reverberate throughout the civilized world, shaking the foundations of every institution: family, church, and state. And yet, long before the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision legalizing abortion that year, liberty and security had already been seriously jeopardized. Several states had already liberalized their abortion laws. Tax funding for Planned Parenthood had already been appropriated. And epidemic promiscuity had already begun to ravage the land. Long after 1973 strong and righteous resistance challenged the seductive tyranny of death on demand. The church arose from its cultural slumber and began to reassert its disciplining role in society. Pro-lifers developed creative alternatives for women and children in crisis. And serious legal challenges continued to threaten Planned Parenthood's death grip on the nation's purse strings.

As calamitous as the decision in 1973 was, like the fall of Constantinople, it was largely symbolic. It was neither the beginning nor the end.
Abortion, promiscuity, racism, greed, and deception are as ancient as mankind. They did not spring up full blown in 1973 with Justice Blackmun and the Supreme Court or even in 1917 with Margaret Sanger and Planned Parenthood. And sadly, they will probably continue to plague us even after Roe v. Wade is overturned and Planned Parenthood's aims are vanquished.

In the Beginning

Exposure, abortion, child sacrifice, and other forms of infanticide more often than not were both legal and respectable in pagan societies from the earliest times. Unwanted children in ancient Rome were abandoned outside the city walls to die from exposure to the elements or from the attacks of wild forging beasts. The Greeks often gave pregnant women heavy doses of herbal or medicinal abortifacients. The Persians developed highly sophisticated surgical curette procedures. Ancient Hindus and Arabs concocted chemical pessaries—abortifacients pushed or pumped directly into the womb through the birth canal. The primitive Canaanites threw their children onto great flaming pyres as a sacrifice to their god Molech. The Polynesians subjected their pregnant women to onerous tortures, their abdomens beaten with large stones or hot coals heaped upon their bodies. The Egyptians disposed of their unwanted children, especially girls, by disemboweling and dismembering them. Their collagen was then ritually harvested for the manufacture of cosmetic creams. The more things change, the more they stay the same.

Plato and Aristotle both recommended infanticide and abortion for Eugenic purposes. Juvenal and Chrysostom revealed that many abortions were performed in order to conceal illicit or illegal sexual activity. Soranos argued that some women killed their children out of sheer convenience or self-indulgent vanity. Ambrose and Hippolytus said that some families resorted to these drastic measures for economic reasons. Others, according to Justinian, did so for religious, ideological, or sectarian reasons. But most women, reported Calaetus, simply were coerced by oppressive cultural norms, values, and structures to despise and reject their progeny.

Indeed, "there is nothing new under the sun" (Ecclesiastes 1:9).
From time to time voices were raised against the slaughter of the innocent and helpless. But they were like voices crying in the desert: hauntingly prophetic but scornfully spurned.

It was not until the rapid spread of Christianity throughout the Mediterranean world in the second and third centuries that a consistent and convincing pro-life message began to sound. But when it did, the whole civilized world stopped to listen. It was not long until laws were passed and a cultural consensus was reached to protect both women and children. The church's pro-life message was arresting.

The reason Christianity commanded such attention and compelled such action was not just that the sanctity of life was a new and novel notion. The pro-life emphasis was provocative because the church affirmed it universally and without dissent, because it was undeniably rooted in Scriptural Revelation, and because it was coupled with complementary action on the part of the faithful.

Affirmation. The wholehearted consensus of the early church was that abortion and infanticide were in fact murder. No ifs, ands, or buts about it. On that, all of the patristics absolutely agreed.

The Didache was a compilation of Apostolic moral teachings that appeared at the end of the first century. Among its many admonitions, it asserted an unwavering reverence for the sanctity of life: "Do not murder a child by abortion or kill a newborn infant."

The Epistle of Barnabas was an early second-century theological tract that was highly regarded by the first Christian communities. Like the Didache, it laid down absolute strictures against abortion and infanticide: "You shall love your neighbor more than your own life. You shall not slay a child by abortion. You shall not kill that which has already been generated."

The second-century apologist Athenagoras in a letter to Emperor Marcus Aurelius wrote, "We say that women who induce abortions are murderers, and will have to give account of it to God. . . . The fetus in the womb is a living being and therefore the object of God's care."

In the third century, Clement of Alexandria asserted that "our whole life can proceed according to God's perfect plan only if we gain dominion over our desires, practicing continence from
the beginning instead of destroying through perverse and pernicious arts human offspring, who are given birth by Divine Providence. Those who use abortifacient medicines to hide their fornication cause not only the outright murder of the fetus, but of the whole human race as well.\(^{36}\)

At about the same time Tertullian wrote in his *Apology* that “murder is forbidden once and for all. We may not destroy even the fetus in the womb. . . . To hinder a birth is merely a speedier man-killing. Thus, it does not matter whether you take away a life that is born, or destroy one that is coming to the birth. In both instances, destruction is murder.”\(^{37}\)

In the fourth century, Basil the Great argued, “She who has deliberately destroyed a fetus must bear the penalty for murder. . . . Moreover, those who give abortifacients for the destruction of a child conceived in the womb are murderers themselves, along with those receiving the poisons.”\(^{38}\)

Ambrose, bishop of Milan, condemned those who “deny in the very womb their own progeny. By use of paricidal mixtures they snuff out the fruit of their wombs. In this way life is taken before it is given. . . . Who except man himself has taught us ways of repudiating our own children?”\(^{39}\)

Likewise, Jerome wrote that those who “drink potions to ensure sterility are guilty of rebuffing God’s own blessings. Some, when they learn that the potions have failed and thus are with child through sin, practice abortion by the use of still other potions. They are then guilty of three crimes: self-mutilation, adultery, and the murder of an unborn child.”\(^{40}\)

Augustine condemned those whose “lustful cruelty” provoked women “to such extravagant methods as to use poisonous drugs to secure barrenness; or else, if unsuccessful in this, to murder the unborn child.”\(^{41}\)

Origen,\(^{42}\) Hippolytus,\(^{43}\) Cyprian,\(^{44}\) Methodius of Olympus,\(^{45}\) Chrysostom,\(^{46}\) Minucius Felix,\(^{47}\) and Gregory Nazianzus\(^{48}\) all added their voices of affirmation as well. Again and again they decried the wickedness of abortion and infanticide. Together they affirmed the sanctity of life.

*Revelation.* The potency of the church’s pro-life message was not simply due to a subjective unanimity, as important as ecumenical agreement was. The Patristics did not pull their view of
the sanctity of life out of thin air. Their common affirmation was but an obedient response to God's Revelation, the Bible.

It was abundantly clear to those faithful early Christians that the Scriptures commanded a reverence for life. Embedded in every book and interwoven into every doctrine was the unwavering standard of justice and mercy for all: the weak and the strong, the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the lame and the whole, the young and the old, the unborn and the born.

The Bible declares the sanctity of life in its account of God's creation (Genesis 1:26-28; 1 Timothy 6:13; Psalm 36:9, Psalm 104:24-30; John 1:34; Acts 17:25).

Woe to him who strives with his Maker! Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him who forms it, "What are you making?" Or shall your handiwork say, "He has no hands"? Woe to him who says to his father, "What are you begetting?" or to the woman, "What have you brought forth?" Thus says the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker: "Ask Me of things to come concerning My sons; and concerning thy work of My hands, you command Me. I have made the earth, and created man on it. It was My hands that stretched out the heavens, and all their host I have commanded (Isaiah 45:9-12).

The Bible declares the sanctity of life in its description of God's sovereignty (Deuteronomy 32:39; Psalm 22:9-10; Job 10:12; John 5:21; Romans 11:36; Colossians 1:16-17).

For You have formed my inward parts; You have covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are Your works, and that my soul knows very well. My frame was not hidden from You, when I was made in secret, and skillfully wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Your eyes saw my substance, being yet unformed. And in Your book they all were written, the days fashioned for me, when as yet there were none of them (Psalm 139:13-16).

The Bible declares the sanctity of life in its discussion of Christ's incarnation (John 3:16; John 11:25; John 14:6; Acts 2:22-28; Colossians 3:4; Romans 5:21).
The thief does not come except to steal, and to kill, and to destroy. I have come that they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly (John 10:10).

The Bible declares the sanctity of life in its explanation of Christ’s redemption (Matthew 18:10-11; Mark 10:45; Romans 8:11; 1 Corinthians 15:26, 54-56; 2 Corinthians 2:16; 1 John 5:11-12).

But has now been revealed by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel (2 Timothy 1:10).

The Bible declares the sanctity of life in its exposition of judicial ethics (Genesis 9:6; Exodus 20:13; Exodus 21:22-25; Leviticus 24:17; Isaiah 1:15; 1 Peter 3:7).

I call heaven and earth as witnesses today against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both you and your descendants may live (Deuteronomy 30:19).

The Bible declares the sanctity of life in its exhortation to covenantal mercy (Deuteronomy 10:18; Isaiah 1:17; Isaiah 58:6-7; Acts 5:20; James 1:27; Titus 2:11-14).

If you faint in the day of adversity, your strength is small. Deliver those who are drawn toward death, and hold back those stumbling to the slaughter. If you say, “Surely we did not know this,” does not He who weighs the hearts consider it? He who keeps your soul, does He not know it? (Proverbs 24:10-12).

Thus, when Christians spoke to their culture in defense of life and liberty, they spoke with great authority. Theirs was a message rooted in precept, not mere prejudice or preference.

**Application.** The early Christians dramatically redirected the civilized world’s attitude toward and treatment of the helpless. But it was not just on the strength of their common affirmation and Biblical Revelation that they were able to win the day. Those faithful pioneers **proclaimed** a pro-life message and **believed** a pro-life message, so they **lived** a pro-life message.

In Rome, Christians rescued babies that had been abandoned on the exposure walls outside the city. These “foundlings” would then be adopted and raised up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

In Corinth, Christians offered charity, mercy, and refuge to temple prostitutes who had become pregnant. These despised, rejected, abused, and exploited women were taken into homes where they could safely have their children and then get a fresh start on life.

In Caesarea, Christians cared for the poor, the sick, the suffering, the lame, and the aged in clinics and hostels. The church protected and provided for these unwanted and dispossessed souls without partiality.

Whenever and wherever the Gospel went out, believers emphasized the priority of good works, especially works of compassion toward the needy. For the first time in history, hospitals were founded, orphanages were established, rescue missions were started, almshouses were built, soup kitchens were begun, shelters were endowed, charitable societies were incorporated, and relief agencies were commissioned. The hungry were fed, the naked clothed, the homeless sheltered, the sick nursed, the aged honored, the unborn protected, and the handicapped cherished.

The pro-life message of the church was not mere rhetoric. It was a commitment. It was a lifestyle. And as a result, it made a deep and lasting impression on the whole civilized world. Even in those regions where the Christian faith never predominated, or where the Gospel took root only to be supplanted later, the sanctity of life was grafted into the cultural conscience.
The idea that infanticide and abortion are wrong, then, is a distinctly Christian idea. And it is an idea that the church has always held to. At no time in its vaunted two-thousand-year history has it ever wavered. Its witness, rooted in common affirmation, Scriptural Revelation, and selfless application has never been repudiated.

At least, not until now.

The Betrayal

All of the church’s forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, ascetics, theologians, and every righteous spirit made perfect in faith have tenaciously defended the sanctity of life. In times of persecution and times of triumph, in times of adversity and times of prosperity, in times of conflict and times of peace, they have remained stalwart and steadfast. None of them ever even considered dissenting from the common affirmation of the faithful. None of them ever even considered denying the clear Revelation of the Bible. And none of them ever even considered departing from the practical application of compassion. After all, these are the very things that make Christianity what it is: orthodoxy, orthopraxy, and orthotraditio.

Today though, there are men and women in the church who not only consider abandoning these things, they do it. And with relish.

Sadly, those men and women now actually control most of the large mainline denominations in the American church. In the first three decades of the twentieth century, it seemed that all of the church’s spiritual and institutional resolve collapsed in the face of Planned Parenthood’s unrelenting assaults. The “light of the world” fell into lock-step with prevailing death-ethic consensus of a dark and dismal world.

In America, after an all-out lobbying effort by Planned Parenthood, the Committee on Marriage and the Home of the Federal Council of Churches—a precursor to the National Council—became the first major ecclesiastical institution in the history of Christendom to affirm the language, philosophy, and ethical methodology of “choice.” Soon after, the Quakers, the Northern Presbyterians, the Congregational church, the
Methodist-Episcopal church, and several Baptist denominations followed suit.

In Germany, the cooperating church accepted Planned Parenthood's logic in giving tacit approval to the Nazi Reich's harsh *Erbgesundheitsgesetz* laws—which prescribed compulsory abortions, sterilizations, and eugenic controls for "dysgenic" peoples throughout occupied Eastern Europe, including the "Final Solution" that had been divised for the Jews.

Even the Lambeth conference of Anglican bishops around the world capitulated to Planned Parenthood presuppositions in their statements on marriage, family life, and birth limitation.

When the Catholic church bemoaned this gross abdication of historic orthodoxy, several leading European Protestants offered a strident defense arguing that God "is revealed in the endless sweep of evolution and His message is being slowly translated by science into the accents of the human tongue." Instead of relying on the Bible or Christian tradition, they said, the church should be guided by "the light of the evidence, the knowledge, and the experience of our time."74

It was not long before an avalanche of compromise occurred. The United Church of Christ—which had led a pro-life initiative in America just two generations earlier—affirmed "the sacredness of all life, and the need to protect human life in particular," but then went on to uphold "the right of men and women to have access to adequately funded family planning services, and to safe and legal abortions as one option among others."75

The United Methodist Church declared:

Our belief in the sanctity of unborn human life makes us reluctant to approve abortion. But we are equally bound to respect the sacredness of life and well-being of the mother for who devastating damage may result from an unacceptable pregnancy. In continuity with past Christian teaching, we recognize tragic conflicts of life with life that may justify abortion, and in such cases support the legal option of abortion under proper medical procedures.76

The Friends church asserted:

On religious, moral, and humanitarian grounds, we arrived at the view that it is far better to end an unwanted pregnancy than
to encourage the evils resulting from forced pregnancy and childbirth. We therefore urge the repeal of all laws limiting either the circumstances under which a woman may have an abortion or the physician's freedom to use his or her best professional judgment in performing it.\textsuperscript{77}

The American Baptist churches baptized the Malthusian rhetoric, saying:

\begin{quote}
We grieve with all who struggle with the difficult circumstances that lead them to consider abortion. Recognizing that each person is ultimately responsible to God, we encourage women and men in these circumstances to seek spiritual counsel as they prayerfully and conscientiously consider abortion.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}

The largest Lutheran communions worldwide, reaffirmed the principles of their Nazi collaboration by stating:

\begin{quote}
In the consideration of induced abortion, the key issue is the status of the unborn fetus. Since the fetus is the organic beginning of human life, the termination of its development is always a serious matter. Nevertheless, a qualitative distinction must be made between its claims and the rights of a responsible person made in God's image who is living in relationships with God and other human beings. This understanding of responsible personhood is congruent with the historical Lutheran teaching and practice whereby only living persons are baptized. On the basis of the evangelical ethic, a woman or couple may decide responsibly to seek an abortion.\textsuperscript{79}
\end{quote}

Even a large number of prominent Evangelical leaders from around the world yielded to the temptations of Planned Parenthood's logic. Meeting under the auspices of \textit{Christianity Today} magazine and the Christian Medical Society, and led by the highly esteemed Carl F. H. Henry, the Evangelicals engaged in debate and exchanged papers for several days before they drafted a consensus report. Published later in the magazine, the report said in part:

\begin{quote}
Changes in the state laws on therapeutic abortion should be encouraged.\textsuperscript{80}
\end{quote}
Suitable cases for abortion would fall within the scope of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists Statement on Abortion.\textsuperscript{81}

As to whether or not the performance of an induced abortion is always sinful we are not agreed, but about the permissibility for it under certain circumstances we are in accord.\textsuperscript{82}

The Christian physician will advise induced abortion only to safeguard greater values sanctioned by Scripture. These values should include individual health, family welfare, and social responsibility.\textsuperscript{83}

Much human suffering can be alleviated by preventing the birth of children where there is a predictable high risk of genetic disease or abnormality. This appears to be a reasonable Christian objective.\textsuperscript{84}

Though many of the theologians and institutions that participated in the symposium later amended their pro-abortion stance, it was, by then, too late.

Not only did much of the church jettison their historic pro-life commitments to officially embrace the old pagan consensus about abortion and infanticide, they also successfully diverted millions of dollars—intended by parishioners for missions—into radical causes and militant organizations like Planned Parenthood.\textsuperscript{85} Additionally, many of them have even developed organizational ties,\textsuperscript{86} recruited staff volunteers,\textsuperscript{87} pioneered cooperative programs,\textsuperscript{88} sponsored seminars and conferences,\textsuperscript{89} co-published educational literature,\textsuperscript{90} filed amicus briefs,\textsuperscript{91} lent the use of church properties,\textsuperscript{92} and established public testimony\textsuperscript{93} for Planned Parenthood.

In less than a generation they were able to whisk away the two-thousand-year-old voice of ecumenical affirmation, the eternal witness of Divine Revelation, and the spiritual service of charitable application. In less than a generation they were able to betray the most basic principles of the Christian faith.

The Balak Strategy

When Balak, King of Moab, was confronted with the advancing armies of Israel immediately following the Exodus sojourn, he began to cast about for a strategy to stop them (Numbers
Military confrontation seemed hopeless. Diplomatic appeasement seemed suicidal. And defensive alliances seemed delinquent (Numbers 22:4). So in desperation he sent for Balaam, a diviner, who was thought to have the power to bless and bind through spells and incantations (Numbers 22:5-6).

At first the magician was reluctant to take part in Balak's ploy despite his generous offer (Numbers 22:15-35). But eventually he gave in and delivered four oracles (Numbers 22:36-24:25). Much to Balak's chagrin, however, each of the oracles predicted that Israel was invincible from without. No army, no king, no nation, and no empire would be able to stand against it. The only way God's Chosen People could be defeated was if they defeated themselves through moral defilement.

That was all Balak needed to know. He didn't need an army. He didn't need diplomats. He didn't need allies. And he didn't even need diviners. He would rely on wolves in sheep's clothing (2 Timothy 3:6).

The next time the curtains of history draw back, the women of Moab have gone down into Israel's camp at Peor. Enticing the people to play the harlot, those women were able to do what no warrior or general possibly could: trap and defeat Israel. And not a sword was drawn. Not an arrow was unsheathed. Not a javelin was hurled.

It would be several hundred years before Moab would be able to consummate their victory and actually sack the capital of Israel. But that future conquest in Jerusalem was ensured by the moral defeat wrought by Balak's women at Peor.

Early on, Planned Parenthood adopted a similar strategy against the church. Margaret Sanger recognized that the church was "the enemy" of her crusade. But she also recognized that an all-out frontal assault on God's People was suicidal. And so she put together a "Balak strategy." She relied on wolves in sheep's clothing (2 Timothy 3:6).

Margaret began by wooing young and ambitious ministers with the trinkets and baubles of power, prestige, privilege, and position. She doted on them, feeding their sense of self-importance. She enticed them with honors. She invited them to sit on her boards. She patronized their pet projects. She wined them and dined them. She rewarded them with trips, junkets, and
tours. She knew just how to tantalize them with attention and appreciation. Her winsomeness was irresistible and her thoroughness was incomparable.

But even without all that alluring charm, Margaret's campaign to seduce Christians would probably have won support in three broad sectors of the church.

Racists. Especially during the Great Depression when tensions were high and jobs were scarce, racists saw Margaret's Eugenic plans and programs as an open opportunity to eliminate whole "undesired" races and "dysgenic" classes. Tragically many of them carried out their vendetta in the name of Christ.

Lettie Perkins grew up in a small sharecropper's cabin deep in the heart of rural South Carolina. When she was just a youngster she remembers a countywide tent revival meeting cosponsored by several large all-White Baptist churches and several social service agencies, including Planned Parenthood. "We were all excited," she said. "The revival was always the social event of the year. And that year was to be the first time Blacks were allowed to attend. We could hardly contain ourselves. Most of the women bought or made new dresses. We got hats and gloves. We really were going to do things right. It was like a debutante's coming-out for us."

The pastor of one of the sponsoring churches spent a good deal of his time for nearly a month before the revival making sure that black pastors in the area turned their people out. "I don't know why we were so naive at the time," Lettie told me. "It was so obvious that he was setting us up for something."

Indeed, he was. On the day that the revival was to begin, Planned Parenthood set up several tents. Blacks were herded into them and "counseled" on the "benefits" of sterilization and birth limitation. "We weren't even allowed to go into the revival meeting itself until we'd listened to their whole spiel," Lettie said. "And even then, they segregated us off to one side. Like usual."

Most of the Black families were outraged. The blatantly racist collusion between Planned Parenthood and the all-White churches was shocking to them, even in that day of raw and festering prejudice. "I can still remember my Mamma just shaking with anger and humiliation," Lettie said. "Our family never went to church again. Not any church, Black or White. Mamma
didn’t want to have anything to do with a faith that could sanction things like that."

Liberals. But it wasn’t just racists that were attracted to Margaret Sanger’s cause. During the first three decades of this century, the great Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy erupted onto the American church scene. More disruptive than even the eleventh-century Schism or the sixteenth-century Reformation, the controversy forever changed the face of Christianity in this country. In reaction to the Modernists’ emphasis on the "Social Gospel," most Fundamentalists withdrew from all cultural involvement to focus on “spiritual things.” Meanwhile the Modernists pursued cultural involvement with a vengeance, uncritically embracing every fringe Liberal cause, issue, and organization including Planned Parenthood. Since the conservative Fundamentalists no longer actively opposed them, the Liberals were able to capture the seats of power and influence.

Men who no longer believed the Bible and who were committed to a radical social agenda were easy prey for Margaret. She exploited the Liberal coup brilliantly.

Richard L. Ford was the young idealistic pastor of a large Methodist church on the West Coast during World War II. Already thoroughly infected with Liberalism even then, his congregation sponsored several cooperative programs with Planned Parenthood. “At the time we were giddy with excitement,” he told me recently. “We felt that we’d been sequestered in a religious ghetto. That we’d been irrelevant for years. Now at last we were doing things that made a difference in the world. Unshackled of every encumbrance—tradition, the Bible, everything—we loyally followed every new fad and fashion.”

A funny thing happened on the way to relevance, however. “I found that I didn’t have answers any more,” Richard said. “When people are facing a crisis in their lives they don’t need their pastor to experiment on their souls and minds with whatever the latest pop therapy is. They need answers. When teens are facing a barrage of temptation you just can’t turn them over to Planned Parenthood. That’s like throwing gas on a fire. They need standards. Solid and sure.”

No longer able to provide his congregation with decisive guidance, Richard was left helpless in the face of a rapidly
deteriorating moral climate. "There wasn't any such thing as sin any more for us," he said. "So, not surprisingly, we began to indulge ourselves. Illegitimate pregnancies skyrocketed. Divorce rates soared. And the worse things got, the more we turned to the very organizations that prompted our demise in the first place. Imagine! Going to Planned Parenthood to solve the teen pregnancy epidemic! That makes about as much sense as going to a pusher to stop drug abuse or to a pimp to stop prostitution. But, that's exactly what we did."

Compromisers. Margaret Sanger was able to successfully recruit large numbers of Fundamentalist, Evangelical, Catholic, and Orthodox Christians into her fold as well. Unlike the racists and liberals who were converts of conscience, these men and women were converts of convenience. They were fine, upstanding Christians who opposed Planned Parenthood's promiscuous sex education programs. They stood firmly against abortion. Until . . .

Charles Boothe is a respected and admired Christian leader. A former pastor and now the chairman of his church's deacon board, he runs a community-wide youth ministry. From the expression on his face I could tell that he was deeply disturbed when he walked into my office. "Jeanie, my youngest daughter, is pregnant," he told me. "She's just seventeen, a senior in high school. What am I going to do? She has her whole life ahead of her. Why this? Why now?"

We briefly talked through the Biblical options: maternity homes, adoption agencies, alternative centers, and marriage to the father. We consoled one another. We wept together. We prayed together. And we talked long into the afternoon. We embraced warmly when he left.

He then promptly took Jeanie to Planned Parenthood and had his grandchild killed.

I was shocked.

Why? Why would he do such a thing? Why would he resort to that which he knew was wrong?

"I've always been against abortion," he told me later. "Always. And I still believe that it's wrong. It's murder. But . . . I tell ya. When it's your own daughter. . . . Well, I just couldn't see ruining her life by making her go through the humiliation of an illegiti-
mate pregnancy. And besides, our reputation . . . my reputa-

tion. . . . Well, I uh . . . I just. . . . Well, you know."

Margaret Sanger’s “Balak Strategy” proved to be a phenomenal

success. Enticing Christians to “play the harlot,” she was able to
do what no activist or ideologue possibly could: trap and defeat
the church (Numbers 25:18).

It would be several decades before Planned Parenthood
would be able to consummate its victory and actually sack the
citadel of Christian consensus. But that future conquest in the
Supreme Court was ensured by the moral defeat wrought by
Margaret’s minions in the church.

Reaping the Whirlwind

Margaret Sanger’s “Balak Strategy” and the church’s capitula-
tion have had devastating results. Even Bible-believing Evan-
gelicals, traditional Catholics, and faithful Orthodox Christians
have been caught in a maelstrom of destruction.

In a recent survey conducted for Josh McDowell’s Why Wait?
campaign, it was revealed that as many as forty-three percent of
all Christian teens have experienced intercourse, with another
twelve percent reporting sexual activity just shy of that. Eighty percent of those teens confessed Christ as their “personal
Savior.” And sixty-seven percent agreed that “the Bible is a
totally reliable guide for all situations.”

What the survey seems to indicate is that the moral and be-
behavioral distinctions between believers and unbelievers have
almost completely disappeared.

Moab was able to prevail over Israel only when that nation lost
its distinctiveness and became assimilated into Moabite culture.

Planned Parenthood has been able to prevail over the
church simply because Believers have allowed themselves to be-
come assimilated into a corrupt and promiscuous culture.

An analysis of Planned Parenthood’s clinic visit records high-
lights that dismal truth. A random sample of nearly thirty-five
thousand medical charts from fourteen affiliates coast-to-coast
revealed that sixty-two percent of the girls receiving abortions
identified themselves as Evangelical Christians. Another
twenty percent professed to be either Catholic or Orthodox.
Of those eighty-two percent, a full seventy-six percent not only
specified their religious preference, they identified their local church membership and pastor.\textsuperscript{124}

The notion that it is primarily “rank heathens” or “flaming liberals” who are aborting their future away simply doesn’t hold up under the facts. The scandal of Planned Parenthood has become the scandal of the church. Sowing the wind, it has reaped the whirlwind (Hosea 8:7).

**Achan in the Camp**

Flushed with confidence following their spectacular victory at Jericho, the people of Israel advanced to the much smaller, much weaker city of Ai. So certain were they of another victory that they sent up only a very small contingent to take the city (Joshua 7:2-3).

Much to their surprise, however, the men of Ai routed their vastly superior forces (Joshua 7:4-5).

Joshua and the leaders of the nation fell on their faces in fear and trembling before God. Trying to make rhyme or reason out of the lopsided battle, they begged for an explanation (Joshua 7:6-9). And what was God’s reply?

The Lord said to Joshua: “Get up! Why do you lie thus on your face? Israel has sinned, and they have also transgressed My covenant which I commanded them. For they have even taken some of the accursed things, and have both stolen and deceived; and they have also put it among their own stuff” (Joshua 7:10-11).

It seems that one man, Achan, had violated God’s specific commands, hiding his sin in his tent, and thus had brought judgment and condemnation upon the entire nation.

Ai was lost, and lives were lost. All because Achan was in the camp. All because sin was in the tent.

There are any number of Christians today who are dumbfounded in the face of our impotence against Planned Parenthood. They cannot understand why we are so constantly and consistently defeated when we contend with its forces in our schools, our courts, and our assemblies. But the reason is abundantly clear. We cannot effectively assault the gates of Planned Parenthood until we cast Achan out of the camp. We cannot
cessfully vanquish Planned Parenthood until we repent of the sin hidden in our own tent.

Judge not, that you be not judged. For with what judgment you judge, you will be judged; and with the same measure you use, it will be measured back to you. And why do you look at the speck in your brother’s eye, but do not consider the plank in your own eye? Or how can you say to your brother, “Let me remove the speck out of your eye,” and look, a plank is in your own eye? Hypocrite! First remove the plank from your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck out of your brother’s eye (Matthew 7:1-5).

Conclusion

Citing the modern American church’s ambivalence to life, mercy, justice, and truth, Federal Judge John F. Dooling, Jr., ruled that the Supreme Court’s pro-abortion stand was “in the mainstream of the nation’s religious tradition.”

By all indications, he was right.

Abortion is still legal in America because American Christians still want it legal.

Running in the face of Scripture and tradition, truth and experience, wisdom and discretion, and sanctity and justice, the church has bolstered the sordid killing business of Planned Parenthood by both its complacency and complicity, for both its convenience and its continuance.

We can point our condemning fingers at Planned Parenthood, but until we turn our gaze toward home, we will never be able to give a convincing rendition of indignation.

And we will never be able to remove the stigma of death and destruction from our land.

Judgment begins with the house of God.

Well it should.
An imbecile habit has arisen in modern controversy of saying that such and such a creed can be held in one age but cannot be held in another. Some dogma, we are told, was credible in the twelfth century, but is not credible in the twentieth. You might as well say that a certain philosophy can be believed on Mondays, but cannot be believed on Tuesdays. You might as well say of a view of the cosmos that it was suitable to half-past three, but not suitable for half-past four. What a man can believe depends upon his philosophy, not upon the clock or the century.\(^1\)

G. K. Chesterton
TWELVE

SLAYING DRAGONS: 
THE CHARACTER 
TO CONFRONT

cum tacent clamant²

Whatever is buried right into our blood from the immemorial habit of holy tradition, we must be certain to do if we are to be fairly happy, and what is more important, decent and secure of our souls.³

Hilaire Belloc

By the thirteenth century, medieval civilization had reached its height. It had also plunged to its depth.

The Christian faith mingled with speculative philosophy, humanist sociology, and recalcitrant theology in urbane amity. The arts flourished. Trade was prosperous and abundant. The woes and cares of the Dark Ages were past. Merriment abounded.

At the same time, morality deteriorated. Troubadours spread liberal and lascivious notions from town to town. Women were imperiously beautiful and impiously immodest. Greed, avarice, and materialism dominated the people’s lives.

Into this volatile mix of old and new, good and bad, virtue and vice, came a profusion of new cults and sects. Moving with returning Crusaders, waves of Oriental mysticism and occultism assaulted Christian truth remorselessly. From the Persians, they brought echoes of Manichean dualism and Mazdakian communism. From the Turks, they brought an ascetic iconoclasm and resigned fatalism. From the Hindus, they brought a libertine gnosticism and a lust for the obscene.

A bevy of religious communities sprang up around these odd heresies and the men who proclaimed them. The Paulicians and
Bogomiles gained wide followings in the Balkans, along the edge of Byzantium. The Beguines and Beghards gained wide-ranging popularity in the Low Countries of Flanders and Lothier. The Waldensians and the Albigensians won devotees throughout Toulouse, Lyons, and all of Southern France. Before long, the thriving towns along the Mediterranean were honeycombed with apostates zealously proselytizing for their cause. "The cities," one Bishop exclaimed, "are filled with these false prophets." Indeed, Milan alone had seventeen new religions. Cults outnumbered churches in Viterbo, Ferrara, and Rimini. And defections in Orleans, Avignon, Sardica, and Nicomedia had become terribly alarming.

Most of the sects had an amazing uniformity of dogma. They all shared an Arian conception of Christ and a Manichean notion of creation. They were pacifistic and ascetic. They were communistic and anarchistic. They exalted individual autonomy, liberty, and equality. They were generally sexually indulgent, opposed to traditional family life, and rejected child-bearing and rearing as oppressive. They revived the popularity of abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia. Because they abandoned vocations and work, they often resorted to theft, confiscation, looting, deception, conspiracy, and divisiveness. They indulged in drunkenness, carousing, and all manner of sensuality. They dabbled in sorcery, witchcraft, alchemy, astrology, divining, and idolatry. Of course, these tendencies and practices varied somewhat from time to time, from place to place, and from cult to cult, but their general conformity was such that churchmen often referred to them all by the name of the largest and best-organized group: the Cathari.

At first, the church was tolerant and indulgent. But, as the cults became more and more extreme, and as their excesses wreaked more and more havoc, it saw the necessity of confronting and exposing them.

The Apostle Paul had warned believers not to tolerate the evil and unfruitful "deeds of darkness," but, rather, to "expose them." The question was, were the cults actually evil, or were they simply misguided?

Bernard of Clairveaux, the greatest Western preacher of the day, answered by saying that evil was "not a matter of opinion." The Scriptures had afforded men, he said, with an objective, measurable, and tangible definition of evil:
Now the deeds of the flesh are evident, which are: immorality, impurity, sensuality, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, outbursts of anger, disputes, dissensions, factions, envying, drunkenness, carousing, and things like these, of which I forewarn you just as I have forewarned you that those who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God (Galatians 5:19-21).

Gregory Palamas, the greatest Eastern theologian of the day, likewise answered, saying, “The church has no option,” but to “apply the unerring, unwavering Standard” against all “concepts and notions that challenge the Truth.”6 Evil was not a matter of degree, he argued, it was knowable and definable:7

There are six things which the Lord hates, yes, seven which are an abomination to Him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked plans, feet that run rapidly to evil, a false witness who utters lies, and one who spreads strife among brothers (Proverbs 6:16-19).

Both Bernard and Gregory determined to expose these Scripturally-defined evils, and before long were met with great success. The cults quickly lost momentum and popularity. Because they did not hesitate to objectively identify evil, and because they earnestly contended for the faith, Bernard and Gregory not only were able to turn back the rising tide of error in their day, they were able to usher in an era of spiritual revival and cultural renaissance as well.8

The cults did not disappear, however. They simply went underground, waiting for a better day, a moment in the sun. That moment seemed to come in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The old Cathari cults resurfaced among Vienna’s literati, in Paris’ Palais Royale, and at London’s Fabiata. Variously called Rosicrucianism, Free Masonry, Unity, and Theosophy, the old sects found ready acceptance with social revolutionaries and activists.

By the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the cults held an honored and tenured place among Liberals on the cutting edge of anti-Christian crusades. Hitler, Lenin, and Stalin were all fascinated and enamored by their rituals and philosophies.9
H. G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, and George Bernard Shaw all dabbled in their eclectic esoterica. And, not surprisingly, Margaret Sanger accepted their tenets and practiced their ethics as well. She was an avid Rosicrucian and a dues-paying member of Unity.

The Light of Day

It is no coincidence that the extremism, brutality, excessiveness, and promiscuity of Planned Parenthood and its various programs so directly matches that of the Cathari. Planned Parenthood is little more than an institutional incarnation of Margaret's faith.

It is also no coincidence that the objective standard that Bernard and Gregory applied to the cults is just as relevant today as it was then. Virtually every major dogma of those heretical sects is a plank in the Planned Parenthood philosophical platform: promiscuity, greed, deception, revolution, socialism, abortion, sorcery, birth limitation, and materialism.

Bernard and Gregory knew that such things were evil in the thirteenth century. They are no less evil in the twentieth. To expose such evil is a Christian duty (Luke 17:3). To rebuke sin and admonish error is never an option (2 Timothy 2:4). Instead, it is an obligation (Titus 2:15). Modeled by Christ before His disciples (Luke 9:41), and before the world (John 6:26), it is like bearing testimony, an essential aspect of true discipleship (Hebrews 12:5). It was openly practiced by the Apostles Paul (Romans 15:14), James (James 5:1-6), Peter (2 Peter 2:1-22), John (3 John 9-12), and Jude (Jude 4-23). And it has been responsible for many of the church's great revivals throughout history.

Evil must be exposed.
Planned Parenthood must be exposed.
But exposing evil is not a thing to be taken lightly. It is a serious matter.

When the Apostle Paul was hounded day in and day out by a demonic medium, he refrained from acting hastily or rashly (Acts 16:16-17). Finally, after "many days" had passed, he confronted the evil, exorcising the woman (Acts 16:18).
Why had he waited so long? Because he knew that evil was nothing to be trifled with (Ephesians 6:10-18). To bring consummate darkness to the light of day is no mean feat (Matthew 17:21).

Confronting evil is not the least bit trivial. It is not a matter of persuasion. It is not best left to education. It is not, after all, a dispassionate discussion of concepts, ideas, and philosophies. It is war. It is real. It is serious. And it is deadly.

It is a war in which opponents are disarmed (Colossians 2:15), captives are taken (2 Corinthians 10:5), and casualties are exacted (1 Peter 5:8). It is a war in which commissions are extended (Mark 6:15), ambassadors are engaged (2 Corinthians 5:20), weapons are dispensed (2 Corinthians 10:4), strategies are formulated (Revelation 5:1-8), espionage is exposed (Acts 20:29-30), battle cries are sounded (1 Corinthians 14:8), and victories are won (1 John 5:4). It is a war more devastating than any other war, where strongholds are demolished and fortresses are destroyed (2 Corinthians 10:4-5). It demands special precautions (2 Corinthians 10:7), special provisions (2 Corinthians 10:3), and special prescriptions (Ephesians 6:11).

Both Bernard and Gregory understood this only too well. Bernard argued that men should not even think about confronting “the crafty, impure, vile, loathsome, and alien spirit of evil” without first “clothing themselves in the holy illumination of righteous character.”

Gregory asserted that “to oppose wickedness while yet unconsecrated is the fool’s bane.” Spiritual warfare demands “spiritual armor,” he said, “an armor bestowed from above by grace, appropriated from below by faith, secured from within by character.”

Like the evil they opposed, the character that Bernard and Gregory esteemed was objective, measurable, and tangible. It was “knowable and definable.”

Again, it was not coincidence that both Bernard and Gregory challenged their followers with the same exhortation from Scripture, echoing the Apostle Paul: “Be on the alert, stand firm in the faith, act like men, be strong. Let all that you do be done in love” (1 Corinthians 16:13-14).

Alertness, steadfastness, courage, strength, and love: these are the character traits that Bernard and Gregory believed were
essential to successfully confront the Cathari in the thirteenth-century. No doubt they are the same character traits essential to successfully confront the Cathari's progeny, Planned Parenthood, in our own day.

Alertness

If we are to expose the evil of Planned Parenthood, we must be sober, watchful, alert, and informed. This is a cornerstone of Christian character.

We are all called to watch over ourselves (Revelation 3:2-3). We are to watch over our relationships (Exodus 34:12), watch over our hearts (Proverbs 4:23), watch over our lips (Psalm 141:3), watch over the paths of our feet (Proverbs 4:26), and watch over our moral conduct. We are to be alert to the call of Christ (Ephesians 5:14), the judgment of Christ (Micah 7:7), and the coming of Christ (Matthew 24:42-43).

We are to be sober in spiritual warfare (Ephesians 6:18) and sober in prayer (Colossians 4:2).

We are to be sober, watchful, and alert in all things, at all times, and in all places so that we can be wise to the snares of our enemies and so that we can avoid the near occasion of temptation and sin (1 Peter 5:8).

So then let us not sleep as others do, but let us be alert and sober (1 Thessalonians 5:6).

Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; awake as in the days of old, the generations of long ago. Was it not Thou Who cut Rahab in pieces, Who pierced the dragon? (Isaiah 51:9).

Take heed, keep on the alert; for you do not know when the appointed time is. It is like a man, away on a journey, who upon leaving his house and putting his slaves in charge, assigning to each one his task, also commanded the doorkeeper to stay on the alert. Therefore, be on the alert—for you do not know when the master of the house is coming, whether in the evening, at midnight, at cockcrow, or in the morning—lest he come suddenly and find you asleep. And what I say to you I say to all, "Be on the alert!" (Mark 13:33-37).
Christians need to be aware of what is going on. They need to be informed.

Aimee Kuiper is a volunteer at an abortion alternatives center sponsored by her church. But just two years ago, she was an avid supporter of Planned Parenthood. “I donated money, volunteered my time, and used my influence to spread their programs in the schools,” she told me. “As stupid as this may sound, I was just ignorant of the facts. I didn’t know what was going on. Most people don’t. I’m convinced that most people would be shocked beyond belief if they could ever find out what’s really going on in our schools and at Planned Parenthood’s clinics. I guess, in a way, it’s a character flaw that they aren’t more alert. I know it was for me.”

“Through knowledge the righteous are delivered” (Proverbs 11:9), but they are “exiled for the lack of knowledge” (Isaiah 5:13).

If knowledge of the truth does not proliferate, a society is doomed (Hosea 4:6). The educational system cannot convey that knowledge. And the established media will not. The fact is, “the senseless have no knowledge” (Psalm 92:6), “fools shun knowledge” (Proverbs 1:29), and “the ungodly hate knowledge” (Proverbs 1:29). If Christians are not sober, watchful, and alert, actively disseminating accurate information about Planned Parenthood, no one will.

It is crucial, then, that we nurture this character trait in our lives. We are to seek knowledge (Proverbs 8:10). We are to store it up (Proverbs 10:14). And we are to preserve it (Malachi 2:7).

We are to apply our minds to know the truth (Proverbs 22:17). We are to apply our hearts to receive it (Proverbs 23:12). And we are to apply our lives to spread it (Proverbs 15:7).

But how are we supposed to obtain that knowledge?

First, and foremost, we need to study the wellspring of knowledge, the treasure-trove of knowledge, the Bible. We need to understand its statutes, commands, and decrees. We need to grasp its dictates, mandates, and commissions. We need its insight, its wisdom, and its inspiration. We cannot hope to nurture Christian character in our lives if we do not daily read it, study it, meditate on it, memorize it, and cherish it.

Second, we need to discover the wealth of knowledge handed down from generation to generation in Church History. There is
no need for us to reinvent the wheel. The righteous men and women who have gone before us faced virtually every situation that we will ever face. They fought virtually every fight. They confronted virtually every evil. Amazingly, their wisdom, their insight, and their understanding is still available (Ephesians 4:17). Through their letters, books, tracts, confessions, treatises, dogmas, liturgies, prayers, apologies, and commentaries, they can speak to us today. Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cabasilas, Cyril Lucarius, Calvin, Spurgeon, Chesterton, Schmemann, and Schaeffer: they can all equip us for alertness if only we will take the effort to seek their counsel by reading their works.

Third, we need to pass along to others the knowledge we’ve obtained. With knowledge comes responsibility. We need to teach Sunday School classes in our churches. We need to print up small circulation newsletters for our neighborhoods. We need to teach extension classes at local schools, colleges, and universities. We need to write letters to the editor. We need to inform our magistrates and leaders. We need to conduct home Bible studies and issue-oriented discussions. In other words, we need to get the word out. Once we’ve learned the facts, we need to get those facts widely disseminated.

Fourth, we need to develop local information networks. Whenever a development occurs in the legislature, or in the schools, or in the media, a local network needs to spring into action. Telephone trees, photocopied notices, computer bulletins, cable TV flashes, radio announcements, newsletter distribution, and direct mail drops can all be utilized if a network has been set up ahead of time. We can then build a grassroots response. A number of “pro-life hotlines” have been established around the country, but we need many, many more. There are also more than three thousand Right-to-Life, American Life League, Operation Rescue, Missionaries to the Pre-Born, and Christian Action Council organizations and committees scattered across the nation, but again, we need more. Planned Parenthood’s howitzers are very effective against the slow and cumbersome tanks of the federal bureaucracy and the pro-life institutions. But they are useless against a swarm of mosquitoes.
Fifth, we need to develop national information networks. This is the information age. We have been blessed with a proliferation of information technologies. There is no need for us to depend on the national media any longer. Sadly, Christians have, by and large, failed to realize that. We have not yet capitalized on those technologies. But, of course, one or two brave pioneers could quickly and easily turn things around.


Confronting the evil of Planned Parenthood demands the sturdy advantage of Christian watchfulness. It requires the informed stamina of Christian soberness. It necessitates the righteous character of Christian alertness.

Therefore, gird your minds for action, keep sober in spirit, fix your hope completely on the grace to be brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ. As obedient children, do not be conformed to the former lusts which were yours in your ignorance, but like the Holy One Who called you, be holy yourselves also in all your behavior (1 Peter 1:13-15).

Steadfastness

If we are to expose the evil of Planned Parenthood, we must also be faithful, steadfast, and unwavering. Like alertness, this is a cornerstone of Christian character.

We are all called to stand firm in the faith (2 Thessalonians 2:25). We are to be steadfast in the midst of suffering (1 Peter 5:9), in the midst of strange teaching (Hebrews 13:9), and in times of trying circumstances (James 1:12).

We are to be steadfast in good works (Galatians 6:9), in enduring love (Hosea 6:4), in conduct (Philippians 1:27), in decision-making (1 Kings 18:21), and in absolute loyalty to the Lord God (Proverbs 24:21).

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your toil is not in vain in the Lord (1 Corinthians 15:58).
It was for freedom that Christ set us free; therefore keep standing firm and do not be subject again to a yoke of slavery (Galatians 5:1).

Nevertheless, the righteous shall hold to his way, and he who has clean hands shall grow stronger and stronger (Job 17:9).

Steadfastness is not an attribute that we can simply conjure up by sheer force of will. It demands a long-term commitment.

Marsha Gatlin is a member of her local school board and has been for more than a decade. She first ran for the seat when her teenage daughter brought home several Planned Parenthood booklets from school one day.

"I made up my mind then and there," she told me, "that I was going to do something about the moral plague that was infecting our children. My children. Well, I'll tell you, it's not been easy. It's been one fight after another. Ten years of conflict. But I'm confident that I've been able to make a difference. So, I'm gonna continue to hang in there. I'm not about to back down on my commitment now."

That kind of commitment is what the Bible calls vision. It is the willingness to sacrifice unceasingly for the Gospel's sake. It is the willingness to bypass immediate gratification, instant satisfaction, and momentary recognition for the good of the future. For the good of Christ's Kingdom. Where faith is "the assurance of things hoped for" (Hebrews 11:1), vision is "the hope of things assured of." Where faith is "the conviction of things not seen" (Hebrews 11:1), vision is "the seeing of those convictions."

Visionary men and women are confident, assured, and undaunted even in the face of calamity and catastrophe, because they can see beyond the present. They can remain sure, secure, and steadfast, because they have a broader perspective. They can look past petty defeats and setbacks. They can plot and plan far in advance of the day of vindication and victory. They have a future-orientation. They believe in the idea of progress.

Though that progress may come in very small stages over very long epochs, visionary men know that it eventually will come. They believe in its inevitability.

And so they remain faithful. Toiling day in and day out, year in and year out. Never despising "the day of small beginnings" (Zechariah 4:10).
Slaying Dragons: The Character to Confront

This is a special legacy of Christianity in modern civilization. It was this Biblical conception of hope, promise, patience, assurance, victory, steadfastness, advancement, dominion, confidence, faith, conviction, and commitment that set the modern world on its course of cultural, technological, and sociological progress.

Vision catalyzes and empowers faith. It is vision that releases faith from the safety zone of irrelevancy to the war zone of cultural transformation.

It was only by exercising visionary faith that believers in past ages were able to “conquer kingdoms, perform acts of righteousness, obtain promises, shut the mouths of lions, quench the power of fire, escape the edge of the sword, and from weakness be made strong” (Hebrews 11:33-34).

Just as Josiah remained steadfast (2 Kings 22:2), just as David remained steadfast (1 Samuel 17:45-49), just as Daniel remained steadfast (Daniel 6:5-11), and just as Job (Job 23:11), Joseph (Genesis 39:7-16), John (Acts 4:19-20), and Paul (Acts 20:24) all remained steadfast, so we are to remain undaunted and immovable in our devotion to truth, justice, and righteousness (Psalm 119:105-112). Theirs was the visionary determination to adhere to God's standards, to uphold God's statutes, to apply God's principles, and to enforce God's decrees. If we are to have any success whatsoever in confronting the evil of Planned Parenthood, we must develop that same kind of vision.

But how? How are we supposed to inculcate that kind of unswerving faith?

First, we need to feed our faith. Vision demands nurture. Commitment necessitates growth. And the only way we can obtain these things is through a dynamic and vital spiritual life. Through worship, personal devotion, and fellowship, we must strengthen and bolster our steadfastness. We must draw vitality and confidence from the “very great and precious promises” of the Word (2 Peter 1:4). We must draw encouragement and stamina from the “assembling together” of the saints (Hebrews 10:25). We must draw life and hope from the glorious presence of the royal throne room (Revelation 5:1-14).

Second, we need to develop habits of personal evangelism and discipleship. The best way to “keep the faith” is to share it. Christ
commissioned all His followers to become "fishers of men" (Matthew 4:19). We should constantly share the Gospel with the lost (Colossians 4:5). We should constantly build up the saved (Colossians 3:16-17). And we should constantly spur on the inactive (Hebrews 10:24-25). At work, at home, at church, at school, around the neighborhood, with family members, with friends, and with casual acquaintances, we should be incessantly enlisting men for the Kingdom and for the work of the Kingdom. We should build our faith by sharing our faith.

Third, we should undertake one or two projects and see them through to completion. Christians are notorious for never finishing what they begin. And there is nothing that stymies and stultifies vision more than that. We should pick out one or two long-term projects that we know we can remain faithful to, and then actually go the whole distance. Tackle the school board, or close down the school-based clinic, or defund Planned Parenthood's local tax-paid abortion clinic, or boycott businesses that support affiliate programs, or maintain a regular picket vigil, or volunteer at an alternative center, or pledge financial support to a pro-life ministry, or distribute appropriate literature, or install a speakers bureau at the local high school: We need to choose a battle and fight it to the end. That is vision made practical. That is steadfastness made tangible.

Confronting the evil of Planned Parenthood demands the undaunted vision of Christian faithfulness. It requires the unwavering commitment of Christian vigilance. It necessitates the righteous character of Christian steadfastness.

Therefore, my beloved brethren whom I long to see, my joy and crown, so stand firm in the Lord, my beloved (Philippians 4:1).

Courage

If we are to expose the evil of Planned Parenthood, we must also be valiant, courageous, and brave. Like alertness and steadfastness, this is a cornerstone of Christian character.

We are all called to be fearless in the Lord (Isaiah 12:2). We are to be brave in the face of our enemies (Deuteronomy 31:6), and brave in the midst of chastisement (Job 5:17-24).

We are to demonstrate valor in our obedience to the Word of God (Joshua 23:6), for the sake of His people (2 Samuel 10:12),
and in all our service (1 Chronicles 28:20). Because we know that God is sovereign, we are to be courageous (2 Chronicles 32:7). Because we know that God is ever present, we are to be courageous (Psalm 118:6). Because we know that God comprehends all things, we are to be courageous (Psalm 139:13-19). We are to take heart and remain certain even in the face of terrifying circumstances (Psalm 91:5) or utter dismay (Joshua 10:25).

The wicked flee when no one is pursuing, but the righteous are bold as a lion (Proverbs 28:1).

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear, though the earth should change, and though the mountains slip into the heart of the sea; though its waters roar and foam, though the mountains quake at its swelling pride (Psalm 46:1-3).

For God has not given us a spirit of timidity, but of power and love and discipline (2 Timothy 1:7).

Courage means standing against the tide, struggling for right to the bitter end, and investing our all-in-all for the cause of the Kingdom.

Mark Dury is a high school senior who has had to learn about courage the hard way. “I had a teacher that constantly tried to bait me,” he said. “She desperately wanted to shake my faith. The thing was, she was a really popular teacher, so whenever I tried to oppose some of the stuff she was doing — like showing our class hard-core porn and stuff — I caught a lot of grief from the other kids. When I found out that she was counseling girls to go to Planned Parenthood for birth control, well, that was just too much. I went to the administration about it. That only made the persecution increase. But, hey, that’s inevitable. I’ve gotta stand up for what is right. There’s no way I can compromise.”

The fact is, “all those who desire to live godly lives will be persecuted” (2 Timothy 3:12). There is no way around it. Persecution is inevitable.

Jesus explained this fact to His disciples, saying:

If the world hates you, you know that it has hated Me before it hated you. If you were of the world, the world would love its
own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out
of the world, therefore the world hates you. Remember the
word that I said to you, "A slave is not greater than his master."
If they persecuted Me, they will also persecute you; if they kept
My word, they will keep yours also (John 15:18-20).

We need not be disheartened by this. Persecution does not
just bring with it pain and privation; it also brings great purpose
and promise. It brings with it the hope of resurrection.

"God causes all things to work together for good to those
who love God, to those who are called according to His pur­
pose" (Romans 8:28). When we refuse to compromise, we may
risk rejection or rebuke. But we know all the while that rejec­
tion and rebuke become opportunities under the sovereign direc­
tion of God Almighty.

Joseph risked everything he had by refusing to compromise
his obedience to God (Genesis 39:7-16). As a result, he was
thrown into prison (Genesis 39:19-20). But God used his prison
experience for good. It became the first stage of dominion for
him. It was not long before Joseph was raised up out of the depths
to rule over the whole land (Genesis 41:37-45). Because he re­
mained courageous and uncompromising, he emerged victorious.

David, too, risked all that he had by refusing to compromise
his obedience to God (1 Samuel 18:1-6). As a result, he was cast
into exile (1 Samuel 19:11-18). But God used his exile experience
for good. It became the first stage of dominion for him. It was
not long before David was raised up out of the depths to rule
over the whole land (2 Samuel 2:4). Because he remained cour­
ageous and uncompromising, he emerged victorious.

Similarly, Daniel risked all that he had by refusing to com­
promise his obedience to God (Daniel 6:10). As a result, he was
thrown into the lions' den (Daniel 6:16-17). But God used his
lions' den experience for good. It became the first stage of do­
minion for him. It was not long before Daniel was raised up out
of the depths to rule over the whole land (Daniel 6:23-28).
Because he remained courageous and uncompromising, he
emerged victorious.

The early Christians also risked all that they had by refusing
to compromise their obedience to God (Acts 4:19-20). As a
result, they were thrown into prison (Acts 5:19). But God used
their prison experience for good. It became the first stage of
dominion for them. It was not long before they were raised up
out of the depths to rule over the whole land (Acts 19:26).
Because they remained courageous and uncompromising, they
emerged victorious.

This same pattern runs all throughout the Bible. It underlies
the stories of Abraham (Genesis 12:10-20), Esther (Esther 3:6-15;
8:1-7), Job (Job 1:13-22; 42:10-15), Jeremiah (Jeremiah 37:11-16;
39:11-12), Elijah (1 Kings 17:1-16; 18:20-46), Hosea (Hosea 1:2-9;
3:1-5), Micaiah (1 Kings 22:7-12, 24-40), and the Apostle Paul
(Philippians 1:7; 3:8-16). Each of these heroes of the faith wit­
nessed the resurrection power of Almighty God. Each of them saw
the most difficult and oppressive circumstances transformed into
glorious victory. Each of them went from death to life, from
bondage to liberty, and from prison to promise. Each of them
mirrored and illumined the Gospel by their great courage:

For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also re­
ceived, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures,
and that He was buried, and that He was raised on the third
day according to the Scriptures (1 Corinthians 15:3-4).

Jesus refused to compromise (Luke 22:42; Philippians
2:5-8). As a result, He was abandoned to the shame of the cross
and the prison of the grave (Matthew 16:21). But God used
both the cross and the grave, the shame and the prison, for
good. They became the first stage of dominion for Him. On the
third day, Jesus arose out of the depths to rule and reign over
the whole land (Philippians 2:9-11). That is the very essence of
the Gospel.

When we remain courageous, facing persecution head on,
walking “by faith and not by sight” (2 Corinthians 5:7), we
affirm the very essence of the Gospel. We are also invincible.

So, how are we to nurture such courage?

First, we need to develop a personal program of obedience.
We need to demonstrate courage in the smaller arenas of life be­
fore we attempt to conquer the world—or Planned Parenthood.
We need to show an individual willingness to implement God’s
plan for marriage, childrearing, financial responsibility, business
integrity, interpersonal ethics, and moral uprightness. We need
to show ourselves faithful in the small things before God can give us responsibility over the big things (Luke 16:10).

Second, we need to develop leadership recruitment and training programs. We must find the willing, train the eager, and encourage the hesitant. We need to scour the hedgerows and beat the bushes (Luke 14:21-23). Courage is both taught and caught. It is, thus, our responsibility to gather the next wave of Christian warriors, training them for valor while, at the same time, modeling valor for them.

Third, we need to transform our churches into both hives of activity and havens of rest. We should be equipped to do the whole work of the ministry at church (Ephesians 4:12). That means that picketers for the local Planned Parenthood should be enlisted, trained, and mobilized there. That means that volunteers for the local alternatives center should be encouraged and commissioned there. But the church should also be a place where the courageous can find sanctuary and take refuge. It should be a place where we can find refreshment. That kind of balance can only be found in true worship.

Confronting the evil of Planned Parenthood demands the unflinching confidence of Christian valor. It requires the uncompromising commitment of Christian bravery. It necessitates the righteous character of Christian courage.

Be very firm, then, to keep and do all that is written in the book of the law of Moses, so that you may not turn aside from it to the right or to the left. . . . But you are to cling to the Lord your God, as you have done to this day (Joshua 23:6, 8).

Strength

If we are to expose the evil of Planned Parenthood, we must also be mighty, stalwart, dynamic, and strong. Like alertness, steadfastness, and courage, this is a cornerstone of Christian character.

We are all called to be strong in Christ (2 Corinthians 10:3-6). God has not given us a spirit of weakness, but of power (2 Timothy 1:7).

The Gospel comes in power (1 Thessalonians 1:5). The Kingdom comes in power (1 Corinthians 4:19). And salvation comes
in power (Romans 1:16). It is a power that the wicked can never know (Matthew 22:29). But every believer is already anointed with it (Luke 24:49).

We have been endowed with the strength to witness (Acts 1:8), to labor (Colossians 1:29), and to do every good thing (Philippians 4:13).

Christ has given us all the strength of His might (Ephesians 1:9) and the strength of His grace (2 Timothy 2:1).

He gives strength to the weary, and to him who lacks might He increases power. Though youths grow weary and tired, and vigorous young men stumble badly, yet those who wait for the Lord will gain new strength; they will mount up with wings like eagles, they will run and not get tired, they will walk and not become weary (Isaiah 40:29-31).

And He has said to me, “My grace is sufficient for you, for power is perfected in weakness.” Most gladly, therefore, I will rather boast about my weaknesses, that the power of Christ may dwell in me. Therefore I am well content with weaknesses, with insults, with distresses, with persecutions, with difficulties, for Christ’s sake; for when I am weak, then I am strong (2 Corinthians 12:9-10).

Finally, be strong in the Lord, and in the strength of His might. Put on the full armor of God, that you may be able to stand firm against the schemes of the devil (Ephesians 6:10-11).

Strength means harnessing the excellent power of Christ to confront and captivate the powers and the principalities and the rulers of this poor, fallen world.

Nicholas Brooks is a lobbyist for a pro-life network in a state noted for its very liberal stance toward abortion. “Planned Parenthood has an easy time of it in this state, I’m afraid,” he told me. “Their funding levels are actually higher than some state agencies. I suppose I could let that get me down. But I believe strongly that, despite the fact that we’ve got the deck almost completely stacked against us here, we’ve put together an excellent statewide organization. We’re here to demonstrate the power of the Living God, to testify boldly of His great mercies. We do that, not by taking over, necessarily, but by demonstrat-
ing excellence and ability and skillfulness day in and day out. God's power is made perfect in our weakness when we display that weakness with precision and excellence."

As God's representatives before men (2 Corinthians 5:20), we are to "proclaim His excellencies" (1 Peter 2:9). But our proclamation must not merely be "in word or with tongue, but in deed and with truth" (1 John 3:18). We proclaim His mighty excellence by our mighty excellence. In everything we do and in everything we say, we are to manifest Him Who has "called us by His own glory and excellence" (2 Peter 1:3). As we follow after Him (Matthew 4:19), as we walk in His footsteps (1 Peter 2:21), and as we imitate His attributes (1 Peter 1:16), excellence is to be the hallmark of our strength.

God expects nothing less.

He Who long ago demanded excellent sacrifices (Malachi 1:8-10), excellent artistry (Exodus 28:2), and excellent service (Proverbs 12:4), has in no way altered His standards of discipleship. We are to live lives marked by moral excellence (2 Peter 1:5). We are to keep our behavior excellent at all times (1 Peter 1:1-2). Our minds are to dwell constantly on excellence (Philippians 4:8). We are to walk in the way of excellence (1 Corinthians 12:31), manifesting cultural excellence (Genesis 1:28), economic excellence (Proverbs 31:10-31), spiritual excellence (Philippians 1:10), and evangelistic excellence (Matthew 28:18-20). The power of God cannot be expressed through mediocrity and triviality.

The great God of excellence and power has called us to be men and women of excellence and power (1 Thessalonians 4:1, 10).

And how is this excellence to be nurtured and manifested?

First, we need to determine just what our gifts and talents are. We need to discipline and harness those abilities for the Kingdom. Focusing our energies on those things that we are qualified to handle enables us to do those things with excellence. We are able to accomplish more. We are able to attain fulfillment. And we are able to manifest our strength in Christ. God's power is made manifest.

Second, we need to make sure that whatever tasks we determine to undertake, we take pains to perform to the best of our abilities. Sloppy, shoddy work does nothing to advance the cause of Christ. There is really no excuse for it. Each of us has areas of
expertise that we can consecrate for the Kingdom. Whatever those areas are, we need to concentrate on heightening our skillfulness and perfecting our abilities.

Third, we need to support the causes and ministries that are really accomplishing something.

The scandalous goings-on in TV evangelism have only served to underscore the need to carefully target our giving and to support the works of genuine excellence. Ministries that are little more than fundraising operations or personality cults should be avoided at all costs. Causes that do little more than stoke the star-maker machinery are worse than worthless. Time, resources, and money are in precious short supply. They should be distributed only to those ministries that actually manifest the excellent power of God.

Fourth, we need to promote and support youngsters that show genuine promise. Scholarships must be secured for Christian students in journalism, medicine, economics, political science, philosophy, history, education, fine arts, biology, and business. And support must be developed for those few institutions that are actually taking those young, impressionable students and turning them into excellent champions for Christ, dynamic activists for the Kingdom, and mighty workers for life and truth.

Confronting the evil of Planned Parenthood demands the unbending fortitude of Christian might. It requires the excellent dynamic of Christian power. It necessitates the righteous character of Christian strength.

For this reason, I bow my knees before the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth derives its name, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inner man; so that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; and that you, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled up to all the fullness of God. Now to Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly beyond all that we ask or think, according to the power that works within us, to Him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations forever and ever. Amen (Ephesians 3:14-21).
Love

If we are to expose the evil of Planned Parenthood, we must be respectful, affectionate, loving, and tenderhearted. Like alertness, steadfastness, courage, and strength, it is a cornerstone of Christian character.

We are all called to be long-suffering in love and tenderness (Philippians 1:3-11). We are to show love to strangers (Deuteronomy 10:19), as well as neighbors (Leviticus 19:18). We are to show love to enemies (Matthew 5:44), as well as brethren (1 Peter 3:8).

In all things, at all times, we are to be examples of love (1 Timothy 4:12). We are to abound in love (Philippians 1:9). We are to walk in love (Ephesians 5:2). We are to comfort one another in love (Titus 3:5), provoke one another in love (Hebrews 10:24), and labor with one another in love (1 Thessalonians 1:3). For love is the Royal Law (James 2:8).

And so, as those who have been chosen of God, holy and beloved, put on a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience; bearing with one another, and forgiving each other, whoever has a complaint against anyone; just as the Lord forgave you, so also should you. And beyond all these things put on love, which is the perfect bond of unity (Colossians 3:12-14).

Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brothers to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious oil upon the head, coming down upon the beard, even Aaron’s beard, coming down upon the edge of his robes. It is like the dew of Hermon, coming down upon the mountains of Zion; for there the Lord commanded the blessing—life forever (Psalm 133:1-3).

A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another, even as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are My disciples, if you have love for one another (John 13:34-35).

Jan Oberholtzer is a sidewalk counselor. Every Saturday, she spends about five hours talking with girls outside a Planned Parenthood abortuary, providing them with information that they would never receive inside the clinic.
“Most of the girls have never been given any information about fetal development or fetal pain,” she told me. “They know absolutely nothing about the medical risks of abortion. They are totally misinformed about everything from payment schedules to liability release forms. So, I’m out here to try to bring a little balance to the situation. Sometimes it’s really frustrating. I go home and just weep for the girls that get sucked in and believe the lies. I have to keep reminding myself that I’m here out of obedience. Otherwise, I don’t think I could do this week after week. I’m here out of obedience. And that is the highest love of all.”

Love is not just a feeling. It is not a warm and fuzzy affection deep inside our hearts. Love is something we do.

Jesus said that if anyone loves Him, he will keep His commandments (John 14:23). Whoever does not keep the commandments, then, does not have love (John 14:24). Love and obedience are inseparable.

Genuine love can only occur when we do what is right in the sight of the Lord, not turning aside to the right or to the left (2 Kings 22:2). It can only flourish in lives that are forthright in the condemnation of sin (Daniel 4:27), unguarded in the pronouncement of truth (Daniel 5:13-28), and single-minded in adherence to the Word of God (Daniel 6:5).

Love means to hold fast to Scripture (Joshua 23:8), to be immovable from it (1 Corinthians 15:58), and to serve the truth with all our hearts (1 Samuel 12:21-22, 24-25).

So how are we to develop and demonstrate such love? 

First, we need to serve others. Service is a visible manifestation of obedient love. But it is also a hothouse for the development of obedient love. As we serve, as we obey, our feelings, affections, and desires are brought into line. When we serve girls with crisis pregnancies by providing them with a home and medical care and nurture and sustenance, our love is stirred and substantiated. When we give our time to the local high school, or to the city government, or to the county jury to oppose the encroachment of Planned Parenthood, our love is developed and demonstrated.

Second, we need to pray for the perpetrators of the Planned Parenthood scandal. When we pray for our enemies, our hearts are changed. God answers our prayers by working in our lives as
well as theirs. We must pray for the doctors, the lawyers, the admin­
istrators, the nurses, the security guards, the receptionists, the
secretaries, the bureaucrats, the judges, and the legislators that
make the Planned Parenthood juggernaut possible. We
must pray both imprecatorily and approbatively. Then, and
only then, will a genuine, obedient love permeate our work.

Third, we must work hard at integrating obedient love into
our families. Parents are charged by God with the awesome and
fearsome responsibility of raising their children up “in the nur­
ture and admonition of the Lord” (Ephesians 6:4). That is not
the job of the pastor, the Sunday School teacher, the youth direc­
tor, the summer camp counselor, the TV evangelist, or the
Christian school educator. It is, first and foremost, the job of
parents. Thus, it is our job to inculcate prayer habits in our chil­
dren by actually praying with them. It is our job to establish
Bible study disciplines in our children by actually studying with
them. It is our job to nurture a commitment to Body life by actu­
ally fellowshipping with them. It is our job to confirm a respect for
the throne of God by actually worshiping with them. And it is
our job to teach them about their bodies and their feelings by not
only talking with them but by actually fasting with them, feast­
ing with them, and displaying self-control in their midst. That
is obedient love.

Confronting the evil of Planned Parenthood demands the re­
spectful commitment of Christian tenderness. It requires the
obedient long-suffering of Christian tenderness. It necessitates
the righteous character of Christian love.

If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but do not have
love, I have become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. And if
I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all
knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains,
but do not have love, I am nothing. And if I give all my posses­
sions to feed the poor, and if I deliver my body to be burned,
but do not have love, it profits me nothing. Love is patient,
love is kind, and is not jealous; love does not brag and is not ar­
rogant, does not act unbecomingly; it does not seek its own, is
not provoked, does not take into account a wrong suffered,
does not rejoice in unrighteousness, but rejoices with the truth;
bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all
Character in Context

Christian character traits are essential. Alertness, steadfastness, courage, strength, and love are indispensable. Confronting the evil of Planned Parenthood would be impossible without them.

But, by themselves, even those character traits are not enough. They must be placed in their proper context. And that context is the church.

The church has become the spurned and neglected step-child of the modern era. It is perceived as being moss-backed and archaic. Or awkward and irrelevant. It is regarded as little more than a water-boy to the game of life.

Part of the reason for this horribly low estimation of the church is due to the fact that the church has always limped through history. Men look at the all too evident, all too apparent, sometimes even glaring, weaknesses of Christ's Bride and just assume that its lame and crippled state is ample justification for dismissing its importance.

The fact is, though, the church's limp is actually a confirmation of its power, relevance, and significance.

After the Fall, God told Satan that the Righteous Deliverer, Jesus Christ, would crush his head. But God also said that, in the process, the heel of the Lord would be bruised (Genesis 3:15). The limp, then, that Christ's Body displays is actually a sign of great victory, not a sign of defeat or incompetence. It is an emblem of triumph.

This reality is portrayed all throughout the Bible. For instance, when Jacob, the father of Israel's twelve tribes, wrestled through the night at Penial, he limped ever after as a sign that he had prevailed (Genesis 32:31).

The Apostle Paul, father of the Gentile church, was given a thorn in the flesh. Since thorns grow along the ground, Paul was pricked—at least symbolically—in the foot. It kept him limping in the eyes of men (2 Corinthians 12:7). Even so, it was in this weakness that Christ's power was affirmed and perfected (2 Corinthians 12:9).

Thus, when the church limps through history, as believers we need not be frustrated or discouraged. On the contrary, we
should be encouraged that God's Word is sure and true. For victory has, indeed, already been won.

The reality is that whatever the church does or doesn't do directly affects the course of civilization. It determines the flow of historical events (Revelation 5-6).

The church has the keys to the Kingdom (Matthew 16:19). It has the power to bind and to loose (Matthew 18:18). It has the authority to prevail over the very gates of hell (Matthew 16:18). It is, thus, the church—not governments or movements or causes or organizations—that will determine our destiny and the destiny of our world.

Thus, all our efforts to confront the evil of Planned Parenthood must be placed in the context of the church. Even if we are alert, steadfast, brave, strong, and loving, if we separate ourselves from the church, we are doomed to frustration. There simply cannot be any "Lone Rangers."

The reason for this is threefold:

First, it is the church that offers us the source of life. It offers the Waters of Life (Revelation 22:17), the Bread of Life (John 6:31, 1 Corinthians 11:24), and the Word of Life (1 John 1:1). The sacramental ministry of the church is our only source for these grace provisions. There is nowhere else that we can turn for these "medicines of immortality." They effect a tangible offering to God, a consecration before God, a communion with God, and a transformation in God. Thus, they actually readjust us to the ultimate reality, making our alertness, steadfastness, courage, strength, and love forces to be reckoned with.

Second, the church offers us accountability and discipline. Sin cripples any work. Whenever sin is casually tolerated, all our efforts are defiled (1 Corinthians 5:6-13), evangelism is stifled (1 Corinthians 5:1-5), and victory is denied (Joshua 7:1-15). Only the church has the authority to discipline heinous sin (Matthew 18:15-20). The purpose of this kind of accountability is, of course, protective and restorative, not defensive or punitive. It is to erect a hedge of responsibility and respectability around our efforts to confront the evil of Planned Parenthood.

Third, the church offers us a place of rest. When, as God's people, we assemble ourselves together, we are at last able to lie down in green pastures, beside still waters (Psalm 23:2). As we
gather around the throne of grace, we are at last able to take refuge and find sanctuary (Psalm 61:1-4). We are able to enter His gates with thanksgiving and His courts with praise (Psalm 100:4). In other words, in the church, we are able to find rest (Hebrews 4:1-13), restoration (Psalm 19:7), reconciliation (Psalm 32:3-6), and recompense (Psalm 73:15-24).

Without the context of the church, even the most dynamic Christian character is exposed to atrophy and entropy. But, within that context, our alertness, steadfastness, courage, strength, and love become powerful weapons in our desperate confrontation with the evil of Planned Parenthood.

**Conclusion**

Nothing can compensate for a lack of integrity and a deficiency of character. Not great wealth. Not access to the masses. Not wild-eyed popularity. Not superb organization. And not mind-boggling power. Just ask the kingpins of the once-proud empire of television evangelism.

The collapse of televangelism was not due to the unpopularity of its message, but to the impiety of its messengers. It was not due to the opposition of its enemies, but to the opulence of its allies.

Our efforts for life, liberty, and truth face similar jeopardy.

Without Christian character, all our scheming and dreaming inevitably comes to naught. Without it, we are impotent in the face of wickedness and evil. Without it, we are helpless before the Planned Parenthood juggernaut.

Our picketing is essential. Our lobbying is crucial. Our education is vital. Our voting is imperative. Our activism is momentous. But if we are ever to effectively expose and confront evil, we must develop and demonstrate Godly character.
THIRTEEN

IDOLS FOR DESTRUCTION: A STRATEGY FOR PROPHETS AND PRIESTS

in hoc signo vinces

Human affairs are moved from deep springs. A spirit moves them. It is by the acceptation, the denial, and the renewal of philosophies that this society of immortal mortals is marked, changed or restored.

Hilaire Belloc

Sand was blowing in off the desert, carried into the city by freak Santa Ana winds. Carbon arcs, mounted on the roofs of several police cars, threw the cracked roadbed into stark relief and made the sand look like static on a video screen.

Reba Elvin stared at the surreal scene, blinking back her tears. Her husband, her son, her pastor, and her Sunday School teacher had all just been arrested. For praying outside a Planned Parenthood clinic.

"I was in shock," she told me later. "To think that in America you can be handcuffed and dragged off to jail for praying on a sidewalk! It's frightening. Where will all this end?"

Unfortunately for Reba and the members of her small Presbyterian church, it didn't end that day with a trip to jail. Three days later, several pro-abortion groups, including Planned Parenthood, asked a federal judge to revoke the church's tax-exempt status, to force the pastor to hand over the church's files and financial records, and to restrain the church's members "and all those acting in concert with them" from any further public protests against abortion.

Planned Parenthood's spokeswoman told the press the church was "in violation of IRS restrictions on political activity
by non-profit organizations. So, besides the fact that the pastor and the membership were trespassing on private property and attempting to restrict the constitutional rights of others, they were also transgressing the time-honored . . . wall of separation between church and State."4

But that is not exactly how eye witnesses of the incident reported it.

"First of all," Reba told me, "no one was on Planned Parenthood's property. Everyone was on the public sidewalk in front of their building. No one even stepped on the grass. Secondly, no one was attempting to restrict anybody's constitutional rights. The people from the church were just there to pray—quietly, peacefully, and in order. No one blocked ingress or egress. No one stopped clients from entering if they wanted to. Now really, since when is praying an attempt to restrict somebody's rights? Thirdly, this wall of separation business is nothing more than an attempt to keep Christians out of public life. If we're ever going to adequately deal with groups like Planned Parenthood, we're going to have to put that myth to rest."

Church and State

According to the design for society outlined in the Bible, church and state are separate institutions.5 They have separate jurisdictions. They have separate authorities. And they have separate functions.

A balanced social order depends on that kind of institutional differentiation. When any one institution begins to encroach upon another, anarchy and tyranny inevitably result. Checks and balances begin to break down.

Thus, it is important that the state not meddle in the affairs of the church. That is simply not its concern. The church is outside of the state's jurisdiction. The framers of the American Constitution recognized this fundamental plank of liberty and, thus, the first article in the Bill of Rights states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."6 The state has no authority over the church and, therefore, must not regulate or interfere in the work of the church. Local municipalities, and even individual commonwealths, might render support to the church—as they often did—but never were they to control the church.7 church and state are separate.
Likewise, the church must not meddle in the affairs of the state. That is simply not its concern. The state is outside of the church’s jurisdiction. Again, the framers of the American Constitution wanted to protect their fledgling republic from any and all tyrannies: both *statism*—in the form of imperialism, socialism, or democracy; and *oligarchy*—in the form of ecclesiocracy, agathism, or caesaro-papism. The church has no authority over the state and, therefore, must not regulate or interfere in the work of the state. They are separate.

This, of course, does not mean that church and state are to have nothing to do with each other. On the contrary, it is essential that they interact and cooperate with each other. They are to balance each other. They are to serve each other. They are to check each other. So, even though they are institutionally separate, their separation is not absolute and exclusive. There is no *wall of separation*. Rather, church and state are distinct but cooperative. They are separate but interdependent.

The *wall* is a myth.

Joseph Story, perhaps America’s foremost nineteenth-century legal historian, underscored this truth in his book on the Constitution saying:

> The First Amendment was not intended to withdraw the Christian religion as a whole from the protection of Congress. . . . At the time, the general, if not universal, sentiment in America was that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the state so far as was compatible with the private rights of conscience and the freedom of worship. . . . Any attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference would have created . . . universal indignation.

The state was to encourage the church.

At the same time, the church was to cooperate with and encourage the state. For instance, the church was to teach the citizenry the Bible, the common standard of law for both church and state. The church was to instruct all men and women in the basic principles of godly citizenship and righteous cultural action. The church was to mobilize the forces of mercy, truth, and justice in times of difficulty or crisis. The church was to recruit from the ranks of the congregation able men and women for the work of civil service. The church was to confront evil, expose sin, and denounce injustice whenever and wherever it
might be found, public and private, civil and congregational. The church was to encourage the magistrates, pray for them, support them, instruct them, and advise them. In other words, the church was to serve as society's prophet and priest.

The American system was, thus, set up as a decentralized, confederated, and republican social structure. It followed the Biblical order of multiple jurisdictions, separate but cooperating, under the sovereignty of God and the rule of His Law.

The current notion of the wall of separation between church and state is, thus, a far cry from what our Founding Fathers intended. It is, in fact, a denial of the multiplicity of institutions and jurisdictions. It cripples the church and exalts the state. It asserts the absolute authority of the state and excludes believers from participation in the cultural, social, and political processes.

The wall of separation idea was slow to catch on in our nation. Until the War Between the States erupted, Christianity was universally encouraged at every level of the civil government. Then, in 1861, under the influence of the radical Unitarians, the Northern Union ruled in the courts that the civil sphere should remain "indifferent" to the church. After the war, that judgment was imposed on the Southern Confederation as well. One hundred years later, in 1961, the erosion of the American system of checks and balances continued with the judicial declaration that all faiths were to be "leveled" by the state. By 1963, the courts were protecting and favoring a new religion—humanism had been declared a religion by the Supreme Court in 1940—while persecuting and limiting Christianity. The government in Washington, much to the delight of groups like Planned Parenthood, began to make laws "respecting an establishment of religion" and "prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It banned posting the Ten Commandments in school rooms, allowed the Bible to be read in tax-supported institutions only as an historical document, forbade prayer in the public domain, censored seasonal displays at Christmas, Easter, and Thanksgiving, regulated church schools and outreach missions, demanded IRS registration of religious institutions, and denied equal access to the media for Christian spokesmen. In short, it has stripped the church of its jurisdiction and dismantled the institutional differentiation the Founding Fathers were so careful to
It has robbed the church of its prophetic and priestly functions.

If our society is ever to return to the balance and integrity that the Founders intended, then the church will have to reclaim its legacy. And that won’t be easy. Unpleasant incidents, like the one Reba Elvin and her church had outside Planned Parenthood, demonstrate that. Even so, such sacrifices may be necessary.

When the righteous increase, the people rejoice, but when a wicked man rules, people groan (Proverbs 29:2).

For the sake of life and liberty in our land, the church must reassert its prophetic and priestly roles.

The Prophetic Church

Part of the reason the church is in such bondage today is that it has failed to teach the truth. Instead of nurturing God’s People with the rich truths of practical Biblical instruction, we have indulged in theological junk food, sectarian arcania, and intellectual irrelevancies. Instead of cultivating commitment on the unwavering foundation of God’s Word, we have humored ourselves with ecclesiastical white elephants.

Therefore My people go into exile for their lack of knowledge; and their honorable men are famished, and their multitude is parched with thirst (Isaiah 5:13).

“Behold, days are coming,” declares the Lord God, “when I will send a famine on the land, not a famine for bread or a thirst for water, but rather for hearing the words of the Lord. And people will stagger from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east; they will go to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, but they will not find it” (Amos 8:11-12).

When Sava of Trnova visited the Kievan Christian republic in 1202, he was struck by the glorious architecture of the churches, by their magnificent music, by their extravagant art, and by their elaborate liturgies. But it was the preaching that impressed him the most. “The vaunted greatness of this land,” he wrote, “is surely rooted in the vaunted greatness of its church. The
vaunted greatness of its church, though steeped in the mighty weigh of orthodoxy, is surely rooted in the power and suasion of its prophetic proclamation from the pulpit. The church taught its people then. And, as a result, those people had built a marvelous culture with liberty and justice for all.

When Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States in 1830, he had a similar experience. He attributed much of the greatness he observed in the land to the vibrancy and relevancy of the church's prophetic role. He noted that virtually every community in the vast new republic was indelibly marked by "pulpits aflame with righteousness." The church taught its people then. And, as a result, those people had built a marvelous culture with liberty and justice for all.

The prophetic church applies the Bible to every sphere of life: art, music, ideas, government, education, medicine, history, economics, agriculture, and science. It believes that "the Bible is authoritative on everything of which it speaks." And it believes that "it speaks of everything." It believes that "not one jot or tittle" has in any wise passed from it (Matthew 5:18). It believes that it is "settled in heaven" (Psalm 119:89), and "established on earth" (Psalm 119:90). It believes the Bible, and it teaches it systematically at all times, "in season and out of season" (2 Timothy 4:2).

Jesus therefore was saying to those Jews who had believed Him, "If you abide in My word, then you are truly disciples of Mine; and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32).

The prophetic church does not just teach the Bible though. It also applies it. The word prophet literally means guide. Whenever and wherever sin exists, the prophetic church is there: exposing, rebuking, reproving, correcting—and guiding.

Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience. Therefore do not be partakers with them; for you were for-
merly darkness, but now you are light in the Lord; walk as children of light (for the fruit of the light consists in all goodness and righteousness and truth), trying to learn what is pleasing to the Lord. And do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead even expose them (Ephesians 5:6-11).

When Planned Parenthood, and its allies in government and the media, rattle their sabers against the poor, the helpless, and the uninformed, the church must arise and expose them. The church must guide.

Son of man, speak to the sons of your people, and say to them, “If I bring a sword upon a land, and the people of the land take one man from among them and make him their watchman; and he sees the sword coming upon the land, and he blows on the trumpet and warns the people, then he who hears the sound of the trumpet and does not take warning, and a sword comes and takes him away, his blood will be on his own head. He heard the sound of the trumpet, but did not take warning; his blood will be on himself. But had he taken warning, he would have delivered his life. But if the watchman sees the sword coming and does not blow the trumpet, and the people are not warned, and a sword comes and takes a person from them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood I will require from the watchman’s hand” (Ezekiel 33:2-6).

If the church refuses the prophetic mantle of John the Baptist (Matthew 4:3-12), of Elijah (1 Kings 21:1-25), and of Nathan (2 Samuel 12:1-13) in exposing the evil deeds of darkness and guiding the people into all truth then the innocent are sure to perish, and God’s vast army will slumber through one Megiddo after another.

For if the bugle produces an indistinct sound, who will prepare himself for battle? (1 Corinthians 14:8).

The Priestly Task

Man’s chief end “is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever.” We are supposed to glorify and enjoy Him in every area of life and with every activity. But we are to do it particularly in worship.
Man is not merely one species among many. He is not a naked ape. He is not simply *homo sapiens*—or thinking man. Instead, he is *homo adorans*—or worshiping man as well. It is his ability to know and serve God that sets man apart from all the rest of creation.\(^{38}\)

When Moses went before Pharaoh to lobby for Israel's liberty, he did not say, "Let my people go that they may start a new political movement." Nor did he say, "Let my people go that they may establish a Christian nation." No, instead, he said, "Let my people go that they may hold a feast to Me in the wilderness" (Exodus 5:1). And, again, "Let my people go that they may serve Me in the wilderness" (Exodus 7:16).

As author David Chilton has written, "We know the story of Israel. God forces Pharaoh to release them and they went on to inherit the Promised Land. But the really crucial aspect of the whole Exodus event, as far as the people's activity was concerned, was *worship*.\(^{39}\) And so it continues to be today. Chilton concludes, "The orthodox Christian faith cannot be reduced to personal experiences, academic discussions, or culture-building activity—as important as all these are in varying degrees. The essence of Biblical religion is the worship of God. . . . True Christian reconstruction of culture is far from being simply a matter of passing Law X and electing Congressman Y. Christianity is not a political cult. It is the divinely ordained worship of the Most High God."\(^{40}\)

Notice what happens when God's people—*homo adorans*—forget this very fundamental truth:

In the second year of Darius the king, on the first day of the sixth month, the word of the Lord came by the prophet Haggai to Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah, and to Joshua the son of Jehozadak, the high priest saying, "Thus says the Lord of hosts, 'this people says, "The time has not yet come, even the time for the house of the Lord to be rebuilt."'"

Then the word of the Lord came by Haggai the prophet saying, "Is it time for you yourselves to dwell in your paneled houses while this house lies desolate?" Now therefore, thus says the Lord of hosts, "Consider your ways! You have sown much, but harvest little; you eat, but there is not enough to be satisfied;
you drink, but there is not enough to become drunk; you put on clothing, but no one is warm enough; and he who earns, earns wages to put into a purse with holes." Thus says the Lord of hosts, "Consider your ways! Go up to the mountains, bring wood and rebuild the temple, that I may be pleased with it and be glorified," says the Lord. "You look for much, but behold, it comes to little; when you bring it home, I blow it away. Why?" declares the Lord of hosts, "Because of My house which lies desolate, while each of you runs to his own house" (Haggai 1:1-9).

When we neglect the priestly role of the church, when we neglect worship, all else goes to seed.

If our first response to Planned Parenthood—or any other evil, for that matter—is political, or social, or organizational, or litigal, or judicial, we are no better than they, for we have put our trust in human action as the ultimate determiner of history.

The priestly church believes in the power of worship (Revelation 8:1-8). It believes in the primacy of worship (John 4:23-24). It believes in the preeminence of worship (Matthew 16:19). It believes that worship reorients us to God’s plan, God’s purpose, and God’s program (Psalm 73:1-28). It believes that worship is the starting point for cultural transformation (1 Timothy 2:1-4), for it is worship that ultimately brings about the demise of the wicked and the exaltation of the righteous (Psalm 83:1-18).

O come, let us sing for joy to the Lord; let us shout joyfully to the rock of our salvation. Let us come before His presence with thanksgiving; let us shout joyfully to Him with psalms. For the Lord is a great God, and a great King above all gods, in whose hand are the depths of the earth; the peaks of the mountains are His also. The sea is His, for it was He who made it; and His hands formed the dry land. Come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker. For He is our God, and we are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand (Psalm 95:1-7).

The priestly church does not just perform worship though. It also applies it. The word priest literally means guardian. Thus, a priest is someone who guards. He protects. He preserves. He stays the hand of destruction and defilement.
Adam was called to be a priest. He was to "cultivate and guard the garden" (Genesis 2:15). When he failed to do his duty, the Fall resulted and judgment fell on the land (Genesis 3:1-20).

Aaron was called to be a priest. He was to guard the people from sin and shame (Exodus 32:25). When he failed to do his duty, the people began to worship and revel before a golden calf and judgment fell on the land (Exodus 32:1-6).

The Levites were called to be priests. They were given that honor and privilege because they guarded the integrity of God when all the rest of Israel was consumed with idolatry (Exodus 32:26-29). It was not until they completely failed to do their duty that condemnation and judgment befell the land (Jeremiah 6:13-15).

Jesus commissioned the church to take up the priestly task (Matthew 28:19-20; 1 Peter 2:5). It was to preserve, protect, and guard the nations.

You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt has become tasteless, how will it be made salty again? It is good for nothing anymore, except to be thrown out and trampled under foot by men (Matthew 5:13).

If the church refuses the priestly mantle of Adam, Aaron, and the Levites, the poor and helpless will, indeed, be trampled under foot by men. They will be crushed by the likes of Planned Parenthood.

So now, in practical terms, just exactly how is the church to manifest its prophetic and priestly roles in the struggle for life? Once believers have been taught, exhorted, equipped, and commissioned, what then? Once they have worshiped, prayed, and proclaimed, what then? What do Christians do once they leave the four walls of the church?

Very simply, we go out and change the world.41 We serve the whole of society guiding and guarding the land: in the schools, in the media, in local government, in the legislature, in the courts, and in the bureaucracy.

The Schools

"A nation at risk."42 That is how the United States Department of Education describes the state of the Union, as viewed from the classroom.
Public education in this country is a dismal failure. Johnny can't read and Susie can't spell. Willie can't write and Alice can't add. Teacher competency is down. Administrative effectiveness is down. Student advancement is down. Test scores are down. Everything to do with our public school system is down—everything, that is, except crime, drug abuse, illicit sex, and the cost to taxpayers.\(^{43}\)

As many as twenty-three million adults in this country are functionally illiterate.\(^{44}\) An additional thirty-five million are aliterate—they can read a few basics with difficulty, but that is about all.\(^{45}\) SAT score comparisons reveal an unbroken decline from 1963 to the present.\(^{46}\) Average verbal scores have fallen over fifty points and mathematics scores have dropped nearly forty points.\(^{47}\) Among the one hundred fifty-eight member nations of the United Nations, the United States now ranks forty-ninth in its literacy levels.\(^{48}\) And this despite one of the most extensive and expensive school systems the world has ever seen.\(^{49}\) Education is, in fact, the second largest industry in the nation, spending more than a quarter trillion dollars every year, with nearly three million teachers and administrators, and the largest union in the world.\(^{50}\) Despite that, more than forty-five percent of all the products of that system cannot even read the front page of the morning newspaper.\(^{51}\)

Into the morass of mediocrity, Planned Parenthood has stepped, wreaking havoc. As if things weren't bad enough already. With guest speakers, information bureaus, sex education, curricula, films, literature distribution, and school-based clinics, Planned Parenthood has launched a full-scale invasion of our schools.\(^{52}\)

If we are going to serve society as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land, we are going to have to reach out to our schools.

There are several things that each of us can do to do just that. **First**, we can go to local PTA meetings. Believe it or not, a great deal can be accomplished at this grassroots level. Why not gather a small packet of Planned Parenthood materials, quotes, and statistics, and pass it around to the parents at a monthly meeting? Or volunteer to speak on the subject of sex education? Or, perhaps, form a task force group to investigate the school's
programs and procedures? The PTA has a tremendous amount of influence on the school administration and even the School Board. If we can catalyze a bottom-up surge of concern, or even outrage, we may be able to turn things around yet.

Second, we can go to School Board meetings. Mandates are often developed on the national level. Programs are formulated on the state level. But all the implementation and spending decisions ultimately pass through the School Board. Because Board members are elected officials, they are generally responsive to those who attend their meetings. Of course, that is the catch. Hardly anyone ever actually makes it to those meetings. Why not commit to attending just a couple of meetings a year? Or maybe we could get a group from our church to switch off so that each of the meetings is monitored. A few well-phrased proposals, a few well-timed testimonies, a few well-thought-out comments, a few wisely-placed books, and a few attended meetings could mean the difference between Planned Parenthood's receiving another School District contract, or some responsible social service provider's receiving it.

Third, we can volunteer to put together an alternative speakers bureau for the schools. Why not contact several local pro-life doctors and nurses and educators and get them into the schools instead of the Planned Parenthood staffers? Why not get a list of speakers and suggested assembly ideas to every health teacher, school nurse, gym teacher, coach, counselor, and principal in our school district? A little time, a little effort, and a little creativity can make all the difference in the world.

Fourth, we can buy good books, films, videos, and curriculum and donate them to our school libraries. The schools often operate on a very tight budget so they are not likely to buy much more than the required items. So, why not stock the shelves of the library with good, wholesome, and helpful items? Perhaps we could even sponsor a book fair so that Christians from throughout the community can participate in your project. A school can't very well use what it doesn't have.

Fifth, we can get involved with the students ourselves. Why not start a youth Bible study after school? Or maybe volunteer with an existing Youth for Christ or Navigator or Young Life or Campus Crusade or Fellowship of Christian Athletes or Chi Alpha pro-
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gram? Building relationships with the students and discipling them for Christ will do more to stymie Planned Parenthood than almost anything else.

One way or another, we need to reach out to our schools. We need to serve them as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land.

The Media

Planned Parenthood, for all intents and purposes, has the media in its pocket. It has accomplished that feat in part by shrewdly developing and craftily implementing a comprehensive system of news releases, news contacts, media spokesmen, data retrieval, source procurement, public relations campaigns, expert analysis, advertising, and interview leads. As a result, it has been able to nurture stories, do lead generation, time breaking events, create desirable publicity, snowball feature items, and shape public opinion.

Why has the church failed to develop that kind of media acumen? Why have pro-life groups not been able to exploit the media as a wedge against public policy the way Planned Parenthood has? Certainly, it is not because the opportunities are lacking. It is not because the technology is unavailable. Nor is it because the resources are inaccessible. But, for some reason, we have yet to make the long-term commitments necessary to turn the media around.

That must change. If we are going to serve our society as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land, we are going to have to recapture the media.

There are several things that each of us can do to do just that. First, we can write letters to the editor. If we have something to say, we ought to say it. Instead of constantly murmuring and complaining about the biased coverage in our local newspapers and magazines, we can voice our opinion. Why not offer an alternative perspective of the latest Planned Parenthood initiative? Or, perhaps, we can gain publicity for the positive programs that our local church or alternative center is offering? A brief, polite, respectful, and well-phrased letter may be able to spark a community-wide dialogue where the facts about Planned Parenthood can actually come to light.
Second, we can put together press packets and media contact networks ourselves. It is hard to dispute facts. And it is hard to ignore facts that are constantly presented in an amiable and professional manner. Why not begin to circulate to local reporters and newsmen a few selected fact sheets, statistical surveys, financial charts, pamphlets, and books on Planned Parenthood? Or, perhaps, develop a series of press releases that we hand deliver to one or two sympathetic broadcasters? If we plan ahead and prepare properly, we can, at the very least, let the media know that we’re here and that we mean business.

Third, we can hold press conferences. If we regularly recover the broken bodies of children from the dumpsters behind a Planned Parenthood clinic, there is no reason in the world why we shouldn’t let the world know. Why not call out the camera crews, contact the newspapers, and notify the radio stations? If we can consistently deliver hard news, controversial stories, and substantial interviews, they will keep coming back to us. We can then begin to use them instead of the other way around.

Fourth, even if every avenue is closed in our community, we can still get the word out. Why not start a radio program? Or even a TV show? Many stations around the country sell air time at very reasonable rates. If we can put together a crisp, professional, responsible, and informative program, we can go straight to the community. Then, instead of constantly having to fight with the media, we become the media. If radio is out of the question, why not try a newsletter? Even a small, little mimeographed neighborhood information sheet can cause Planned Parenthood all kinds of headaches if it presents accurate, up-to-date, hard-hitting information.

Fifth, we can sway advertisers and sponsors to press for more objective coverage. A boycott is not the only kind of leverage that we can use with businesses to get them to spend their publicity dollars more responsibly. A clear presentation of the facts can do wonders. Why not include major advertisers and public relations firms in our press release list? Or, perhaps, we could develop a relationship with the decision-makers, helping them to realize what kind of impact they have on the community. The media will not continue to support Planned Parenthood if they see their advertising space dropping off significantly.
One way or another, we need to recapture the media. We need to serve it as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land.

**Local Governments**

Local governments are truly the nuts and bolts of the American system. Without the administration of cities, counties, parishes, districts, precincts, zones, commissions, municipalities, and states, civil stability would surely disintegrate. The Founding Fathers of our nation recognized that, and the system of government that they designed was purposefully decentralized and localized. They wanted to make certain that the villages, townships, communities, and states shaped the policies of the nation and the priorities in Washington, not vice versa.

Napoleon once asserted that the way to capture a nation is not to "storm the palaces," but to "capture the countryside." He was right.

The impact of Planned Parenthood has been enhanced as much by local zoning ordinances, health codes, and funding appraisals as it has by court rulings and legislative packages. There is a basic principle at work here— not just a constitutional principle, but a Biblical principle: whoever will be faithful with "few things" and "small things," will be made master over "many things" and "great things" (Matthew 25:14-30).

If we are going to serve society as prophets and priests, we are going to have to participate in, and influence, our local governments.

There are several things that each of us can do to do just that.

*First*, we can attend meetings. Again, it is the small meeting that determines the course of community life: city council meetings, county health board meetings, utility district meetings, tax appraisal meetings, county development meetings, and environmental impact meetings. Only a tiny handful of people—about one tenth of one percent of the registered voters—attend those meetings on a regular basis. Only about two percent of the electorate ever attend such meetings. Needless to say, that minuscule minority has an inordinate amount of influence over the day-to-day administration of their local governing bodies. So why not be a party to that powerful minority? Why not sit on a few com-
mittees, put together a few budget proposals, and develop alternatives to the present programs? If we would, Planned Parenthood would surely be exposed for what it is.

Second, we can participate in precinct caucuses. The precinct is the lowest common denominator in the American political process. Basically, it is an election district. It is the place where votes are cast and counted. But it is also the hub of party organization. It is there in the precinct that our political parties receive their direction, support, continuity, platform, and purpose. What a party is, whom it nominates, and even where it is going are all determined in those small meetings all across the country, in schools, American Legion halls, and polling booths, not under the bright lights of the national convention. And the thing is, anyone who votes in a party's primary is eligible to participate in the precinct caucus. Only about three percent ever actually do.\(^{58}\) So, why not let that three percent be us? Why not submit resolutions that hit hard on Planned Parenthood's programs of lust and greed? Why not elect pro-life activists as precinct chairmen, election marshals, poll watchers, and convention delegates? We can actually make a difference if only we will.

Third, we can participate in local campaigns and elections. Every vote really matters. Since only about sixty percent of the citizens of this country are registered to vote, and only about thirty-five percent actually bother to go to the polls, a candidate only needs the support of a small elite group of people to win.\(^{59}\) It only takes about fourteen percent of the electorate to gain a seat in the Senate.\(^{60}\) It takes about eleven percent to gain a seat in the House.\(^{61}\) Only about nine percent is needed to win a governorship.\(^{62}\) And it takes a mere seven percent to take an average mayoral or city council post.\(^{63}\) Any race is winnable. Why not get involved in a worthy campaign? Why not work to get magistrates in office who will defund Planned Parenthood? Why not give up a few weekends to stuff some envelopes, post some yard signs, man a phone bank, host a candidate forum, distribute bumper stickers, or mount a voter registration drive? We truly can make every vote count.

One way or another, we need to participate in, and influence, our local governments. We need to serve them as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land.
The Legislature

Ostensibly, Congress is the source of all federal law in this country. The president cannot make law; he only administers it. The courts cannot make law; they only adjudicate it. Only the combined efforts of the two branches of Congress—the House and the Senate—can make law.

The House of Representatives has four hundred thirty-five members apportioned on the basis of population, and elected every two years from among the fifty states. The Senate has one hundred members, two from each state, elected to staggered six-year terms. Together those five hundred thirty-five magistrates have the power to stop abortion, defund Planned Parenthood, clean up our schools, regulate the profligate birth control drug trade, revoke tax-exempt status for abortuaries, enforce parental consent, and increase legal and medical liabilities. If only they would.

And they would if we could only bring the right kind of pressure to bear.

If we are going to serve our society as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land, we are going to have to influence the legislature.

There are several things that each of us can do to do just that. First, we can initiate correspondence with our legislators. Only one out of every twenty Americans has ever written to their Congressmen. Only one out of every two hundred has written more than once. And only one out of every ten thousand has written more than five times. So while the mail room on Capitol Hill may receive several thousand letters every day, only a few hundred actually address specific policy issues—the rest are trivial or intercessory. Because the congressional staff tabulates these letters and then surveys them in the manner of a poll, any one letter can leave a tremendous impact on the policymaking process. And a regular, consistent correspondence may mean the difference between a pro or con vote on something as important as Title XX appropriations for Planned Parenthood or Hyde Amendment restrictions or a Freedom of Choice Act or a Fetal Harvesting bill. So why not invest the price of a stamp and fifteen minutes' time and write a letter? But not just one letter. Why not develop a habit of correspondence? Informative, cordial,
fact-laden, action-oriented, positive, and helpful letters launched the first American Revolution. Perhaps they can launch a second.

Second, we can attend our legislator’s home district meetings. Most Congressmen come home for town meetings, or issues seminars or fundraisers or social events or campaign stops or holiday celebrations. Only a very small part of the constituency regularly attends these meetings. Why not take it upon ourselves to make as many of those appearances as we possibly can? Or delegate various meetings out to several people in the church who can report back to the whole group? If our legislator knows that a very informed, very active, very vocal core of his constituency is unalterably opposed to Planned Parenthood funding and contracting and coddling, he is much more likely to examine the issues with some degree of care. And if we have the opportunity at those personal appearances to hand him fact sheets, press kits, tracts, or books, then all the better.

Third, we can respond to our legislator’s polls. Most Congressmen use the mails to gauge constituency concerns. Why not make the most of those prime opportunities? Why not answer his polls thoughtfully and carefully with hand-written comments in the margins? A personal, neat, well-composed comment shows congressional staffers that we really care about an issue, and they are more likely to consider our thoughts.

Fourth, we can testify before congressional committee and sub-committee hearings. There are at least sixteen different stages that a bill must pass through before it actually becomes law. It must be introduced. It must be referred to committee. It must proceed through the appropriate sub-committees within that committee. It must then be subjected to hearings and mark-up. Next, the bill must be reported to the full House. Then it is put on the calendar. When the date for discussion on the floor finally comes up, consideration must be obtained. Then discussion, amendment, and debate occurs. Next comes the voting stage. If the bill passes the House it is referred to the Senate where a similar, albeit shorter, consideration, committee, and floor process is followed. Once the Senate passes its version, the bill goes before a joint committee of both branches to consolidate any differences. The completed bill then goes to the president for signing. Only then does the bill become law. The thing is,
anywhere along the way, the bill can be altered, adjusted, or scrapped altogether. That is why committee and sub-committee hearings are so crucial. Debate, discussion, and expert testimony in those early stages of a bill can decide whether it will be a strong moral and ethical piece of legislation or one more capitulation to the powers that be at Planned Parenthood. Why not get the doctors, lawyers, teachers, and counselors we know to go to Washington and testify for the several committees and sub-committees considering family planning legislation? Why should Planned Parenthood's experts be the only ones called on? We can just as easily make the calls and write the letters and pull the strings to get our people in as they can.

One way or another we need to influence the legislature. We need to serve it as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land.

The Courts

The judiciary has become a virtual playground for Planned Parenthood — despite twelve years of conservative judicial appointments. Besides the infamous Roe v. Wade decision, at least a dozen other decisions have been handed down by the Supreme Court that violate the sanctity of life and undermine the viability of the Constitution. In most of them, Planned Parenthood played a central role, as either the plaintiff or as a "friend of the court." In Doe v. Bolton, in 1973, the Court invalidated a Georgia statute limiting abortions to “accredited medical facilities.” The decision also broadened the definition of “maternal health” to include a broad range of factors including “general maternal well-being” as a justification for last trimester abortions.

In Bigelow v. Virginia, in 1975, the Court struck down a state law restricting abortion clinic advertising policies.

In Singleton v. Wulff, in 1976, the Court gave abortionists the right to challenge government abortion funding restrictions “on behalf of their patients.” Thus, the industry was given free rein to act as plaintiffs and lobby for themselves through the courts. In Planned Parenthood of Missouri v. Danforth, also in 1976, the Court struck down provisions in the state law requiring abortionists to save the life of the aborted child when possible. It also invalidated a spousal consent statute.
In *Colautti v. Franklin*, in 1979, the Court struck down a Pennsylvania statute creating a standard for the determination of the viability of unborn children.

In *Bellotti v. Baird*, also in 1979, the Court invalidated a Massachusetts statute requiring parental consent for minor children receiving abortions.

In *Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health*, in 1983, the Court struck down a city ordinance requiring all second and third trimester abortions to be performed in hospitals. It also invalidated a statute requiring abortionists to inform their patients of the medical risks of abortion and of possible alternatives to abortion. It argued, in essence, that the “pro-choice movement” need not provide women with choices.

In *Planned Parenthood of Kansas City v. Ashcroft*, also in 1983, the Court invalidated a state statute requiring second trimester abortions be performed in hospitals.

In *Thornburgh v. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists*, in 1986, the Court struck down all mild forms of abortion regulation, including restrictions for informed consent, informational reporting requirements, and performance of abortions after viability. The decision, for all intents and purposes, made abortion the only completely unregulated surgical procedure in the United States.

In *Webster v. Reproductive Services*, in 1989, the Court opened the door for state perogative in regulating abortion facilities. Heralded as a victory for “anti-choice” forces by the media, the ruling in fact did not strike down a single provision in *Roe* or create any form of restriction on child-killing procedures.

In *Rust v. Sullivan*, in 1991, the Court upheld the right of the federal government to determine who could and who could not receive Public Health Service block grants. Again, though widely advertised as a “pro-life” victory, the decision did not strike down any aspect of the childkilling standards of *Roe*.

In *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, in 1992, the so-called “conservative” Court actually reinforced and upheld the child-killing-on-demand principles of *Roe* while at the same time confirming the “compelling interest of the various states.”

The great liberties that we enjoy in America have been secured against the arbitrary and fickle whims of men and movements...
by *the rule of law.* Our system of government does not depend upon the benevolence of the magistrates, or the altruism of the wealthy, or the condescension of the powerful. Every citizen, rich or poor, man or woman, native-born or immigrant, hale or handicapped, young or old, is equal under the standard of unchanging, immutable, and impartial justice.

As Thomas Paine wrote in *Common Sense,* the powerful booklet that helped spark the War for Independence, "In America, the law is king."71

If left to the mere discretion of human authorities, statutes, edicts, and ordinances inevitably devolve into tyranny. There must therefore be an absolute against which no encroachment of prejudice or preference may interfere. There must be a foundation that the winds of change and the waters of circumstance cannot erode. There must be a basis for law that can be depended upon at all times, in all places, and in every situation.

Apart from this Christian innovation in the affairs of men there can be no freedom. There never has been before, and there never will be again. Our Founding Fathers knew that only too well.

The opening refrain of the Declaration of Independence affirms the necessity of an absolute standard upon which the rule of law must be based:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Appealing to the "Supreme Judge of the World" for guidance, and relying on His "Divine Providence" for wisdom, the Framers committed themselves and their posterity to the absolute standard of "the laws of nature and nature's God." And the essence of that standard, they said, were the inalienable, God-given, and sovereignly endowed rights of *life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.* A just government exists, they argued, solely and completely to "provide guards" for the "future security" of that essence. Take it away, and the rule of law is no longer possible.

Thomas Jefferson asserted that:
The chief purpose of government is to protect life. Abandon that and you have abandoned all.\textsuperscript{72}

Abraham Lincoln pressed the same issue home when he questioned the institution of slavery on the basis of the sanctity of all human life and the rule of law:

I should like to know if taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where it will stop. If one man says it does not mean a Negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man?\textsuperscript{73}

Because Planned Parenthood—and its pro-death bedfellows on the Supreme Court—have been so diligent in their assault on the unborn, the aged, and the infirmed, the rule of law in our land is now in real jeopardy. No one is absolutely secure, because absoluteness has been thrown out of our constitutional vocabulary. Now that the right to life has been abrogated for at least some citizens, \textit{all} the liberties of \textit{all} the citizens are at risk because suddenly arbitrariness, relativism, and randomness have entered the legal equation. The checks against petty partiality and blatant bias have been disabled.

This is not the rule of law. It is the brutal imposition of fashion and fancy by privileged interlopers.

Ronald Reagan in his book \textit{Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation}, pointed out that, "Our nation-wide policy of abortion on demand through all nine months of pregnancy was neither voted for by our people nor enacted by our legislators—not a single state had such unrestricted abortion before the Supreme Court decreed it to be national policy in 1973."\textsuperscript{74} The pro-death stance of the court was, he said, "an act of raw judicial power."\textsuperscript{75} It was a denial of the rule of law. It was a tyrannical usurpation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness because, as the President said, "We cannot diminish the value of one category of human life—the unborn—without diminishing the value of all human life."\textsuperscript{76}

Although these truths are "self-evident" in the sense that they are written on the fleshly tablet of every man's heart, they are by no means universally accepted (Romans 1:19-22). In fact, such reasoning is, to some a "stumbling block," and to others "mere
foolishness” (1 Corinthians 1:23). That is because the rule of law is a Christian idea, made possible only by the revelation of law from on high. And all too many men “suppress” that truth in one way, shape, form or another (Romans 1:18).

Thomas Jefferson acknowledged this saying:

Can the liberties of a nation be sure when we remove their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people, that these liberties are the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever, that revolution of the wheel of fortune, a change of situation, is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural influence! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in that event. 77

In order to protect and preserve any rights we must protect and preserve all rights—beginning with the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But in order to protect those rights, we must return to that distinctly Christian notion that the God who providentially rules the affairs of men has already inalienably endowed these rights to each of us.

Again and again the Court has undercut the rule of law principle and reinforced the barbarism of child-killing—thus it has undercut the very standard of liberty itself.

The lower courts have proven to be equally hostile to life and liberty. Repeatedly stiff sentences have been handed down to abortion protesters, alternative service providers, and pro-life organizers, often on trumped-up charges.

Clearly, if we are going to serve society as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land, we are going to have to help turn the courts around.

There are several things we can do to do just that.

First, we can utilize our vote. Many of the judges that wreaked havoc on life and liberty in our land are elected to the bench and they must stand for re-election. So, why not mount a campaign to replace pro-abortion, anti-family judges? Why not spend as much time and energy on those obscure judicial races as we do on legislative campaigns? In that way we can cut right to the heart of the matter.
Second, we can begin to exercise the principle of jury nullification. The purpose of a jury is to put a check on the power of the magistrates by putting ultimate power in the hands of individual citizens. In a very real sense, the Founding Fathers gave each citizen three votes: the first was the free elections vote in order to choose their representatives; the second was the Grand Jury vote in order to prevent overzealous prosecutors from harassing the citizenry; and the third was the jury vote in order to restrain the courts from unjustly applying legitimate laws or from legitimately applying unjust laws. Thus, the true function of the jury is to try not only the actions and the motives of the defendant, but the actions and the motives of the prosecution, the court, and the law as well.

According to the 1972 decision of *U.S. v. Dougherty*, juries have the "unreviewable and irreversible power . . . to acquit in disregard of the instruction on the law given by the trial judge." In other words, the jury can ignore the prosecutor, ignore the judge, and even ignore the law if the courts and the law seem to be out of line with Biblical directives. This is the cherished doctrine of jury nullification that men like John Adams, James Madison, John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and John C. Calhoun struggled for for so long.

Sadly, it is an almost forgotten doctrine. That is why it is so essential that we become informed jurors, to hold the courts in check. Thus, we need to aspire to jury duty, not avoid it. We need to apply ourselves diligently so that we can be selected. We need to be certain never to disqualify ourselves in pro-life cases just because we hold moral convictions on those matters. Moral conviction is just exactly what the courts need right now.

So, why not take the opportunity next time jury duty comes up and serve willingly? Why not exercise jury nullification and throw a legal wrench in the judicial works? It can only help matters.

Third, we can begin to go on the offensive. Why should we always be on the defensive? Why should Planned Parenthood be the only organization to take cases before the courts as a means of policy advocacy?

Although a few Christian pro-life groups, like the Rutherford Institute, the American Center for Law and Justice, and the National Legal Foundation have begun to scratch the surface in
these areas, much more needs to be done. Litigation needs to pour forth from the Christian community in torrents. Parents need to sue school districts over the debauched curriculum programs. Women abused by abortion need to sue Planned Parenthood and other abortuaries for medical malpractice. Pro-life leaders need to sue the various media outlets for slander and deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. And churches need to sue zoning commissions for discriminatory regulation. In the same way that Planned Parenthood has smothered believers over the last thirty years with their lawsuits, we need to take to the courts, fighting fire with fire. We need to stop waiting until we are sued to utilize the system to save the system. Why not initiate a few lawsuits? Or, perhaps, sponsor some of our friends in a court fight? Planned Parenthood has had the courts to themselves for long enough now.

**Fourth,** we can begin to utilize the defense of necessity. The *defense of necessity* is a legal maneuver that argues that “lesser laws may be broken so that a greater good might be done.” So, for instance, breaking and entering a burning house to save a victim from the flames is not a crime. Likewise, assault and battery on a rapist in order to free his victim is a justified act. The *defense of necessity* may also be utilized to test laws that protect abortionists. Sit-ins in the Planned Parenthood clinics where the unborn children are butchered in wholesale slaughter are not simple cases of civil disobedience, but are opportunities to bring the *defense of necessity* into the courts, thereby testing the validity of the laws. Planned Parenthood has been utilizing the various legal tests to throw out Christian laws for years. Isn’t it about time to turn the tables? Why not begin to set some legal precedents in a few minor trials so that the *defense of necessity* is available for us to use in the major cases? It is crucial that we plan ahead, gain a foothold, and forge some victories.

One way or another we need to help turn the courts around. We need to serve them as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land.

**The Bureaucracy**

The bureaucracy is, perhaps, the most powerful “branch” of the American governmental system. It is certainly the largest and the most expensive. Yet it is nowhere mentioned in the Constitution. It was in no way envisioned by the Founding Fathers.
That makes for a very dangerous situation. Who monitors the bureaucracy? Who checks and balances its administration? Who even knows what it does?

When section 1008 of the Title X appropriations bill for population control went into effect, the bureaucratic minions simply ignored it and did whatever they jolly well pleased. Section 1008 stated that no funds could be issued to "any program or agency where abortion is utilized as a method of family planning." Despite that clear injunction, the Department of Health and Human Services has poured millions of dollars into the coffers of Planned Parenthood. Thus, the bureaucracy has illegally provided more than half of the budget for Planned Parenthood's program of death, deception, and perversion, out of our tax dollars.

Because the bureaucracy is unmonitored and unchecked, it is above the law. Quite literally.

If we are going to serve society as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land, we are going to have to bring the bureaucracy back under control.

There are several things we can do to do just that.

*First,* we can call for the enforcement of existing laws. Every day, the bureaucracy publishes several hundred new pages of rules, regulations, statutes, policies, orders, directives, and restrictions that carry the force of law. But, all too often, these new ordinances in the *Federal Register* are contrary to existing law. They are nothing but an attempt to anonymously end-run the legislature and the courts.

If we could monitor both the *Federal Register* and the policy programs that go unpublished, holding the various civil servants accountable to existing law, the humanistic loopholes would be virtually closed. Planned Parenthood would lose its tax funding. The administration would, at long last, be returned to the sanity of a standard of law. Why not specialize in a particular area of the law and then hold the bureaucracy accountable to it? Why not turn the screws and actually make the system work the way it is *supposed* to work? If we don't make it work, no one will.

*Second,* we can hold bureaucrats accountable for their actions. The great advantage of most civil servants over elected magistrates is the cover of anonymity. No one knows who they are. They are nameless and faceless. Thus, they are able to
wield power and influence without fear of exposure or public reprisal. Often they can work for years behind the scenes, doing damage to life and liberty without any notoriety whatsoever. They are buried beneath a thick insulation of red tape, well-disguised from the penetrating gaze of public and media.

But what if these well-protected, long-anonymous civil servants were exposed? What if they were held accountable for their actions? What if their names and faces and actions and activities were published for all to see? What if we began to put them under the same kind of scrutiny that elected officials must undergo?

Why not make the bureaucracy accountable for its policies and programs? Why not call individual administrators to task for their behind-the-scenes activities? We need to do the research necessary to catalog the names, computerize the lists, and monitor the decisions so that wayward civil servants can be made to serve the citizenry once again.

Third, we can clog the machinery of the bureaucracy with delays, requests, and inquiries, buying time for more permanent measures. The bureaucracy is a lumbering, bumbling monolith. It is a vast Goliath. A monstrous giant. But a few Christians properly prepared can walk in David's footsteps and become giant-killers.

When Planned Parenthood's cohorts in the bureaucracy begin to lay waste to justice, mercy, and liberty, we need to swarm into the fray, slowing, stalling, deterring, frustrating, distracting, and annoying. With speed, flexibility, and commitment, a few insignificant mosquito-like maneuvers can clog the bureaucratic machinery for months. Why not ask for an official inquiry, or a hearing? Or, maybe demand all the files on a given subject for the last decade under the Freedom of Information Act? We can make phone calls. Or write letters. Or ask questions. Or visit offices. Or talk to supervisors. Or make appeals. By buying time, perhaps we can sway the process in a more sane and sensible directive.

One way or another, we need to bring the bureaucracy back under control. We need to serve it as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land.
Paying the Piper

Serving society as prophets and priests is all too often a thankless task. And, at times, quite dangerous. You can be sure that Planned Parenthood is none too thrilled to see Christians guiding and guarding this nation’s cultural and political affairs. The fact is, there simply isn’t enough room in its pluralism for us.

As a result, it—and a number of other groups—has pressed for, and won, a number of restrictions on Christian activity in the society at large. Various IRS regulations, Federal Election Commission regulations, and federal statutes constrain Christians, and especially ministers and church congregations, from engaging in particular political actions.

If a church is registered with the government as a 501(c)(3) organization, the minister and the membership must pay close attention to the details of these restrictions. Not all of them are fair, or just, or right, but they do exist, and churches should at the very least know what the boundaries and risks are.

According to the IRS and the FEC, a church or minister “may not directly or indirectly participate in, intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidates for public office.”

Even so, the regulations do have loopholes.

For instance, the courts have ruled that a minister may allow his name to be used in political ads in support of particular issues. He may be identified in the ad as the minister of a particular church. He may even work with other individuals to establish a political action committee, though that committee must operate and “be viewed” as separate from the church. He may also engage in lobbying activities, circulate petitions, conduct voter registration drives, loan mailing lists, and introduce candidates at services. And, of course, the courts have ruled that he may speak from the pulpit to encourage the members of the congregation to become active in every aspect of the political process. He may preach on the importance of political activism and may pray for elected officials as often as he chooses. He may even lead public prayers for the election of candidates who support a particular philosophy or cause as long as the prayer “cannot be construed as a direct endorsement of a candidate or candidates.”
At times, it seems that the loopholes in the system are open so wide that our prophetic and priestly duties are entirely unencumbered.

Sadly, there are other times when the loopholes built into the system close up tighter than a drum. Reba Elvin and the members of her church found that out the hard way.

There are times, in fact, when the system seems only to work against the cause of life and liberty.

Church historians for years have pondered with inquisitive awe the uncharacteristically ferocious persecution that the New Testament era believers faced. In a day of tolerance, prosperity, and governmental stability, why did the intense public outrage break forth?

Was there something about the early church rituals that particularly irked the Romans?

Almost unquestionably not. The Empire sheltered within its folds all manner of esoterica and erratica. In comparison, the church was tame to say the least.

Was there something about the early church doctrine that particularly irked the Romans?

Again, that's highly unlikely. Mystery cults, occultic covens, and theosophic sects of the wildest order thrived under the tolerant wings of the Empire.80

So what was it that singled Christianity out to be so awfully despised by the civil magistrates and the populace at large?

According to Francis Schaeffer, "The early Christians died because they would not obey the state in a civil matter ... they were civil rebels. The Roman State did not care what anybody believed religiously; you could believe anything or you could be an atheist. But you had to pay homage to Caesar as a sign of your loyalty to the state."81

The Christians said "no." That is why they were thrown to the lions. They were civil rebels. They were not imprisoned, beaten, reviled, stoned, exiled, and executed because of their peculiar dogmas. They met with persecution because they refused to obey the government.

An excerpt from the first-century *Law of the Twelve Tables* states that no Roman citizen was to "have gods on his own, neither new ones nor strange ones, but only those instituted by
A statute in the second century *Celsus Tables*, aimed specifically at the Christians, stated that "they form among themselves secret societies that exist outside the system of laws . . . an obscure and mysterious community founded on revolt and on the advantage that accrues from it." And, according to the great second century Christian defense attorney, Athenagoras, prosecution against believers proceeded on two points: "That we do not sacrifice and that we do not believe in the same gods as the state."

The historian, Dio Cassius, confirmed this emphasis in Roman law during the reign of Domitian. He stated that the Emperor "had executed, among many others, the consul Flavius Clemens, even though he was a cousin of his, and his wife, Flavia Domitilla, who was also related to Domitian. The accusation against both was that of treason. On the basis of this accusation, many others who had adopted the customs of the Jewish Christians were also condemned. Others were, at the very least, deprived of their property or suffered banishment." Clearly, the Roman government saw the Christians not simply as an arcane religious group, but as a band of civil insurrectionists. They were undermining the authority of the state by claiming a higher allegiance. Christianity knocked the state from its messianic pedestal. Thus, it was anarchy in the eyes of the imperial protectors.

Any time the state attempts to make itself "the center of all human loyalties, the goal of all human aspirations, the source of all human values, and the final arbiter of all human destiny," says John W. Whitehead, "conflict becomes inevitable." Such was the case in Rome.

And, all too often, such is the case in our own day.

Why was there such severe persecution against Christians in the days of Imperial Rome? For the same reasons that Christians are being harassed today so brutally by Planned Parenthood: the Law of God is higher than the law of men. And in the monolithic modern federalism, the law of men unavoidably contravenes the precepts of Scripture. Christians, thus, are branded as subversives to the welfare of the society.

If so—so be it!

Peter, James, and John had to work outside the system for a time in order to get the message of the Gospel out (Acts 4:19-20).
Ultimately, the Gospel won and the Roman Empire was converted. But, until that had occurred, the disciples of Christ had to find other means to affect the ministry of cultural action.

At the present time, the laws of many states and municipalities hinder us from fulfilling our God-ordained responsibilities: rescuing the perishing (Proverbs 24:10-12), educating our children in the Law of God (Deuteronomy 6:1-9), and caring for the poor and homeless (Isaiah 58:6-12). What are we to do when such civil tyranny actually excludes us from the system? Do we have to resort immediately to civil disobedience?

Not at all.

In the Scriptures, God's people, at various times and in various situations, demonstrate a number of different reactions to civil tyranny that involve working within the system. When the state oversteps its bounds and begins to violate God's immutable Law, believers have several models of tactical action from which to choose.

For instance, Daniel, when asked to violate Scripture, simply utilized the tactic of the wise appeal. Instead of instantly indulging in belligerent rebellion against divinely instituted authority, he proposed an alternative course of action, which ultimately gained for him the favor of the court (Daniel 1:8-16).

Similarly, the Apostle Paul, when faced with an ungodly and unscrupulous jury, exercised the tactic of lawyer delay. Instead of reviling the authorities, instead of outright rebellion, and instead of sullen submission, Paul upheld the integrity of God's law through the appellate process (Acts 25:1-27).

Moses, when faced with the awful oppression of God's people, began a very forthright lobbying initiative. Rather than advocating an armed rebellion, he sought a change in Pharaoh's tyrannical policy. His whole approach, though from without, was to force the evil system of Egypt to change from within (Exodus 5:1-21).

Obadiah was the chief counsel to King Ahab, perhaps the most corrupt and tyrannical of all the kings in Israel's history. As a devout believer in the Lord, Obadiah was able to instigate a program of reform and renewal right under the haughty noses of Jezebel and her dastardly Baalic courtiers. Instead of actively rebuking the evil monarchs and their consorts, he worked around
the system to promote Scriptural resistance and positive reclamation (1 Kings 18:3-16).

Jeremiah counseled the people of Israel to submit to the totalitarian rule of Nebuchadnezzar. Many commentators have taken this to be an example of humility and subservience, but Jeremiah actually exercised a tactic of Scriptural resistance. It is what we might call the *wounded lamb* approach. In contrast to the *wounded water buffalo* strategy so articulately advocated by his contemporary Hananiah, Jeremiah's plan was to humiliate the invaders through the Godly goading of their own consciences (Jeremiah 44:1-30). Ezekiel, too, avoided civil disobedience in his struggle against tyranny. His resistance tactic involved graphic public protest. He took his prophetic message to the streets and therein garnered both public and divine favor (Ezekiel 4:1-5:17).

Each of these heroes of the faith was forced by circumstance to work for cultural reform. But they all understood that when the messianic state begins to violate its divine trust, there are still a wide variety of tactical options available to them short of civil disobedience. Like them, we can work within the system with the wise appeal, lawyer delay, lobbying, legislative reform, suffering servanthood, and public protest. Even when faced with awful debilitating oppression, believers should draw on these alternative avenues of resistance before resorting to more dire strategies. A veritable arsenal of Scriptural tactics has been supplied to the believer in order to stay him from the last resort of rebellious confrontation.

Scriptural respect for divine institutions must forever remain foremost in our minds (Romans 13:1-7; 1 Peter 2:13-25). Though tyranny may incline us toward libertarian activism, though godlessness may provoke grief in our bowels of compassion, though the barbarism of Planned Parenthood may rankle our wrathful ire, believers have a Scriptural mandate to do God's work, God's way, in God's time. Until the tactics of the wise appeal, lawyer delay, lobbying, legislative reform, suffering servanthood, and public protest have been exhausted and entirely frustrated, civil disobedience is not a live option. Again, we must say civil disobedience is a last resort. There is no ground whatsoever in the Biblical narrative for skipping ahead to the drastic when the mundane might just as well do. To advocate civil disobedience
before the exhaustion of alternative resistance is to thwart God's redemptive program and the rule of Law.

Of course, once every alternative has been exhausted—and in many cases they already have been—then we may have to go the way of Peter, James, and John, and stand for the truth of God regardless of the costs: rescuing the perishing, protecting the innocent, defending the defenseless, exposing injustice. Notice, for instance, that Daniel, Paul, Moses, Obadiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel all eventually had to exercise civil disobedience in order to protect the integrity of their faith.

In this day of humanistic tyranny and the unrelenting barbarism of Planned Parenthood, these kinds of issues are, once again, prominent for the ministry of prophets and priests. It would stand us in good stead to pay heed to the procedural agenda as set forth in Scripture—and Scripture alone. Witness for instance, the careful Biblical parameters set for civil disobedience by the participants in abortion clinic rescues.87

**Tearing Down the High Places**

In his remarkable book, *Idols for Destruction*, Herbert Schlossberg asserted, "When a civilization turns idolatrous, its people are profoundly changed by that experience. In a kind of reverse sanctification, the idolater is transformed into the likeness of the object of his worship."88

As the Psalmist put it:

> Those who make idols are like them and thus are all who put their trust in them (Psalm 115:8).

> "Blood-thirsty gods produce blood-thirsty people," Schlossberg continues. "If someone thinks that chance rules the universe, his actions are likely to appear random. If people increasingly think that malevolence rules . . . we can expect more human sacrifice. If there is a decline in the number of people who believe that God is love, we can expect fewer who think that actions of love are moral imperatives. For any individual or society, therefore, the religious questions are the ultimate ones that govern human conduct, whether they believe it or not."89

This is why it is so crucial for us, as prophets and priests guiding and guarding the land, to do more than point out the dangerous idolatries of Planned Parenthood. We must destroy every idol and we must tear down the high places. Whatever the cost.
Asa was a good king who ruled over the kingdom of Judah for forty-one years. "He did what was right in the sight of the Lord," and he walked in the steps of "David, his father" (1 Kings 15:11). He instituted a number of crucial reforms, including the removal of male cult prostitutes and the destruction of Asherah images (1 Kings 15:12-13). But, despite all the good that he did, he is remembered most for what he did not do. His final epitaph was simply that he had failed to remove the high places (1 Kings 15:14). He was good. He was moral. But he just did not go far enough.

Asa's son, Jehoshaphat, was also a good king. He reigned in Jerusalem for twenty-five years, "doing right in the sight of the Lord" (1 Kings 22:42-43). He, too, instituted important reforms but, like his father, he just did not go far enough. "The high places were not taken away, and the people still sacrificed and burnt incense there" (1 Kings 22:43).

Similarly, Jehoash was a good and moral king. He reigned in Jerusalem for forty years (2 Kings 12:1). And he "did right in the sight of the Lord all his days" (2 Kings 12:2). But he did not go far enough: "the high places were not taken away" (2 Kings 12:3).

Amaziah was a good and moral king for twenty-nine years in Jerusalem (2 Kings 14:2). He, too, "did right in the sight of the Lord" (2 Kings 14:3). And, yet, "the high places were not taken away" (2 Kings 14:4). He simply did not go far enough.

Azariah, son of Amaziah, reigned fifty-two years in Jerusalem (2 Kings 15:2). Like his father, "he did right in the sight of the Lord" (2 Kings 15:3). And, yet, he, too, is remembered for the epitaph: "the high places were not taken away" (2 Kings 15:4). He was good. He was moral. But he just did not go far enough.

Jotham was another of the good kings of Judah. He reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem (2 Kings 15:33), "and he did what was right in the sight of the Lord" (2 Kings 15:34). Sadly, though, "the high places were not taken away" (2 Kings 15:35). He was good and moral, but he did not go far enough.

Each of these kings ultimately failed, despite their good works and good intentions, because they did not utterly destroy the idols of the land. And, bit by bit, the idolatry eroded their culture until one day it completely destroyed it (2 Kings 25:8-21). Each of the kings failed to serve their society as prophets and priests, guiding and guarding the land.
May we not make the same terrible mistake. May we stir up within ourselves the courage to remove all the high places and to destroy all the idols.

**Conclusion**

On January 22, 1988 while more than fifty thousand pro-life workers assembled on Capitol Hill, Ronald Reagan issued an historic proclamation establishing the sanctity of all human life, including unborn children. In that proclamation he wrote: “I, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim and declare the unalienable personhood of every American from the moment of conception until natural death, and I do proclaim, ordain, and declare that I will take care that the Constitution and the laws of the United States are faithfully executed for the protection of America’s unborn children. Upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.”

Despite this, in the years since, abortion has proceeded apace. Despite this, Planned Parenthood has proceeded apace. Apparently a lot has changed since the days when presidential proclamations actually meant something—since the days of Abraham Lincoln.

There is an important lesson for us in this: Presidential politics, presidential policies, and presidential personalities cannot and will not effect the kinds of changes we need in order to protect the helpless, the disenfranchised, the poor, the despised, and the neglected. Similarly, a pro-abortion president is not necessarily an impenetrable impediment against righteous action. The great lesson of the twentieth century is that ideological politics is very limited in its ability to effect long-term change. Symbolic gestures simply are not sufficient.

The church must reassert its priestly and prophetic roles, guarding and guiding the land in the schools, in the media, in local government, in the legislature, in the courts, and in the bureaucracy. Anything less is just not enough.
A man who knows that the earth is round but lives among men who believe it to be flat ought to hammer in his doctrine of the earth’s roundness up to the point of arrest, imprisonment, or even death. Reality will confirm him, and he is not so much testifying to the world as it is—which is worth nothing—as to Him who made the world, and Who is worth more than all things.

Hilaire Belloc

We can’t fight something with nothing.

That is a basic truth that the church has always understood. Its great struggles against darkness, defilement, death, and deception through the ages have simultaneously been struggles for light, loveliness, life, and liberty. Wickedness was always met with righteousness, not just righteous indignation.

Thus, in our efforts to defend the helpless, the hopeless, and the harassed in our own day, it is important that we not simply say “no” to Planned Parenthood; we must say “yes” to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines.

John Chrysostom knew only too well that you can’t fight something with nothing. The great fourth century saint was renowned far and wide for his scintillating and prophetic oratory. His sermons, first in the city of Antioch and then in Constantinople itself, attracted throngs of rapt listeners. He was known as the “golden tongued” preacher and glorious revival
followed him wherever he went. This despite the fact that he readily denounced sin in high places, he unhesitatingly confronted vice and corruption, and he fearlessly exposed the powers and the principalities.

Why was he so popular? He seemed to break every homiletical rule in the book. His messages were too long. His arguments were too complex. His rhetoric was too harsh. And his counsel was too demanding. How then was he able to so mesmerize the crowds and to catalyze repentance?

According to Thrasymachos of Trace, a fifth-century church historian, Chrysostom's sermons were almost entirely Biblical and thus had "all the vibrancy and authority and suasion of Holy Writ itself." He believed that "the dispensation of the Word to the people was sacramental" and thus necessitated "a careful exegesis of Scripture" as well as "a practical exposition of Scripture every time he took to the pulpit." Unlike many of the preachers in his day, he refused to indulge in either "philosophical speculation or recreational pleasantry." He avoided "pastoral mundania and communal absurdia" serving his listeners instead "the pure meat of the Gospel, turning neither to the right nor the left, distracted from his Holy Duty by neither clamoring urgency nor beckoning tyranny."

Chrysostom was a Biblical preacher. And no doubt that alone set him apart from many, if not most, of his contemporaries. Even so, that still does not adequately explain his great power and popularity. And Thrasymachos admits as much. "As important as his Biblio-centricity was," noted the historian, "it was his spiritual estate that lent Chrysostom such anointing and favor. . . . It was his personal commitment to the basic disciplines of the faith . . . almsgiving, prayer, and fasting."

John Chrysostom did not simply say "no" to sin and malevolence; he said "yes" to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines.

Jan Hus also knew that you can't fight something with nothing. The great fourteenth-century reformer was, like Chrysostom, renowned far and wide for his scintillating and prophetic preaching. His sermons, first in the city of Prague and then in the countryside surrounding Bohemia, attracted enthusiastic and rapturous crowds. He was known as the "firebrand of the Czechs" and renewal broke out spontaneously wherever he went. This despite the fact that he openly challenged papal exclusivity, he
courageously condemned the selling of indulgences, simony, and ecclesiastical larceny, and he forthrightly demanded uncompromising discipleship from every believer.

Why was he so popular? Again, he seemed to break every homiletical rule in the book. He exploded popular beliefs. He condemned common practices. And he stood against the tide of his entire generation. How then was he able to become a passionately lauded national hero?

According to Herve Kotasek, a sixteenth-century Czech historian, it was Hus who first gave currency to the notion of Sola Scriptura—Scripture only—a doctrinal cornerstone of the Reformation. "The Bible was his all-in-all," Kotosek asserted. He adhered to the faith of the Englishman, John Wyclif, affirming the supremacy of the Holy Ordinances. Preaching expositarily through the Gospels, he emphasized a "precept upon precept, line upon line, verse upon verse ministration, taking full upon himself the necessity to feed his flock." Unlike many of the preachers in his day, "he refused to pander to the rich and esteemed." He remained "entirely uninterested in the most popular of intrigues, sacred or secular, holy or profane." Instead, he studiously maintained the "sacramental office of preaching the Word of Life, unadorned and unadulterated with trivial concerns."

Hus was a Biblical preacher. And no doubt that alone set him apart from many, if not most, of his contemporaries.

Even so, that still does not explain his great power and popularity. And Kotasek admits as much. "Though thoroughly compelling in the pulpit," the historian commented, "his allure was assured by as much in what he was, as what he said . . . for indeed the holiness of Hus was great. He gave of himself unto the poor. . . . He gave of himself unto the prayers, and. . . . He gave of himself unto the fasts of the year. . . . holding sway o'er unrighteousness with an anointing that may delight upon only those who walk in the footsteps of the Master." Jan Hus did not simply say "no" to sin and malevolence; he said "yes" to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon also knew that you can’t fight something with nothing. The great nineteenth-century pastor and evangelist was, like Chrysostom and Hus, renowned far and wide for his scintillating and prophetic preaching. His sermons,
first in Victorian London, and then all around the globe, drew unprecedented crowds week after week, year after year, and decade after decade. He was known as the "prince of preachers" and enthusiastic revival followed him wherever he went. This despite the fact that he was uncompromising in his doctrinal fidelity, he was forthright in his non-conformity, and he was unflinching in his opposition to vice and corruption.

Why was he so popular? He seemed to break every homiletical rule in the book. His sermons were too coarse. His theology was too rigid. His passion was unbridled. And his temperament was colloquial. How then was he able to attract such a loyal following?

According to Spurgeon's contemporary W. C. Wilkinson, the great preacher's sermons were a "steady unfailing river of Biblical utterance." During his remarkable ministry, he held to "an absolute, simple, single fidelity, maintained by him throughout, maintained unintermittingly, from the juvenile beginning to the culminating maturity of his work—the serene, unperturbed, untempted fidelity of mind, of heart, of conscience, of will, of all that was in him, and all that was of him, to the mere and pure and unchanged and unaccommodated Gospel of Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever. That stands up and out in his sermons, that lifts itself and is eminent, like a peak of the Himalayas, high regnant over all the subjected high tableland of this noble church." What his preaching did "was to present to his hearers the one unchanging Gospel in countless changes of form, each perfectly level to the comprehension of all. He turned and turned the kaleidoscope of the sermon, and exhibited to his hearers, never weary of beholding, the same precious Biblical truths, over and over again." Unlike many preachers in his day, he was never tempted to entertain "the little waves of scientific guess, of new theologiacal shift, or of filial culture seeking to replace Biblical ethics with pagan aesthetics." He never "stood before his hearers like a reed shaken with the wind." Instead, "he stood solid on the Rock of Scripture, with the whole balanced weight of his great persona." Wilkinson concluded saying, "Spurgeon was one of the greatest preachers of all times and of all climes. Such is the indefeasible heritage of anointed exposition."

Spurgeon was a Biblical preacher. And there is no doubt that his pulpit prowess set him apart from most, if not all, of his contemporaries.
Even so, that still fails to adequately explain his phenomenal, worldwide, multigenerational, long-lasting popularity, influence, and power. And Wilkinson admits as much. "His remarkable greatness was not simply due to his magnificent gift of eloquence, that steady unfailing river of Scriptural utterance, that winning, manly, pathetic voice, like a silver trumpet, like a flute, like an organ. Nay, it was his inexhaustible holiness of mind and body and discipline. It was his commitment to the poorest of the poor. . . . It was his commitment to prayer and fasting. . . . It was his nobility of Christian discipline and character."  

Like John Chrysostom and Jan Hus before him, Charles Haddon Spurgeon did not simply say "no" to sin and malevolence; he said "yes" to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines.

The Brass Tacks

At the heart of His great Sermon on the Mount, Jesus details for His followers three essential disciplines: almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. (Matthew 6:2-18). Notice that in His discussion about these things, He never said, "If you give," or "If you pray" or "If you fast." These disciplines were not options to Him. He unequivocally said, "When you give" (Matthew 6:3), and "When you pray" (Matthew 6:5), and "When you fast" (Matthew 6:17). Genuine faith in Christ will always be expressed in these ways.

Throughout the history of the church, these three practices have been the recognized and recognizable marks of true spirituality. Godly character ultimately manifests them. Priestly compassion necessarily embraces them. Prophetic fervor inevitably relies on them.

Adeimantos of Thessily, the great seventh-century liturgist often asserted that "upon these three hang the whole of our faith, the whole of our hope, and the whole of our love."  

Cephalos of Chalcedon, a famed eighth-century philanthropist and physician, argued that "the care of our Christian culture would surely disintegrate, should we ever abandon our three Beatific Disciplines: alms, intercessions, and fastings."  

Otto Blumhardt, the great seventeenth-century Lutheran missionary to Africa, claimed that "on the day the church abandons its care of the poor, its fervent ministry of supplication, and
its intently chosen fast, we will undoubtedly see its clergy dragged off in wickedness and promiscuity, its parishes awhorzing after greed and avarice, and its congregants awash in every vain imagination and unspeakable perversion. On that day the church will no longer be the church. May it never be. May it never be. Stay the day with the hand of faithful diligence, I pray.”

Like Chrysostom, Hus, and Spurgeon, each of these men, and thousands, or even millions of others recognized that Christ's three essential disciplines were the dynamic upon which genuine grace turned. Impeccable character without faith-provoked deeds—alms, prayer, and fasting—is lifeless (James 2:14-26). Eloquent expository preaching without faith-provoked works—alms, prayer, and fasting—is impotent (James 1:22-27).

**Almsgiving**

Jesus was a servant. He came to serve, not to be served (Matthew 20:28). And He called His disciples to similar lives of selflessness. He called them to be servants (Matthew 19:30).

Oddly, servanthood is a much neglected and largely forgotten Christian vocation today. Most of us who bear the banner of Christ are obsessed with leading. We want headship. We want prominence. We want power, privilege, and prestige. We want dominion, not servitude.

But Jesus made it plain that if we want to help transform the world—doing God's will on earth as it is done in heaven—we must not grasp at the reins of power and influence. We must serve. We must give. We must sacrifice. Only then will we be fit for leadership. Jesus said, “Whoever wishes to be chief among you, let him be your servant,” (Matthew 20:27). Our attitude, in fact, “should be the same as Christ's, who, being in very nature God did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made Himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness. And being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient to death, even death on a cross. Therefore God exalted him to the highest place and gave Him the name that is above every name” (Philippians 2:5-9).

This basic principle is reiterated throughout Scripture. The theme of the suffering servant who later triumphs, who serves
faithfully and then succeeds, is one of the most common Biblical paradigms. We see it in the lives of Jacob (Genesis 31:1; 36-42), Joseph (Genesis 39:1,7-20; 41:38-43), David (1 Samuel 16-19; 23; 24:20), Daniel (Daniel 6:3-28), and the Apostle Paul (Galatians 1:10; Romans 1:1).

It is no accident then that those of us who are commissioned by the King of kings and the Lord of lords to be “witnesses in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth” (Acts 1:8), and “to make disciples of all nations” (Matthew 28:19) are commissioned as servants. Not as overlords.

When the Apostle Paul wrote to Titus, the young pastor of Crete's pioneer church, he pressed home this fundamental truth with impressive persistence and urgency. The task before Titus was not an easy one. Cretan culture was marked by deceit, ungodliness, sloth, and gluttony (Titus 1:12). And he was to provoke a total Christian revival there! He was to introduce peace with God through Christ. Thus, Paul's instructions were strategically precise and to the point. Titus was to preach the Word diligently, but he was also to live out the Word practically. Charity was to be a central priority.

Paul wrote:

> For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present age, looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from every lawless deed and purify for Himself His own special people, zealous for good works (Titus 2:11-14).

Word and deed. Biblical preaching and almsgiving.

This was a very familiar theme for Paul. It wasn't exclusively aimed at the troublesome Cretan culture. He returned to it at every opportunity. Earlier, he had written to the Ephesian church saying:

> For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest anyone should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ
Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them (Ephesians 2:8-10).

God saves us by grace. There is nothing we can do to merit His favor. We stand condemned under His judgment. Salvation is completely unearned—except by Christ—and undeserved—except to Christ. But we are not saved capriciously, for no reason and no purpose. On the contrary, “We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works.” We are “His own possession,” set apart and purified to be “zealous for good deeds.” Word and deed are inseparable. Judgment is answered with grace. Grace is answered with charity. This is the very essence of the Gospel message.

So, Paul tells Titus he must order his fledgling ministry among the Cretans accordingly. He himself was “to be a pattern of good deeds” (Titus 2:7). He was to teach the people “to be ready for every good work” (Titus 3:1). The older women and the younger women were to be thus instructed, so “that the Word of God might not be dishonored” (Titus 2:5). And the bondslaves, “that they might adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things” (Titus 2:10). They were all to “learn to maintain good works, to meet urgent needs, that they might not be unfruitful” (Titus 3:14). There were those within the church who professed “to know God, but in works they denied Him, being abominable, disobedient, and disqualified for every good work” (Titus 1:16). These, Titus was to “rebuke . . . sharply, that they might be sound in the faith” (Titus 1:13). He was to affirm constantly, “that those who believed in God would be careful to maintain good works” (Titus 3:8).

As a pastor, Titus had innumerable tasks that he was responsible to fulfill. He had administrative duties (Titus 1:5), doctrinal duties (Titus 2:1), discipling duties (Titus 2:2-10), preaching duties (Titus 2:15), counseling duties (Titus 3:12), and arbitrating duties (Titus 3:12-13). But intertwined with them all, fundamental to them all, were his charitable duties. Almsgiving was to be central to his task.

What was true for Paul and Titus in the first century is just as true for us today, for “these things are good and profitable for all men” (Titus 3:8).
Chrysostom understood that. So did Hus and Spurgeon. Genuine discipleship always weds Word and deed. It always combines Biblical preaching with almsgiving. It always has. It always will.

The Bible tells us that if we would obey the command to be generous to the poor, we would ourselves be happy (Proverbs 14:21), God would preserve us (Psalm 41:1-2), we would never suffer need (Proverbs 28:27), we would prosper and be satisfied (Proverbs 11:25), and even be raised up from beds of affliction (Psalm 41:3). God would ordain peace for us (Isaiah 26:1-3). He would bless us with peace (Psalm 29:11). He would give us His peace (John 14:27). He would guide our feet into the way of peace (Luke 1:79). He would ever and always speak peace to us (Psalm 85:8). And He would grant peace to the land (Leviticus 26:6).

Therefore let us be “zealous for good works” (Titus 2:14).

Is this not the fast which I chose, to loosen the bonds of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke, and to let the oppressed go free, and break every yoke? Is it not to divide your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into the house; when you see the naked, to cover him; and not to hide yourself from your own flesh? Then your light will break out like the dawn, and your recovery will speedily spring forth; and your righteousness will go before you; the glory of the Lord will be your rear guard. Then you will call, and the Lord will answer; You will cry, and He will say, “Here I am.” If you remove the yoke from your midst, the pointing of the finger, and speaking wickedness, and if you give yourself to the hungry, and satisfy the desire of the afflicted, then your light will rise in darkness, and your gloom will become like midday. And the Lord will continually guide you, and satisfy your desire in scorched places, and give strength to your bones; and you will be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water whose waters do not fail. And those from among you will rebuild the ancient ruins; you will raise up the age-old foundations; and you will be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of the streets in which to dwell (Isaiah 58:6-12).

We can't fight something with nothing. We can't simply say “no” to Planned Parenthood; we must say “yes” to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines. We must say “yes” to good
works to the needy and neglected. We must say "yes" to girls in crisis pregnancies, and teens caught in the web of immorality, and families trapped in financial difficulty. We must say "yes" to almsgiving and servanthood.

But how do we go about doing that?

First, we must begin to implement effective programs of Biblical charity in our churches that transform poverty into productivity. In 1950, one in twelve Americans lived below the poverty line. In 1979, that figure had risen to one in nine. Today, one in seven fall below the line—nearly thirty-four million people. More than one fourth of all American children live in poverty. And for Black children under the age of six, the figures are even more dismal: more than fifty percent. Today, eighty-one percent of elderly women, living alone, live in poverty, all too often in abject poverty. Tens of thousands of Americans are homeless, living out of the backs of their cars, under bridges, in abandoned warehouses, atop street-side heating grates, or in lice-infested public shelters. Even at the height of the Great Depression, when dust-bowl refugees met with the “grapes of wrath” on America's highways and byways, there have never been so many dispossessed wanderers. The fact is, the economic recovery of the eighties barely reached into the cavernous depths of the bottom third of the economy. Shelters are bulging at the seams. And social service agencies are buried under an avalanche of need. And the situation here at home is nothing compared to that of the Third World.

Even so, we could make a dramatic difference simply by practicing Biblical charity. If only we would. Not only would the poor be cared for and the oppressed set free, but we would be able to reclaim the moral high ground from groups like Planned Parenthood as well.

Second, we must begin to find ways to encourage, uphold, and support working mothers in our nation. Over the last decade, per capita family income has increased about seven percent. At the same time, however, the consumer price index has inflated more than eleven percent. Add to that the fact that only one out of every five jobs actually pays enough to lift a family of four above the poverty line, the fact that the tax burden falls on poor families especially hard, the fact that home businesses and
cottage industries are heavily restricted, that occupational licensing has closed many traditional family trades to the family, and that cultural and societal pressures have tainted the vocation of homemaking, and working mothers become a foregone conclusion.\(^43\) In 1970, only thirty-nine percent of America's mothers had entered the work force.\(^44\) By 1980, fifty-four percent were working.\(^45\) And by 1985, sixty-one percent were.\(^46\) According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, almost half of those working mothers have children under the age of six.\(^47\) The emotional pressure, the physical fatigue, and the spiritual entropy that working mothers face day in and day out can be utterly debilitating.\(^48\) And with no relief in sight. Ever.

Again, though, we could make a difference.\(^49\) If only we would. Not only would families be strengthened and mothers be protected, but we would be able to reclaim the moral high ground from groups like Planned Parenthood as well.

Third, we must begin to come to the aid of widows and displaced homemakers in our society. The liberalization of divorce laws, the breakdown of family solidarity, and run-away immorality have combined to create a whole new underclass in American society: the abandoned housewife. The number of displaced homemakers rose twenty-eight percent between 1973 and 1983 to more than three million women.\(^50\) Another twenty percent increase from 1983 to 1993 brought that number to more than four million.\(^51\) An astonishing sixty-one percent of those women suddenly left alone had children under the age of ten at home.\(^52\) Often without job skills and stranded without alimony or child support, as many as seventy percent of these women make less than ten thousand dollars a year, and fifty percent are employed at minimum wage or less.\(^53\) It is, thus, readily apparent why a full seventy-five percent of all Americans living below the poverty line in the United States are women and their children.\(^54\) Caught between traditionalism and feminism, these women have no advocate. No matter where they turn, they don't fit in. They know no context.

Once again, though, through a proper and Biblical administration of alms, we could make a real difference.\(^55\) If only we would. Not only would the widows and orphans be cared for, but we would be able to reclaim the moral high ground from groups like Planned Parenthood as well.
Fourth, we must develop compassionate and dignified ministries for and to the handicapped. They are the forgotten and the neglected. And there are millions of them. As many as sixteen percent of all Americans suffer from some sort of crippling disability—congenital or accidental. There are almost seven million mentally retarded Americans, with an additional fifteen million suffering from severe learning disorders. There are at least a million men, women, and children with total hearing loss, and six and a half million with total visual impairment. Still another seven million are restricted by paralysis, atrophy, deformity, amputation, degeneration, or immobility. Abandoned by families, shunned by peers, frustrated by dependency, targeted by Planned Parenthood, United Way, and the March of Dimes, and incapacitated by loneliness and doubt, the handicapped are all too often society’s pariah.

But, we could make a difference with ministries of compassion. A real difference. If only we would. Not only would the handicapped be able to vouchsafe their dignity and worth, but we would be able to reclaim the moral high ground from groups like Planned Parenthood as well.

Fifth, we must lend full support to existing pro-life ministries: alternative clinics, adoption agencies, shepherding homes, maternal care hospitals, natural family planning centers, abstinence-based sex education programs, missionary organizations, activist groups, rescue outreaches, research organizations, and charitable outreaches. And in order to do this, not only are we going to have to open our homes, volunteer our time, and dedicate our talents, we are going to have to loosen our purse strings as well. Planned Parenthood has invested vast sums of money in its dastardly programs. It has marshalled tremendous resource pools. It has funded, subsidized, and capitalized for maximum impact. It has withheld nothing from the cause.

But wealth is a gift from God, set aside for one purpose and one purpose only: to confirm the Covenant and to establish the Kingdom (Deuteronomy 8:18). Even the wealth of the wicked will one day be converted to Kingdom purposes (Proverbs 13:22). That is why the Bible places so much emphasis on stewardship. Every Christian should be a giver (Deuteronomy 16:17). We should give to the church through tithes (Malachi 3:10). We should give to special projects through offerings
(1 Corinthians 16:1-2). And we should give to those who have ministered to us through gifts (Galatians 6:6). Giving is an aspect of worship (Deuteronomy 16:10-11). Thus it should be done with a cheerful heart (2 Corinthians 9:7), whether out of prosperity (1 Corinthians 16:2), or paucity (2 Corinthians 8:2). After all, giving is an investment in the Kingdom of God (Matthew 6:19-21).

We can't fight something with nothing. We can't simply say “no” to Planned Parenthood; we must say “yes” to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines. Like Chrysostom, Hus, and Spurgeon, we must say “yes” to good works. We must say “yes” to almsgiving.

Prayer

If we are going to conform ourselves to God's holy and perfect will, we must pay heed to the eternal and established Word of Truth.

The grass withers, the flower fades, but the Word of our God stands forever (Isaiah 40:8).

The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple (Psalm 19:7).

The entrance of Your Words gives light; It gives understanding to the simple (Psalm 119:130).

For the Commandment is a lamp, and the Law is light; Reproofs of instruction are the way of life (Proverbs 6:23).

To ever go beyond Scripture would mean to evade the purposes of God (1 Corinthians 4:6). That is why the heroes of the faith were so driven to the discipline of prayer. Diligence in prayer always grounds God's people in a dependence on His Word. Such was the case of David (Psalm 51:1-19), Nehemiah (Nehemiah 1:1; 2:1), Jeremiah (Lamentations 5:1-22), Jonah (Jonah 2:2-9), the disciples of Jesus (Acts 1:8-14), and the first Jerusalem church (Acts 2:1-47).

A failure to seek God in prayerful fellowship leads invariably to a violation of God's Word and a rejection of His purposes. Such was the case with Cain (Genesis 4:3-8), Korah (Numbers 16:1-35), Balaam (Numbers 22:2-40), and Saul (1 Samuel 13:5-14).
That is why the Bible makes it plain that Christians are to be constant in prayer. We are to pray in the morning (Mark 1:35). We are to pray at noon (Psalm 55:17). We are to pray in the evening (Mark 6:46). We are to pray during the night watch (Luke 6:12). In fact, we are to pray unceasingly (1 Thessalonians 5:17). God has given us access to His throne (Hebrews 4:16). He has given us fellowship with Christ (1 Corinthians 1:9) and counsel with the Holy Spirit (John 14:26). Therefore, we are to make use of the glorious privilege of prayer at every opportunity (1 Timothy 2:8).

The fact is though, prayer doesn’t simply make us more cognizant of God’s Word. Prayer changes things. By the grace of God.

No matter how bad things may look, no matter how ominously the odds may be stacked against the cause of truth, justice, and mercy, prayer can transform it all. Planned Parenthood may seem to have a frightening advantage in money and manpower. They may seem to have unending resources and unflagging energy. But Christians have prayer. And prayer is the most potent force in all the cosmos availed to mere mortal men. Prayer binds and it looses (Matthew 18:18). It casts down and it raises up (Mark 11:23-24). It ushers in peace (1 Timothy 2:1-2), forgiveness (Mark 11:25), healing (James 5:14-15), liberty (2 Corinthians 3:17), wisdom (1 Kings 3:3-14), and protection (Psalm 41:2).

We can’t fight something with nothing. We can’t simply say “no” to Planned Parenthood; we must say “yes” to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines. Like Chrysostom, Hus, and Spurgeon, we must say “yes” to prayer. We must pray with wholeheartedness (Jeremiah 29:13). We must pray with contrition (2 Chronicles 7:14). And we must pray faithfully (Mark 11:24), fervently (James 5:16), obediently (1 John 3:22), and confidently (John 15:7).

But how do we go about doing this in a comprehensive, practical, and effective way?

First, we must develop a deep and abiding commitment to personal and devotional prayer. We must pray for national and cultural revival. We must intercede mightily and persistently for our magistrates and leaders. And we need to be specific: naming names, stating issues, claiming promises, and invoking Scrip-
It is crucial that we cry out from our prayer closets for justice and mercy to blanket the land like a sweet morning dew. It is ludicrous for us to picket, lobby, and labor against Planned Parenthood if we have not first honed our principal weapons.

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses. We are destroying speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and we are taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ, and we are ready to punish all disobedience, whenever your obedience is complete (2 Corinthians 10:3-6).

Second, we must effect corporate prayer disciplines. We must infuse church worship with the unction and gumption that can only come by fervent intercession. We need to pray corporate benediction and blessing for all those who honor God’s Word (Psalm 69:13-19). And we need to pray malediction and cursing for all those who impugn God’s Word (Psalm 69:20-28). The practice of singing Approbative Psalms—the various hymns of blessing from the Psalter: 5, 7, 9, 20, 23, 25, 65, 75, and 113—and Imprecatory Psalms—the various hymns of cursing from the Psalter: 2, 10, 35, 55, 69, 79, 83, 94, 109, and 140—has long been the first recourse for the church in times of distress and dismay. So, why have we failed to instigate seasons of prayer? Why has the church not gathered its people in mourning and humiliation, in weeping and supplication to pray for the end of the abortion holocaust and the demise of its perpetrators? Why hasn’t a profusion of cottage prayer meetings, spontaneous revivals, prayer breakfasts, all-night vigils, and fasts flooded the heavenlies with our urgent pleas for relief? And how can we legitimately rail against Planned Parenthood when we have yet to do these things? Really?

Third, we must develop prayer networks and hotlines both on the local and on the national levels. We desperately need to find ways to respond quickly and decisively to the various machinations of Planned Parenthood's medical, legal, educational, and jurisdictional juggernaut. We need to be able to respond to the trumpet call (Joshua 2:15). We need to be able to sound the alarms (Amos 3:6). We need to be able to rush to one
another’s defense (Galatians 6:2). With phone trees, computer linkups, newsletters, radio broadcasts, electronic bulletin boards, and short wave skip beams, we need to tie all the forces for life together with the strong bonds of prayer.

The bottom line is simply that we can’t fight something with nothing. We can’t just say “no” to Planned Parenthood; we must say “yes” to the fullness of the Christian faith and its disciplines. Like Chrysostom, Hus, and Spurgeon, we must say “yes” to fervent intercession. We must say “yes” to prayer.

**Fasting**

Fasting—or abstinence from food for a time—is not exclusively a Christian practice. It exists in many other religions. It is practiced by some for health reasons. It is even practiced by some for political reasons. So when Jesus commanded His disciples to fast, He was not introducing a novel custom at all (Matthew 6:16, 18). He did however give fasting a distinctive meaning. He connected the practice of fasting with the very mystery of life and death.

According to the Bible, sin is not only the transgression of God’s standards leading to judgment and imputed guilt (Romans 3:10-23); it is also the mutilation of life (Romans 5:12). “The wages of sin is death” (Romans 6:23). It is for this reason that the Bible’s narrative of the original sin is cast against the backdrop of eating (Genesis 3:1-7). Food is a means of life. It affords us vitality. It lends us strength. It bolsters our health. But it is not the source of life, because life is not merely biological. The fact is, food has no life in and of itself. Only Christ has life and is Life (John 1:4). Calories don’t enable food to bestow life. God does. By His direct command. Jesus said, “Man does not live by bread alone” (Matthew 4:4). If he tries, he dies (Proverbs 16:25). To truly live, man must live “by every Word that comes from the mouth of God” (Matthew 4:4).

Adam and Eve rejected the fullness of life preferring “bread alone.” They tried to ignore the life-sustaining Word of God (Genesis 3:4-6). As a result, not only were they alienated from God, incurring His wrath, but they died (Genesis 5:5). Though they ate, food could not and would not sustain them. Thus, hunger came to be a reminder to them that they were ultimately
dependent on something more than food. They were dependent upon God. Fasting then is an invitation to remember. It is a discipline that enables believers to reckon their dependency upon God.

Unlike those who fast to secure better health, or to obtain political concessions or even to accrue some ascetic merit, Christians fast in order to renew their fellowship with the Lord God. For us, fasting is not a matter of pragmatism — a ritual or obligation designed to make something happen. We don't fast for personal benefit or to make a show of our piety (Isaiah 58:3-5). Rather, we fast "unto the Lord," recognizing our utter and complete reliance on Him (Zechariah 7:5).

Our fasting may be absolute (Ezra 10:6; Deuteronomy 9:9; Exodus 34:28) or partial (Daniel 10:3; 1 Kings 17:1-24). It may be entirely private (Nehemiah 1:1-4, 2:1; Matthew 6:16-18) or demonstrably public (Jeremiah 36:6; Joel 2:15). It may be occasional (Ezra 10:6; Esther 4:16; Acts 13:3) or seasonal (Leviticus 23:27; Psalm 35:13; Zechariah 9:19). But one thing is certain: if we are seriously seeking to do the will of God, obeying His Word and walking in dependence on Him, we will fast (Matthew 6:18).

We should fast in times of distress (Esther 4:3; Nehemiah 1:4). We should fast during seasons of repentance (Ezra 10:6; Nehemiah 9:1). We should fast while seeking God's direction (Acts 13:3; Luke 2:37). We should fast while awaiting an outpouring of grace (Psalm 69:10; Joel 2:12), an endowment with power (Judges 20:1-48; Mark 9:29), and a liberation from captivity (Isaiah 58:6; Matthew 17:21). It is only as we humbly fast that we have the spiritual wherewithal to guide and guard the land as prophets and priests (2 Chronicles 7:14).

Blow a trumpet in Zion, consecrate a fast, proclaim a solemn assembly, gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children and the nursing infants. Let the bridegroom come out of his room and the bride come out of her bridal chamber (Joel 2:15-16).

We can't fight something with nothing. We can't simply say "no" to Planned Parenthood; we must say "yes" to the fullness of the Christian faith and disciplines. Like Chrysostom, Hus, and Spurgeon, we must say "yes" to fasting.
It has been so long since the church has taken seriously its mandate to fast we have all but forgotten how! So what can we do to reclaim this lost legacy of obedience, commitment, dependence, and power?

First, we must begin to teach God's people the meaning, the purpose, the importance, and the practice of fasting. Sermons need to be preached. Books need to be distributed. Bible studies need to be taught. Families need to be discipled. And congregations need to be catalyzed. Techniques, health principles, and spiritual exercises need to be communicated to every believer so that the church can once again bear its mantle of strength in the world.

Second, we must renew an individual commitment to fasting. Like the heroes of faith in bygone days, we each need to fall on our faces before God in distress, humiliation, weeping, and mourning for the awful perversity that is ravaging our land. Planned Parenthood's juggernaut should drive us to sackcloth and ashes. It should stir in us a desperation to seek God with vigor. It should throw us passionately before Him, utterly reliant, completely dependent upon His sustaining grace. It should provoke us to regular fasting, to seasons of fasting, to unremitted fasting.

Third, we must call our churches to days of public fasting and supplication. We must sanctify our time as congregations. No Christian's time is his own. It is not ours to dispose of as we choose. We have "been bought with a price" (1 Corinthians 6:20), therefore, we are to set our days, weeks, and years apart to the Lord for His glory (Romans 14:6-12). In the Old Testament, the days were divided into eight periods: dawn, morning, midday, dark, evening, and three night watches. These were distinguished by times and seasons of prayer (Psalm 55:17; Daniel 6:10). In the New Testament, the value of this kind of discipline was affirmed by the early Christians who punctuated their urgent task of evangelization with the patient discipleship of regular spiritual refreshment (Acts 3:1). Similarly, the weeks of God's people were ordered with purpose and balance. Centered in the Old Testament around Sabbath sacrifices, and in the New Testament around the Lord's Day sacraments, the weeks established Biblical priorities for the people by giving form to function
and function to form (Deuteronomy 5:12; Hebrews 10:24-25). These disciplines enabled them to wait on the Lord and thus to “run and not be weary” and to “walk and not be faint” (Isaiah 40:31). Even the years were given special structure and significance. In ancient Israel, feasts, festivals, and fasts paced the believers’ progression through the months (Exodus 13:6-10; Psalm 31:15). The early church continued this stewardship of time, punctuating years with the Christian holidays: Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost—each marked by feasts, festivals, and, of course, fasts. Thus, God’s people were enabled and equipped to run the race (Philippians 2:16), to fight the fight (Ephesians 6:10-18), to finish the course (2 Timothy 4:7), and to keep the faith (2 Timothy 3:10). If we are to attain to even just a little of their potency, power, and prowess, it is crucial that we return to these patterns of humility and dependence.

We can't fight something with nothing. We can't simply say “no” to Planned Parenthood; we must say “yes” to the fullness of the Christian faith and disciplines. Like Chrysostom, Hus, and Spurgeon, we must say “yes” to utter dependence upon God. We must say “yes” to fasting.

**Where the Rubber Meets the Road**

Mark Lincoln is the pastor of a small Presbyterian church in central California. Active in the pro-life movement for more than a decade, he recently has gone through a time of tremendous discouragement, frustration, and burnout. “I guess I just got to the point where I had come to the end of myself,” he said. “I had worked for years and had very little fruit to show for it. Our church’s crisis pregnancy center was floundering—understaffed, underfinanced, and underexposed. Several of the members of the church had been arrested and then convicted of trespassing on the property of Planned Parenthood during a prayer protest. Our workers were exhausted and our resources were depleted. And we didn’t have a thing to show for any of that. We were all full of heartache and despair.”

Mark decided to take off several days to spend some time at a retreat center. “I needed to regain some perspective. I needed a new focus. It seemed like the enemies of God were racking up all
the victories while the poor pitiful People of God were being ground into the dust. I wanted to know why."

Taking nothing but the Bible and an anthology of Patristic Epistles, Mark began to read and think and pray. "It didn't take me very long to figure out what had gone wrong with our efforts. It seemed to be written on every page of Scripture. It was illumined in the teachings of the Early Church Fathers at every turn. How I had missed it before, I'll never know. It was as plain as day. We had left our first love. It was that simple. We had been trying to fight Planned Parenthood our own way, through our own efforts, with our own resources, through our own energies. The well of our strength is finite, while the well of God's grace is infinite. So as admirable as our struggle had been, it was ultimately self-defeating and foolhardy."

Mark came back from the retreat with a renewed commitment. "I knew that it was time for me to get serious about halting the holocaust. I knew it was time for me to get serious about exposing Planned Parenthood. But I also knew that the only way that I could be serious was to do things God's way. Our church will still picket. We will still lobby, and testify, and mobilize, and carry out rescues, and mount campaigns and all that. But at the core of all we do, we will walk in the way of the Lord. We will exercise spiritual discipline. We will cling to the fullness of the faith."

"Because we can't fight something with nothing?" I suggested.

"Yeah, right," he said. "Because we can't fight something with nothing. Not any more, we can't."

**Conclusion**

In his famous sermon, "The Weight of Glory," C. S. Lewis made a penetrating assessment about Christian virtue. He said that:

If you asked twenty good men today what they thought the highest of the virtues was, nineteen of them would reply, Unselfishness. But if you asked almost any of the great Christians of old he would have replied, Love. You see what has happened? A negative term has been substituted for a positive, and this is of more than philological importance. The negative ideal of Unselfishness carries with it the suggestion not primarily of securing good things for others, but of going without them ourselves, as if our abstinence and not their happiness was the important point.63
Lewis understood that Christian virtue—at least as it was comprehended and practiced by the great believers of the past—was not a negative thing; it was positive.

It would stand us in good stead to recover that sensibility in our day. The fact is, we can accomplish very little if we are merely anti-abortion or anti-Planned Parenthood. We must be pro-life—in the sense that we embrace the fullness of love and life and faith.

Anything less is less than sufficient unto this day.
I looked up and saw war in the sky. Malevolent light beams bathed the clouds in an eerie sunset of blood red and ash gray. That war should have such a lovely reflection made the prospect of encountering it all the more menacing—or at least it should have. But I was driven by an irresistible compulsion. There was nothing to do except go forward.

I was back in town. I was back where I'd had the frightening chase through the alley, around the corner, and down the freeway with a child cradled in my arms. It was six months later and my throat still knotted and my eyes still clouded whenever I thought of it.

My hotel was just a few blocks from the abortuary. As soon as I was settled in and refreshed from my long trip, I yielded to its magnetism and set out walking.

I trembled with emotion. A flood of images crowded my senses. Apprehension, fear, curiosity, longing, anger, grief, and frustration vied for my emotions. With every step, tension mounted within me.

I took in all the dreary particulars of the cityscape. The final remnants of sunlight glittered ominously through a chainlink fence, still wet from a late afternoon rain. Puddles pocked the asphalt walk, leaden like pools of mercury. I recognized all the elements of the scene. Yet there was a lack of coherence about it.
There always is when the dread of war smears its thick urgency upon a land.

As I came upon the final block, I suddenly became dizzy with disorientation.

_Is this it?_
_No, this can't be it. Where is the building?_
_It's gone. The clinic is gone._
_How can that be?_
_I know this is it._
_What's going on here?_

I checked the address. I double checked. There was no question about it. This was it. But the clinic was gone. Completely. Leveled. Vanished. No trace in sight.

I walked toward the lot. Down around the corner was the old retainer wall, still scrawled with graffiti. And out back was the alley, now completely visible from the street.

A sign planted in the middle of the property said that the clinic had moved. Except for the naked and now weed-choked foundation and the remembered geography, that was the only hint that anything had _ever_ been here.

I walked back to the alley and stood where the old dumpster had been. And I stooped down to pick up a broken piece of rubbish.

At the touch, a shiver went up and down my spine. And then a shudder. This was a place of eternity. Of war.

Like hymning angels chime, I whispered a prayer. Tears fell from my eyes like rain. And then I turned to go.

I realized then, all anew, that in _time_ God would make everything right. Like this place.

I looked up at the sky. The colors of war were still there. But somehow they didn't look as foreboding now. Somehow they looked right. Coherent.

As I walked back to my hotel, I sensed a balancing of my equilibrium—both urgency and patience coexisting there.

And I smiled.
The worship of will is the negation of will. To admire mere choice is to refuse to choose. You cannot admire will in general, because the essence of will is that it is particular. Every act of will is an act of self-limitation. To desire action is to desire limitation. In that sense every act is an act of self-sacrifice. When you choose anything you reject everything else.\textsuperscript{1}

G. K. Chesterton
In history's mixture of good and evil, the thing we should note—the thing the historians will note with amazement—is the profundity and the rapidity of change.\textsuperscript{3}

\textit{Hilaire Belloc}

With knowledge comes responsibility (Luke 12:42-48). Now that you know what you do about Planned Parenthood, you have a responsibility to \textit{share} that information with others. Not only that, you have a responsibility to \textit{use} that information to effect justice, mercy, and truth in your family, in your community, and in your circle of influence.

If you are ever given the opportunity to speak before a precinct caucus, or a PTA meeting, or a School Board session, or a County Commissioner's hearing, it is important that you have your facts straight, your material organized, and your focus clearly in view.

Making an effective presentation of the facts about Planned Parenthood need not be a daunting experience. Most of the work is already done for you. All you need to do is to pick and choose your quotes, statistics, and anecdotes and, then, boldly go forth (Matthew 28:19-20; Acts 1:8).

Here are a few tips on how to do just that:

\textit{First}, write your whole presentation out, even if only in outline form. This will keep you on track and accurate. There is nothing worse than obscure generalities or irrelevant rabbit
trails. Stick to your prepared comments. You'll be more confident. And you'll be more convincing.

Second, use hard evidence. There aren't more than one hundred footnotes in each chapter of this book for nothing! They are there for you to use. So use them! Cull out the startling statistics and the incendiary quotations. Prove your point. Drive home your message. Don't leave anything to speculation. Chapter two was especially written so that you could take whole paragraphs and even whole sections word for word, verbatim, and use them as ammunition in your testimony or presentation.

Third, always make sure you use local examples, local statistics, and local quotations in your talk. Don't let the spokesman for Planned Parenthood brush off your arguments as irrelevant simply because you've failed to do your homework. Go to the library. Stop by the schools. Visit the clinics. Check the facts. Leave absolutely nothing to hearsay. Remember, lives depend on your getting everything right.

Fourth, do your best to soften your barrage of statistics, studies, and surveys with real life stories. Bring your point all the way home. Make your presentation personal and passionate. Make it human. Make it real. If at all possible, have several women who have been exploited by the local Planned Parenthood abortuary to collaborate your facts with their anecdotes. Don't let your arguments be dismissed and dispatched as mere ephemeral theory.

Fifth, have plenty of supporting pro-life literature, tracts, books, articles, and research papers available for those who may be interested in further investigation. Never show up empty-handed. Back up your claims with real substance. Challenge your adversaries to read through this entire book. Give them a copy. Subscribe to pro-life newsletters in their name. And then watch the sparks begin to fly!

Sixth, be prepared to propose real and practical alternatives. If you tell the school board that Planned Parenthood's sex education programs have to go, but then fail to give them some viable alternate courses of action, you might as well save your breath. Find out about the many fine abstinence-based educational programs for public schools and then be prepared to answer questions on them. Learn about the local abortion alternative centers and
then be prepared to defend them. Get involved with one of the many excellent pro-life organizations in your area, and know how to counsel, refer, and advise.

Seventh, be sure that you maintain a polite, courteous, and Christian demeanor throughout. You can say the right thing, but say it in the wrong way, and you'll lose your audience every time. Part of the success of Planned Parenthood has been its ability to choose winsome, articulate, and attractive spokesmen for itself. It is crucial that you counter that advantage with a double dose of Christian charity and longsuffering. Don't lash out. Don't pop off. Don't retaliate. Be tough and unswerving, but always with an eye toward winning the weak, championing the helpless, and wooing the undecided (Jude 22-23).
Around the turn of the century, a new theology grew to prominence among Liberal Protestants in Europe and America. It was dubbed the Social Gospel movement.

Essentially, Social Gospel advocates promoted a message of “salvation by works.” They argued that true spirituality consisted of good deeds in the realm of politics, economics, and social justice. Very much like the modern-day proponents of Liberation Theology, they reduced the Good News of Jesus Christ to a revolutionary ideology.

By suggesting that authentic Christianity will inevitably concern itself with the plight of the poor, it may seem to some that I have accepted, at least in part, the tenets of this aberrant theology. Nothing could be further from the truth, however.

“Salvation by works” or “salvation by Law” is the most ancient of all heresies. It is indeed, “another Gospel” (Galatians 1:6). It is a “different Gospel” (Galatians 1:7). It is a “contrary Gospel” (Galatians 1:9). It is a Gospel repudiated throughout both the Old and New Testaments: Abraham condemned it (Genesis 15:6; Romans 4:3; Galatians 3:6); Moses condemned it (Deuteronomy 27:26); David condemned it (Psalm 32:1-2; Psalm 51:1-17); Isaiah condemned it (Isaiah 1:10-18); Jeremiah condemned it (Jeremiah 4:1-9); Amos condemned it (Amos 5:1-17); Habakkuk condemned it (Habakkuk 2:4); Paul condemned
it (Romans 9:32; Galatians 3:10; Ephesians 2:9); and Peter con­demned it (2 Peter 1:3-4; 2:1-22).

"Salvation by works" is heretical in every way imaginable. It abolishes the significance of the cross (Galatians 5:11). It makes light of Christ's sacrifice (Galatians 2:21). It nullifies the work of the Holy Spirit (Galatians 3:3-5). It abrogates the necessity of grace (Romans 4:4). "Faith is made void and the promise is nullified" (Romans 4:14) because it makes man and man's ability the measure of all things (Matthew 15:6-9). Thus, the Social Gos­pel is nothing more than another form of Humanistic Paganism.  

Salvation according to the Bible is a work of sovereign grace. There is absolutely nothing we can do to merit God's favor: "He saved us, not on the basis of deeds which we have done in right­eousness, but according to His mercy, by the washing of regen­eration and renewing by the Holy Spirit, whom He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior, that being justi­fied by His grace we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life" (Titus 3:5-7).

All men are without exception sinners. And thus, all men are both doomed and damned apart from God's providential and unilateral grace provision. Thus, the most fundamental factor in understanding anthropology is not ideological, psychological, or sociological. It is instead soteriological. The most fundamental factor in understanding anthropology is the thanatos factor.  

Very simply, because of sin all men have morbidly em­braced death and apart from Christ are utterly without hope (Romans 5:12).

At the Fall, mankind was suddenly destined for death (Jerem­iah 15:2). We were all at that moment bound into a covenant with death (Isaiah 28:15).

There is a way that seems right to a man, but its end is the way of death (Proverbs 14:12; 16:25).

Whether we know it or not, we have chosen death (Jeremiah 8:3). It has become our shepherd (Psalm 49:14). Our minds are fixed on it (Romans 8:6), our hearts pursue it (Proverbs 21:6), and our flesh is ruled by it (Romans 8:2). We dance to its cadences (Proverbs 2:18) and descend to its chambers (Proverbs 7:27).
The fact is, "the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23) and "all have sinned" (Romans 3:23).

There is none righteous, not even one; there is none who understands, there is none who seeks for God; all have turned aside, together they have become useless; there is none who does good, there is not even one. Their throat is an open grave, with their tongues they keep deceiving, the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood, destruction and misery are in their paths, and the path of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes (Romans 3:10-18).

And, all those who hate God, love death (Proverbs 8:36). It is no wonder then that abortion, infanticide, exposure, and abandonment have always been a normal and natural part of human relations. Since the dawning of time, men have contrived ingenious diversions to satisfy their fallen passions. And child-killing has always been chief among them.

Virtually every culture in antiquity was stained with the blood of innocent children. In fact, abortion, infanticide, exposure, and abandonment were so much a part of human societies that they provided the primary literary *liet motif* in popular traditions, stories, myths, fables, and legends.

The founding of Rome was, for instance, presumed to be the happy result of the abandonment of children. According to the story, a vestal virgin who had been raped bore twin sons, Romulus and Remus. The harsh Etruscan monarch Amulius ordered them exposed on the Tiber River. Left in a basket which floated ashore, they were found by a she wolf and suckled by her. Later, a shepherd discovered them and took them home to his wife and the kindly couple brought them up as their own. Romulus and Remus would later establish the city of Rome on the seven hills near the place of their rescue.

Oedipus was presumed to be an abandoned child who was also found by a shepherd and later rose to greatness. Ion, the eponymous monarch in ancient Greece miraculously lived through an abortion, according to tradition. Cyrus, the founder of the Persian empire, was supposedly a fortunate survivor of infanticide. According to Homer's legend, Paris, whose amorous
indiscretions started the Trojan War, was also a victim of aban-
donment. Telephus, the king of Mysia in Greece, and Habius,
ruler of the Cunetes in Spain, had both been exposed as children
according to various folk tales. Jupiter, chief god of the Olympian
pantheon, himself had been abandoned as a child. He in turn
exposed his twin sons, Zethus and Amphion. Similarly, other
myths related the fact that Poseidon, Aesculapius, Hephaistos,
Attis, and Cybele had all been abandoned to die.

Because they had been mired by the minions of sin and
death, it was as natural as the spring rains for the men and
women of antiquity to kill their children. It was as instinctive as
the autumn harvest for them to summarily sabotage their own
heritage. They saw nothing particularly cruel about despoiling
the fruit of their wombs. It was woven into the very fabric of their
culture. They believed that it was completely justifiable. They
believed that it was just and good and right.

But they were wrong. Dreadfully wrong.

Life is God's gift. It is His gracious endowment upon the
created order. It flows forth in generative fruitfulness. The earth
is literally teeming with life (Genesis 1:20; Leviticus 11:10; 22:5;
Deuteronomy 14:9). And the crowning glory of this sacred teem-
ing is man himself (Genesis 1:26-30; Psalm 8:1-9). To violate the
sanctity of this magnificent endowment is to fly in the face of all
that is holy, just, and true (Jeremiah 8:1-17; Romans 8:6).

To violate the sanctity of life is to invite judgment, retribution,
and anathema (Deuteronomy 30:19-20). It is to solicit devasta-
tion, imprecatation, and destruction (Jeremiah 21:8-10).

Do not be deceived, God is not mocked, whatsoever a man
sows, that he shall also reap (Galatians 6:7).

But the Lord God, who is the giver of life (Acts 17:25), the
fountain of life (Psalm 36:9), the defender of life (Psalm 27:1),
the prince of life (Acts 3:15), and the restorer of life (Ruth 4:15),
did not leave men to languish hopelessly in the clutches of sin
and death. He not only sent us the message of life (Acts 5:20)
and the words of life (John 6:68), He sent us the light of life as
well (John 8:12). He sent us His only begotten Son—the life of
the world (John 6:51)—to break the bonds of death (1 Corinthians
15:54-56). Jesus “tasted death for everyone” (Hebrews 2:9), actually “abolishing death” for our sakes (2 Timothy 1:10) and offering us new life (John 5:21).

For God so loved the world, that He sent His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life (John 3:16).

One of the earliest Christian documents—actually predating much of the New Testament—asserts that “There are two ways: a way of life and a way of death.” In Christ, God has afforded us the opportunity to choose between those two ways—to choose between fruitful and teeming life on the one hand, and barren and impoverished death on the other (Deuteronomy 30:19).

Apart from Christ it is not possible to escape the snares of sin and death (Colossians 2:13). On the other hand:

If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new” (2 Corinthians 5:17).

All those who hate Christ “love death” (Proverbs 8:36); while all those who receive Christ are made the sweet savor of life (2 Corinthians 2:16).

This is the faith, “once and for all delivered to the saints” (Jude 3). This is not a Social Gospel, it is simply The Gospel.

Even so, this Gospel truth is not supposed to be mere dogma, it is to be worked out in every detail and dimension of life. Thus, all those who walk the path of life (Psalm 16:11; Proverbs 2:19; 5:6; 10:17; 15:24), and eat from wisdom’s tree of life (Proverbs 3:18; 3:22; 4:13; 4:22-23), are made the champions of life (Proverbs 24:10-12).

Ultimately, this is where the whole notion of good works fits into Biblical theology. The Apostle Paul tells us that though we are saved “by grace through faith” (Ephesians 2:8), “not as a result of works” (Ephesians 2:9), we are “created in Christ Jesus for good works” (Ephesians 2:10).

In other words, good works are something we do because we have been justified, not in order to be justified. Concern and care for the innocent, helpless, poor, and afflicted is an effect of
salvation, not the *cause* of salvation. It is a way of *life*, not a way of *salvation*. And therein lies all the difference.

This then is the faith "which was once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). This is the faith that orthodox believers have held to throughout the centuries—from the Patristic Age, through the Protestant Reformation, and to the present day:

**Ignatius of Antioch** (14-107). "Carnal people cannot act spiritually, or spiritual people carnally, just as faith cannot act like unbelief, or unbelief like faith. . . . Those who profess to be Christ's will be recognized by their actions. . . . They will give and be given graciously unto the poor just as the Lord gave and was given unto them."^9

**Clement of Rome** (34-100). "Let us not merely call Him Lord. . . . Let us acknowledge Him by our actions of mercy and charity."^10

**The Didache** (110). "Every prophet who teaches the truth but fails to practice what he preaches is a false prophet. . . . Ministry to the afflicted is but a mark of faith. Yet the absence of that mark is evidence of an absence of that faith."^11

**Basil of Caesarea** (330-379). "A man who has two coats or two pair of shoes, when his neighbor has none, evidences a lack of grace in his life. . . . The redistribution of wealth is in no wise the point. The revealing of faith is the point."^12

**John Chrysostom** (347-407). "The essence of the Gospel is not concern for the poor but it certainly provokes that concern. In fact without that concern, the essence of the Gospel surely has not been grasped."^13

**Ambrose of Milan** (339-397). "Faith is the begetter of a good will and of good actions to the least of these."^14

**Jan Hus** (1369-1415). "Doubt must be cast on fruitless lives. Profession must be followed by deeds of charity, otherwise that profession is false."^15

**Martin Luther** (1483-1546). "Where there are no good works, there is no faith. If works and love do not blossom forth, it is not genuine faith, the Gospel has not yet gained a foothold, and Christ is not yet rightly known."^16

**The Augsburg Confession** (1530). "It is necessary to do good works; not that we may trust that we deserve grace by them, but because it is the will of God that we should do them."^17
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_The Belgic Confession_ (1561). “It is impossible that the holy faith can be unfruitful in man.”

_The Heidelberg Catechism_ (1563). “It is impossible that those who are unplanted into Christ by true faith, should not bring forth fruits of mercy and graciousness.”

_The Westminster Confession_ (1646). “Good works, done in obedience to God’s commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith: and by them believers manifest their thankfulness, strengthen their assurance, edify their brethren, adorn the profession of the Gospel, stop the mouths of the adversaries, and glorify God whose workmanship they are, created in Christ Jesus thereunto; that, having their fruit unto holiness, they may have the end, eternal life.”

_Matthew Henry_ (1662-1714). “Man may as soon take pleasure in a dead body, void of soul, or sense, or action, as God takes pleasure in a dead faith, where there are not works.”

_Jonathan Edwards_ (1703-1758). “That religion which God requires, and will accept, does not consist in weak, dull, lifeless wishes, raising us but a little above a state of indifference. God, in His Word, greatly insists upon it, that we be in good earnest, fervent in spirit, and our hearts vigorously engaged in mercies.”

On and on the testimony of faith through the ages affirms a Gospel evidenced by social concerns but condemning a Social Gospel dependent upon those concerns.

This is indeed the Gospel of light and life.
Ah, a book. Nothing is finer with which to convey truth, to expose falsehood, or to while away the hours. 

Hilaire Belloc
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Grand Illusions peeks behind the curtain of Planned Parenthood exposing the lies that have made it a "respectable" institution.

—R. C. Sproul, President, Ligonier Ministries

In the course of my research, I have found that the abortion industry's very existence depends on secrecy, deception, and distortion of information. For this very reason, I strongly recommend George Grant's book, Grand Illusions, because it provides much needed information that I'm sure Planned Parenthood would rather no one knew!

—Frank E. Peretti, Author

Grant's solid investigative journalism uncovers the myth of "choice" and the fraud that is Planned Parenthood. This book demands a response.

—Michael Card, Recording Artist & Author

For those who care about family and children, this book is a must. Planned Parenthood is a radical extremist group funded with millions of your tax dollars. Read this book! Prepare to get educated about Planned Parenthood.

—Donald E. Wildmon, President, American Family Association.

In Grand Illusions, George Grant speaks with the voice of reason and the voice of passion. This book is a masterpiece of meticulous research brought to life by clear, vivid writing. It has punch! I believe God has called George Grant to be a watchman at our gate.

—Patrick Morley, Businessman, Author, Speaker

For more than forty years I have read the literature of Planned Parenthood, and in the last twenty years I have seen their operations in eighty-four countries. They are the most wicked organization on earth, destroying our youth, our families, church, and society. That is why George Grant's Grand Illusions is must reading for anyone interested in the welfare of the family, the church and society.

—Rev. Paul Marx, President, Human Life International

George Grant is right—this is a war. A war of words. Choice means categorical selfishness. Fetus means a mass of disposable tissue. And education means learning how to live and act in shameless immorality while suffering no consequences. What a grand illusion. When are we going to wake up?

—Beverly LaHaye, President, Concerned Women for America

As a legislator, I have found Grand Illusions to be an invaluable resource. As a businessman, I have found it a trusted guide. As a parent, I have found it a profound encouragement. And as a Christian, I have found it a powerful inspiration. Very simply, Grand Illusions is a classic.

—Rep. Louis "Woody" Jenkins, Louisiana House of Representatives
*If facts can make a difference, this book should put an end to the debate about the social value of Planned Parenthood. George Grant makes a damning case against this beneficent-sounding organization which is, indeed, a cancer in American society.*

Connie Marshner, Commentator, *Focus on The Family, “Weekend”*

When I read this book, I envisioned Planned Parenthood as a large, luxurious ocean liner cruising the open seas. I saw the leadership of Planned Parenthood on the deck, smug and defiant, smiling and waving to passing boats, confident that their ship could never be sunk. They felt an impact, heard an explosion, but continued smiling and waving, arrogantly self-assured that it was a minor problem. Meanwhile, below the surface, the lower decks were filling with water, the engine room was on fire, and the ship was irreparably damaged—doomed to sink. It had been hit by one brilliantly designed and perfectly aimed torpedo—*Grand Illusions*. Read it, praise the Lord, and pass the ammunition.

—Randall A. Terry, Host, *Randall Terry Live*

Planned Parenthood has enjoyed one of the longest free rides in political history. Now, George Grant, in the tradition of solid investigative reporting, punches their ticket, exposing the organization's agenda as anything but the benign, responsible movement it has portrayed itself to be.

—Cal Thomas, Columnist, Los Angeles Times Syndicate

George Grant is a prophetic figure whose wisdom and insight shine like a beacon through the contemporary fog of our culture, calling a generation, drunk on the myth of Planned Parenthood, back to sobriety in the truth of God's Word. While many have denied, debated, and defended the truth, George Grant calls us to demonstrate it. May the shocking reality of *Grand Illusions* disturb us out of our complacency to heed Grant's call.

—Steve Camp, Recording Artist & Author

George Grant chronicles the Planned Parenthood agenda of enticing our youth into "safe sex" in order to feed the cash registers of the largest unregulated legal industry in the world—the abortion clinics. Harbored under the deception of "non-profit," Planned Parenthood continues to profit unchecked with our public school system. As a former abortion provider, I can attest to the accuracy of facts and recommend every truth-seeking citizen read *Grand Illusions*.

—Carol Everett, President, LifeNetwork

In every generation, individuals have risen to the challenge of speaking authoritatively and pro-actively to the critical issue of the day. In our generation, George Grant must be numbered among them. Over the years George has consistently demonstrated the ability to research and communicate truth, effectively combating the grand illusions perpetuated by groups ranging from Planned Parenthood to the promoters of the abortion pill RU-486. Because his arguments are impeccable and his conclusions commanding, I regularly use him as primary resource for creative thinking and redemptive action.

—David J. Gyertson, Ph.D., President, Regent University
"Planned Parenthood" is such a soothing phrase—until you discover that the planners and the parents are two different sets of people. George Grant ably exposes the chilling agenda our tax money is subsidizing.

—Joseph Sobran, The National Review

Words like social planning and social engineering are especially frightening to the elderly, the poor, and those with disabilities. And eliminating the "defectives" did not disappear after post-war Germany—George Grant demonstrates that Planned Parenthood is playing a crucial role in preserving that pernicious social policy. Anyone with a disability or over the age of 65, beware!

—Joni Eareckson Tada, Christian Institute on Disability

Grant's book gives excellent documentation about Planned Parenthood's hidden "plan" for Black Genocide. These shocking facts will especially stir blacks, Jews, and other minorities to realize that our very survival depends upon us taking a stand for righteousness.

—Rev. Dr. E. Jean Thompson, Founder and President, International Black Women's Network

A careful reading of Grand Illusions will reveal the tragic plans and policies of Planned Parenthood. It is but symptomatic of a grave problem in our society today. However, it is not the problem. The real problem is an impotent and apathetic church. It is the task of the church to throw the searchlight of truth upon evil and expose it. Sadly, for years, we have not done so. It is my prayer that this book will open the door of understanding concerning this organization and bring to an end the "free ride" we have given them.

—Dr. James Draper, President, The Baptist Sunday School Board

George Grant has done it again. He has written a compelling and decisive analysis of one of our most difficult social dilemmas—and he has done it with style and grace. This book is certainly must reading for every concerned Christian today.

—D. James Kennedy, Ph.D., Senior Minister, Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church

This book is filled with the fire of the Lord as it lives in George Grant. His exposé of Planned Parenthood is the kind of historically informed writing which our times demand. Our churches and our leaders desperately need to be prepared for the storms ahead. This book will inform and challenge, feeding a Godly vision for the church's glorious future.

—Rev. Don Finto, Belmont Church, Nashville, Tennessee

There are two great holocausts in our day: that of 35,000 people dying every day of hunger, and that of pre-born children dying in the United States and around the world from abortion. No one has done more to expose the deceitfulness of Planned Parenthood's contribution to this genocide of the pre-born than George Grant in his book Grand Illusions.

—Darrow Miller, Executive Vice President, Food for the Hungry
We have waited a long time for a documented, in-depth expose such as this.

—J. C. Willke, M.D., President, Life Issues Institute

Thousands of devastated post-abortion women have seen, too late, beyond the illusion to the delusion. Thank God for George Grant, who speaks the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth regarding the powerful but perverse abortion movement.

—Pam Koerbel, Director, Post Abortion Ministries

George Grant's *Grand Illusions* presents an air-tight historical case against the good intentions of Margaret Sanger and her associates when they founded Planned Parenthood. Their racist, Darwinian strategy was adopted as public policy in Nazi Germany, leading to a public relations blackout of the past on the part of today's Planned Parenthood movement. This is the offense of *Grand Illusions* in their eyes: the book has penetrated this calculating, systematic historical blackout.

—Gary North, Ph.D., Historian and Economist

Pro-life people around the world owe a debt of gratitude to George Grant for revealing the reality behind the public facade of Planned Parenthood. *Grand Illusions* should be a key resource for everyone who works in or supports the pro-life movement.

—Colleen Parro, Director, Republican National Coalition for Life

A few people in life have important things to say, but bore you to death saying them. Many other folks are eloquent, but have nothing to tell you. In this book of George Grant's—as always is the case with his writing—you get the best of both worlds.

—Joel Belz, Publisher, *World Magazine*

Society has indoctrinated today's Christian to believe that it is impolite to bring the lessons we learn in church on Sunday back to the community with us on Monday. Planned Parenthood has been a primary beneficiary of that brainwashing, and our children have been the victims. *Grand Illusions* peels back the glossy cover-up and challenges us to reclaim the moral education of our families to the ultimate benefit of the very society which has silenced us for so long.

—Mrs. Mary Ann Dacey, Executive Director, National Organization of Episcopalians For Life (NOEL)

You don't really know the depths of the depravity of Planned Parenthood unless you have read George Grant's *Grand Illusions*. Many people have written about this evil empire, but no one has done a better job of revealing the nature of Planned Parenthood.

—Bill Price, President, Texans United For Life

Often lost in the emotional debate over abortion is the issue of federal funding of pro-abortion groups like Planned Parenthood. After reading *Grand Illusions*, even supporters of the "right to choose" should believe in letting taxpayers choose not to have their money underwrite Planned Parenthood's would-be social engineers.

—Doug Bandow, Columnist, Copley News Service
Karl Marx said, "Destroy the heritage of a people and they can easily be persuaded." George Grant has shown that since its inception, Planned Parenthood has been bent on severing the spiritual heritage of American families, the anchor chain of our society. He has caught Planned Parenthood with its hand in the cookie jar of American philanthropy. Thanks to Mr. Grant, the National Legal Foundation has the reference source to help close the lid on the cookie jar, combat Planned Parenthood's strategies, and ensure that America’s spiritual anchor will hold.

—Dr. Robert K. Skolrood, Executive Director & General Counsel, The National Legal Foundation

As a clergyman in a mainline denomination, I was shocked to find out so many disturbing, well documented facts about Planned Parenthood which were contrary to all that we have been led to believe. George Grant has succeeded in not only exposing the big business of Planned Parenthood but also in giving sound advice on how to combat this “anti-choice” juggernaut.

—Rev. Roger Grist, St. John’s Episcopal Church

George Grant’s Grand Illusions is one of the most outstanding studies of the true and hidden agenda of Planned Parenthood. It is must reading for all those who are concerned with protecting unborn life.

—Ralph E. Reed, Jr., Executive Director, Christian Coalition

Grand Illusions is good because it shatters the illusion that has been craftily crafted by those with an anti-family agenda. But Grand Illusions is grand because it stretches us to think and act Biblically. George Grant exposes the enemy’s lie, exalts God’s truth, and exhorts the Christian to action.

—Susan Hunt, Consultant to Women in the Church, Presbyterian Church in America

Beware of this book! George Grant’s comprehensive research, gut-wrenching anecdotes, and forceful reasoning combine to serve up a stunningly compelling book. Grand Illusions will inform and anger you regarding Planned Parenthood’s history, operating methods, and objectives—and just may make you into an activist! All this with Grant’s predictably trenchant logic and elevating style.

—Calvin W. Edwards, Executive Vice-President, Walk Thru the Bible Ministries

I wish that every mother and father who are considering an abortion could read this book before they make that final decision. Grand Illusion exposes the real truth and trauma that women go through and live with for years.

—Luci Freed, Executive Director, Nashville Crisis Pregnancy Center

Perhaps a better name for Planned Parenthood would be Planned Deception. George Grant reveals the shocking truth about the true agenda of Planned Parenthood. I challenge every American to read this book and let these well-documented facts reveal the greatest brainwashing job that has ever been done on American society.

—Nancy Alcorn, President, Mercy Ministries of America
George Grant is masterful in exposing the facade of Planned Parenthood. *Grand Illusions* tells it like it is and educates the public about the nation's number one abortion provider.

—Thomas A. Glessner, J.D., Past President, The Christian Action Council

This is an infuriating book, and it is high time Americans were infuriated. Planned Parenthood wouldn't receive another nickel from the taxpayers—indeed, wouldn't last another day—if voters knew what George Grant reveals in *Grand Illusion*.

—David A. Noebel, Ph.D., Summit Ministries

*Grand Illusions* is undoubtedly the most authoritative book available anywhere on one of the most powerful and pernicious organizations in the world. Planned Parenthood not only undermines and usurps parental authority, but it also defiles and denigrates the minds of our children. For that reason, I would wish that every parent would have the opportunity to read this carefully documented book.

—Mercedes Wilson, Family of the Americas

George Grant's *Grand Illusions* unmaskst both the elitist, racist past of Planned Parenthood and its horrific anti-family, anti-life present. If every American would take the time to acquaint themselves with the facts contained in this book, the questions of any public funding for Planned Parenthood would be over.

—Dr. Richard Land, President, The Christian Life Commission

George Grant's distinctively Christian analysis of the perceptions and realities of Planned Parenthood found in *Grand Illusions* provides the church with the ammunition that ought to move it from complacency to action in the battle being waged for the lives of our children.

—Patricia P. Bainbridge, Executive Director, Life Decisions International

George Grant has written the best expose of Planned Parenthood in print. Planned Parenthood is one of Americas nasty little secrets. Grant has flung open the shutters letting the light of day illuminate one of the greatest con-jobs of this century. That Planned Parenthood enjoys any respectability at all, in our society, is a sad commentary on our times. *Grand Illusions* helps to expose for all to see an organization that, from its racist-eugenic inception, should have found no support in the Free World.

—Frank Schaeffer, Author and Speaker

In this updated edition, George Grant shows how Planned Parenthood continues to spread its pro-death philosophy across the nation. He shows us why it is more important than ever that we launch a concerted effort to dethrone Planned Parenthood and have it viewed as the controversial, anti-family and anti-God organization it is. Every parent who cares about their children and the future of their nation should read this book.

—Jim Sedlak, National Director, Stop Planned Parenthood, Inc.
This book is filled with such pertinent information about Planned Parenthood that readers will be astounded. The research is impeccable, in depth, and absolutely surprising.

—Charles A. Provan, M.D.

*Grand Illusions* is the book for anyone who thinks, or knows anyone who thinks, that Planned Parenthood is a fine, high-minded organization. In this award-winning book, George Grant traces not only the history of Planned Parenthood, but goes behind the scenes to show you in person the wreckage it is causing in young women’s lives right now.

—Mary Pride, Author and Speaker

Planned Parenthood is guilty of moral crimes so ghastly they are scarcely believable. That’s why the gripping case presented in *Grand Illusions* is must reading. The horrifying facts behind the abortion and sex education industry simply must be exposed, and George Grant does the job in spell-binding fashion.

—Marlin Maddoux, Host, *Point of View*

*Grand Illusions* is by far the best expose of Planned Parenthood ever written. Everyone should read this book. Everyone should use it. The only way for truth to triumph is if the illusion is shattered. And this book shatters the illusion.

—Joseph M. Scheidler, Director, Pro-Life Action League

Planned Parenthood has spent millions to erect a false public relations front. Hundreds of journalists have cooperated. Not George Grant. With passion and accuracy, he courageously knocks down the screen to reveal what everyone who cares about life should know.

—Marvin Olasky, Ph.D., Professor of Journalism, The University of Texas

I am horrified to read the extensive documentation about the anti-family strategies of Planned Parenthood. Not before I read this book was I aware of the abundance of amoral information being distributed to our kids at taxpayer’s expense. It is hard to believe what is at the very heart of the multi-billion dollar Planned Parenthood movement. You need to read *Grand Illusions* for yourself—the documented facts speak loudly.

—Josh McDowell, Author/Youth Communicator

*Grand Illusions* is a dramatic and challenging wake-up call to complacent Christians. As an attorney who has fought on the defending side against Planned Parenthood’s well bankrolled lawsuits, I am painfully aware of their efforts to suppress pro-life speech, protest, or abortion regulation.

—Paige Comstock Cunningham, Attorney

George Grant exposes how U.S. tax dollars have been used under Democrat and Republican presidents to subsidize the Dr. Mengeles of the pro-abortion movement.

—Howard Phillips, President, The Conservative Caucus
Finally, a book that reveals Planned Parenthood's agenda of black genocide. What a practical handbook for exposing this multi-million dollar fraud.

—Andrea Sheldon, Traditional Values Coalition

Many comparisons have been made between the abortion holocaust of the past twenty years and the Nazi holocaust earlier this century. As brutal as the extermination of the Jews was, the 40 million murders by legalized abortion since 1972 has proved to be an even greater blight on our nation. Planned Parenthood has been at the forefront of the child-killing industry and in Grand Illusions George Grant ably exposes their complicity.

—Larry Pratt, President, Committee to Protect the Family.

Grand Illusions has peeled back the facade of deception from Planned Parenthood more clearly than any other book.

—George McNerlin, Morningstar Radio Network

A much needed exposé of Planned Parenthood by an expert researcher and historian.

—Dr. Samuel L. Blumenfeld, Editor, The Blumenfeld Education Letter

This work is typical George Grant. It is both comprehensive and entertaining. The most valuable resource in fighting the number one nemesis of the babies.

—Paul deParrie, Editor, The Advocate

Grand Illusions is by far the best documented and researched exposé of the strategy and tactics of Planned Parenthood yet published. It seeks to infiltrate the nation's schools with "health clinics" which Grant shows are, in fact, used by Planned Parenthood as a means of indoctrinating students in sexual permissiveness by the free distribution of condoms and pills, and then by referring the girls who become pregnant to one of their own clinics which provide abortions. For these reasons, all parents concerned with the health and moral behavior of their high-school age children should read this book and put a stop to Planned Parenthood's evil machinations.

—Rev. E. L. Hebden Taylor, Rector, St. Albans Anglican Church

A few years ago George Grant dared to write this book about Planned Parenthood. As he has made clear, there is nothing "left-wing" about Planned Parenthood. Its popularity among the business classes of America is a matter for concern and prayer, and makes me wonder why conservative Christians continue to look to the business class for leadership. This is a highly appropriate time to bring this book out again. We learn from Grant two things: (1) that no single issue like "pro-life" will be enough to deal with this complex monster, and (2) that the Body of Christ's answer will have to come ultimately through service—to the crisis-pregnant women, to the "unwanted" children, and, before that, to the young people who want to know about the meaning of human reproduction. Above all, the edifice which took generations to build will not disappear overnight. Service, prayer, and time will eventually conquer it.

—Howard Ahmanson, Fieldstead & Company
George Grant pays Planned Parenthood the highest compliment: he takes them seriously by attending very closely to their history, their beliefs, and their actions. He then uncovers, through comprehensive research, the tragic and sobering political results of their sinister agenda. This is a vital and revealing book about an urgent topic that far too many people know so little about.

—Michael Cromartie, Research Fellow, Ethics and Public Policy Center

When people want information on Planned Parenthood, the first place I send them is to Grand Illusions by George Grant. It is still the best place to document the history and influence of Planned Parenthood in our society. Grant strips the veneer off their cultivated public image and exposes Planned Parenthood for what it is.

—Kerby Anderson, President, Probe Ministries

The so-called warrior for women's rights—Planned Parenthood's founder Margaret Sanger—is hoist by her own petard, with her very words, rooted in hatred and bigotry, exploding in the false face of her fraudulent reputation. The re-writers of history won't appreciate George Grant's thoughtful scholarship and careful documentation—but the truth only hurts when it should.

—William P. Hoar, Washington Editor, The New American

George Grant compasses the growth of the Planned Parenthood movement, from Ms. Sanger's eugenics to its current status as the world's biggest abortion provider. He gets to the heart of the matter, and in so doing speaks for the millions of beating hearts sacrificed to the Molech worship that is Planned Parenthood.

—R. C. Sproul, Jr., Editor, TableTalk

Pity the target of a George Grant book or article. This unlucky one's every weakness will be relentlessly probed and exposed. His character and intellect will be studiously measured against Grant's eloquent and constructive insights into conservative standards and tradition.

—Tom Atwood, The Heritage Foundation

Thank God for such a diligent researcher and able writer as George Grant. His documentation allows the deplorable record of Planned Parenthood to speak for its shameful self. Every citizen of America should read the record presented here.

—Senator Ed Glassgow, President, South Dakota Christian Coalition

Grand Illusions exposes the deceit and hypocrisy of the pro-abortion movement through the words and history of their leaders. It's must reading for anyone who wants to know the truth about abortion.

—John Wimber, Vineyard Christian Fellowship of Anaheim
Research, detail, accuracy. Three obvious distinctions of George Grant's *Grand Illusions*. How can a society pass more laws to protect animals, but continue by the minute to kill its own unborn? Exposing Planned Parenthood as a scam should be our goal. Today . . . and everyday . . . until it is totally aborted!

—David T. Clydesdale, Music Composer & Conductor

George Grant has added yet another important and increasingly needed work to substantive pro-life literature. As the author of a recently published book on Planned Parenthood, I welcome the updated, expanded version of *Grand Illusions*. It includes additional material to arm the activist with information to fight the evil of Planned Parenthood.

—Douglas R. Scott, Author, *Bad Choices: A Look Inside Planned Parenthood*

Because George Grant is a superb historian as well as relentless reporter, *Grand Illusions* reveals the truth that few know about Planned Parenthood's origins—that its founder, Margaret Sanger, was a vehemently anti-Christian, anti-marriage, anti-capitalist admirer of Nazi Germany's "race purification" program. Even more surprising, Grant documents how Sanger's radicalism, under a thin veneer, still guides Planned Parenthood today.

—Charles Hull Wolfe, Historian, Coral Ridge Ministries

If George Grant's book *Grand Illusions* is not quite Uncle Tom's Cabin, it may nonetheless have the same galvanizing effect on the pro-life movement as Stowe's book had on the antislavery movement—but without her wild sensationalism.

—Gary Whitby, *Christianity Today*

George's writing always yields a double edged sword . . . through the power of language and factual information. Add prayer and action to that . . . who can stand?

—Ted Gerk, Kelowna Right to Life

We all know that evildoers flourish and prosper in darkness! George Grant's *Grand Illusions* places the spotlight of righteous scrutiny upon the works of those involved in the evil of Planned Parenthood.*

—John Clemens, News Director, USA Radio Network

George Grant has done an excellent job of cataloging the deleterious medical effects of abortion—especially RU-486.

—Douglas G. Kay, President, National Institute for Healthcare Research

When I read the writings of George Grant, I am struck by his anointed ability to analyze and discern his subjects. His depth of knowledge and clarity of thought will impact your life and sharpen your views.

—James Robison, President and Founder, LIFE Outreach International