

THE ANTI-LIFE FAMILY CONFERENCES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mercedes Arzu Wilson

AS THE SUN ROSE over Communist China on a September morning in 1995, the Western forces marched on to the conference-center determined to start a sexual revolution in the developing world. The pro-family forces from the developing countries, encouraged by a determined group of volunteers, also streamed toward the conference-venue. Though severely outnumbered, these courageous pro-family veterans of two previous United Nations conferences (Cairo and Copenhagen) felt wiser and braver.

THE REVOLUTION

This was clearly an undeclared war. At issue was a document under consideration by conference-delegates representing virtually every country of the world. It calls for worldwide population-control on a colossal scale, which would be achieved through abortion, pills and other man-made technologies. It includes the universal recognition of not two genders but possibly five. It is hostile to the two-parent family and to motherhood in particular. It is also antagonistic toward religion and religious people. It promotes sexual experimentation and homosexuality—anything that does not result in childbirth. In short, the UN document is riddled with every possible attack on the family. It would effectively make Planned Parenthood's mission-statement international law through compulsory treaty. Parents would have to take a back seat in this new tyrannical system.

This battle, pitting the world's most powerful Western countries against its most weak and impoverished, entails changing cultural values and religious traditions worldwide. The most vocal countries in the Western coalition were the European Union (comprised of 15 European countries and most Scandinavian countries, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the U.S.). Under the auspices of the UN, they seek to make universal population-control and an attack on the traditional family the cornerstone of a new world.

CONTROLLING MARRIAGE AND MOTHERHOOD

The UN Universal Declaration on Human Rights provides for the "recognition of the inherent dignity" of each human being. It also calls equal rights of all human beings the "foundation of freedom, justice and peace." Despite these earlier statements made by the UN's member-states, the

Western coalition vigorously insisted upon the removal of all references to human dignity from the document considered in Beijing in September 1995.

The Universal Declaration makes marriage a fundamental right. It also provides that, “The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the state.” In contrast, the Beijing document portrays marriage and the family as obstacles to a woman’s self-realization. Marriage and family are associated with violence against women within a family.

The Western negotiators did not stop there. They insisted on changing the term *family* to the ambiguous word *families*. This is an ominous change, for it implies that any group of unrelated people could call themselves a family. While pro-family delegates were successful in preventing this change, other provisions of the document extended the actual meaning of the term *family*.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides that “motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and protection.” The Western countries repeatedly requested the deletion of any references to the word *mother* except when it appeared in a negative light. In effect they argued that the role of women is to be an executive, a politician, a producer—anything but a mother.

“IMAGINE THERE’S... NO RELIGION, TOO”

The UN Universal Declaration on Human Rights provides that, “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion... freedom, either alone or in community with others, and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.” Yet in Beijing the anti-family coalition aggressively sought to remove all reference to religion, spirituality, morals or ethics—except where they were portrayed negatively, such as when associated with intolerance or extremism.

To these delegates, there is nothing good about religion, especially the Catholic Church. After all, it is argued, it is the Church that has kept women down and, therefore, has been responsible for overpopulating the earth.

According to this document, every country in the world must recognize that “human rights and fundamental freedoms,” as defined by the feminist-controlled Western countries, are more important than cultural or religious traditions and beliefs. Imagine the actual impact on your life, if you hold your religious views to be more important than this UN decree.

MY PARENT, THE STATE

The Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the Convention of the Rights of the Child made special provision for parents’ rights and

responsibilities regarding the education and upbringing of their children. The Western delegations worked to eliminate recognition of parental rights and responsibilities from key sections of the draft—even rejecting direct quotations from the Convention of the Rights of the Child. One pivotal paragraph was changed to give first mention to “rights of the child to access to information, privacy, confidentiality....” The implication here is that these supersede the parents’ rights.

In Beijing special committees (called “contact-groups”) were set up to allow for discussion and consideration of recommended action on various topics. In the contact-group on parental rights, the Guatemalan delegation suggested two possible additions to the Beijing document. Under the proposals, one of the following would be added: (1) “with the support and guidance from the parents and in conformity with the Convention on the Rights of the Child” or (2) “recognizing the rights and responsibilities of parents and persons legally responsible for adolescents to provide in a manner consistent with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, appropriate support and guidance in matters of sexual and reproductive matters.” The end result would be recognition of basic parental rights. Number two was approved by a majority of delegates attending the meeting of the contact-group.

Two days later the Canadian chairman suddenly produced copies of a totally different option with a significant change in the language. The new version read: “Taking into account the rights of the child to access information, privacy, confidentiality, respect and informed consent, as well as the rights and duties of the parents and legal guardians to provide in a manner consistent with the capacities of the child, appropriate direction and guidance in accordance with the Convention of the Rights of the Child, and in conformity with non-discrimination against women, in all actions concerning children, the interest of the child should be a primary consideration.” This was an unacceptable paragraph, but was nevertheless adopted.

If the Western delegates were to have their way, children were effectively to be property of the state—which would decide not only how they are raised, but if they should live or die.

NOT TWO GENDERS, BUT FIVE

From the very beginning in Beijing, the main strategy of conference-leaders was to bring up the most controversial points first. This would give the minority-coalition of Western nations an advantage before the various delegations from the poor countries got used to the dubious strategies of the opposing forces. They did not want the poor countries to align with each

other in the closed-door meetings. This was a very clever move. On the first day, September 4, the chairman brought forth to the delegations the most controversial of all the points in the draft document—the lack of a precise definition of the word *gender*.

This controversy erupted in the preparatory committee-meeting at the UN in New York in the spring of 1995. Originally only three countries (Argentina, Guatemala and Honduras) questioned the meaning of the term. They requested that the word *gender*, which appears over 200 times in the 145-page document, be adequately and clearly defined. This caused a tremendous uproar from the developed countries which wanted to leave the word without a definition.

On September 4 the chairman reported at the main committee the ambiguous language that had been approved in New York by about 40 countries—with the exception of Guatemala, which offered a clear definition and dissented from leaving it undefined. When this point was brought up in Beijing, Guatemala requested the floor and offered this definition: “The term *gender* in this document refers to male and female as the two sexes of the human being.” Unfortunately, no support was given to the Guatemalan delegation—even from those expected to support the amendment.

This was a very sad and tragic day. No support was given to oppose what is going to become a very dangerously ambiguous definition of a word that has now been given official acceptance by 182 countries around the world. It was decided that *gender* would be “interpreted and understood as it is in ordinary and generally accepted usage.” The extremists—anti-womanhood and anti-motherhood feminists—claim that gender-roles are socially constructed. In other words, one is not born male or female, but society imposes such constructs. Paragraph 28 says “Socially constructed gender roles” and “socially ascribed gender roles” also appear in paragraph 50 of the draft. Consequently, recognition of five genders could emerge: male, female, homosexual, bisexual, and transsexual.

This not an unimportant point. Acceptance of the definition of *gender* as “socially constructed, socially determined or socially ascribed roles” imposes an alien and radical ideology on the women of the world. Such an ambiguous definition of *gender* carries with it the implication that motherhood and heterosexuality are not natural, but artificially created social constructs. It is a denial of the natural differences between men and women—which must be respected if women are to be truly equal as women and not as “imitation-men” as indicated in these documents. The language accepted at the conference is actually promoting the masculinization of women. It would be equally destructive and wrong to promote the feminization of

men.

“AN OFFER YOU CAN'T REFUSE”

Marilyn McAfee, the American ambassador to Guatemala, was so incensed by my challenge to the Beijing document that she wrote to the Guatemalan Minister of Foreign Relations about my statements to the press. The following are excerpts from her letter, a copy of which was sent to my brother while he was still a candidate to the presidency.

Through this letter I wish to express to you my preoccupation on the comments to the press by a member of the Guatemalan delegation, Mrs. Mercedes Arzu Wilson, during the Fourth Woman's Conference....

The government of the United States has maintained a very active program of foreign aid for more than 30 years in this country [Guatemala].... The U.S. Congress is currently in the process of defining the budget of foreign aid for the 1996 Fiscal year and will substantially reduce the levels of aid for this year.... In light of the current deliberations by the U.S. Congress, the comments made by Mrs. Wilson arrive at an especially inopportune moment and we hope it will not have a negative effect on the U.S. aid to Guatemala.

It would be unfortunate if it was thought that certain public comments, lacking prudence, ...reflect the reaction of Guatemala toward our aid.

Was the American ambassador concerned that I was speaking, or was she really seeking to censor the content of my speech?

After receiving Ambassador McAfee's threatening letter, I sent a copy to Congressman Bob Livingston (R-LA), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and Rep. Christopher H. Smith (R-NJ), chairman of the House Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. Rep. Livingston soon responded:

I feel distressed and deeply concerned that our American Ambassador to Guatemala would write a letter accusing you of criticizing U.S. foreign aid because of your strong stand in defending life, motherhood, parental rights, and high moral grounds....

As Chairman of the Appropriations Committee..., I can assure you that there is no political bias in Congress against Guatemala for your courageous stand as a delegate from Guatemala in Beijing. On the contrary, there is much admiration and esteem for your work.

Rep. Smith was even more blunt:

I am deeply disappointed that our ambassador to your country has seen fit to disparage your participation in the [UN] Conference. In particular, her expression of "hope" that your comments "will not have a negative effect on the U.S. aid to Guatemala" implies a threat that is entirely inappropriate.

Often countries are singled out as dissenters for standing up for the family, motherhood and parental rights. Many countries are sacrificing their moral values and ethical principles in the hope of economic concessions that may never come. Why do we always have to be beggars? How can we eradicate poverty, hunger and misery when the so-called humanitarian aid is really used as a bribe?

POPULATION-CONTROL AND SEX-EDUCATION TO ADOLESCENTS:

THE ROOT OF ALL PROBLEMS

The time has come for the truth to unfold with regard to the so-called “humanitarian” family-planning programs that are nothing more than chemical warfare against women and families. As a Guatemalan, I can tell you that government officials and the people of my country have long been pressured to accept such pernicious programs. I can assure you there is nothing humane about them.

The Western world, led by the U.S., has financed the most shameful and repressive population-control drama in history. In India, for example, millions of men were hauled away in trucks and forcibly sterilized. Women are often offered financial incentives—which are difficult to refuse when you are among the poorest of the poor—in an effort to lure them into destroying their delicate reproductive organs. The West is also responsible for inspiring the notorious one-child population-control policy that enforces compulsory sterilization and abortion in China—all while claiming to oppose such abhorrent practices.

The contraceptive mentality has degenerated to such a degree that doctors generally fail to inform their patients of all the dangers to their health and the abortifacient effect of the many methods of artificial birth-control. These include the most commonly used methods, such as the Pill, Norplant, Depo-Provera and the Intra-uterine device. (All of them were first experimented with using the poor in Third World countries.) Their proponents ignore studies which show a link between the hormones in such chemical devices and a significant increase in cancer among women, as well as numerous other serious consequences.

Writers from around the world detail violations of women’s rights by population-programs when they are coerced to have fewer children than they desire in order to meet governmental goals.¹ Frequently, women in the Third World are not told of the side-effects of the various contraceptive methods. These adverse reactions may be more severe for poor women than for women in the West given widespread malnourishment and their generally

poor health.

Implants like Norplant and injectables like Depo-Provera promise protection against conception for months and even years. However, if a woman changes her mind and wants a child, she may be forced to continue the use of these methods. If the government has set population-reduction goals, she may be unable to find medical personnel willing to assist her by removing implants.

As shown in “The Human Laboratory,”ⁱⁱⁱ a video documentary filmed by the British Broadcasting Company:

[T]hrough [BBC’s] moving filmed testimony, HORIZON uncovers a catalogue of claims that Norplant is destroying women’s lives. Serious side effects have been reported.... The film follows the diminutive Farida Akhter on her mission of mercy through the slums of Dhaka to uncover what she believes is the truth of the [Norplant] trials: side-effects often not reported; women pleading for removal of Norplant, but being turned away or asked to pay large sums of money; claims that they did not even know it was an experimental drug. And harrowing tales of bad science and coercion come from the poorest slums in the Western hemisphere, in Cité Soleil, Haiti, which health workers believe has become America’s offshore human laboratory. Farida Akhter says: “It’s cheaper for them to use Third World women than to use an animal in a laboratory in the West.”

Narrator: Norplant is at least an officially approved contraceptive. But there are other, less regulated methods already in use... there are... a whole range of private foundations that are funding the building of a population-control movement. One private organisation is run by two doctors [Dr. Elton Kessel and Dr. Stephen Mumford] from America’s southern states who believe they’ve found the answer for Third World Women in a drug called Quinacrine.

Dr. Elton Kessel: We have trials of the Quinacrine method going in some 17 countries like India, China, Bangladesh, and the trials are going very well. 10,000 women have had this method without a single fatality being reported.

Narrator: Dr. Elton Kessel was the founding director of Family Health International. He now researches Quinacrine in a worldwide operation, masterminded from Dr. Mumford’s basement in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Quinacrine is inserted into the top of the womb where it causes inflammation and scarring in the Fallopian tube, in theory blocking the tube with scar-tissue and preventing the sperm from reaching the egg.

Stephen Mumford: It’s a very simple procedure, takes only a few minutes. It can be done in very primitive settings by people who do not necessarily have a lot of clinical skills....

Narrator: But some scientists believe the drug could put women’s lives at risk—from cancer and ectopic pregnancy. And they question this entire approach to sterilisation.

Professor Shree Mulay: This method of producing scar-tissue is extremely barbaric. To try to damage the tissue so that you produce inflammation and block the tubes that way I think is extremely crude. It is imprecise for sure because one does not know

where exactly that is going to take place and it causes a tremendous amount of pain because of the inflammation. There has been a long history of chemical-sterilisation research and this history is really an ugly one and its quite a shocking one because all kinds of agents have been used—sulphuric acid, formaldehyde—all of these agents which actually burn the tissue and cause production of scar-tissue. Chemical sterilisation was first tried out by the Nazis in their very first experiments in the death camps. That it has been picked up in the 60s, 70s and the 80s and been promoted as rescue for the women of the Third World I think is quite extraordinary.

In a field-trial prior to marketing it for general use, a fertility-regulating vaccine (FRV) is being injected with tetanus-toxoid into young women in India. According to a World Health Organization document, the vaccine, anti-human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG), is being injected without the strict controls imposed on such experiments by most developed countries where governments regulate the introduction of new vaccines to ensure that there are no serious, unwanted side-effects.

The motives behind such attacks on individuals and families—after all, real human beings are targets when "population" is criticized—often include unfounded opinions about economic reality. Yet as many astute observers have pointed out, they also include the puzzling and sinister notion that other people are bad—that human beings are the problem, rather than social injustice, faulty distribution of goods and services, and lack of economic opportunity and freedom. The population-controllers never seem to see themselves as part of an "overpopulation-problem," only the defenseless poor, whom they belittle, coerce and seek to reduce in number.

Time and time again I demanded that women should be properly informed of such abuses, reminding them that the Beijing Conference was supposed to be for the benefit of women. Nevertheless, my petitions were repeatedly denied, my factual information from US government sources was ignored, and my requests that programs of abstinence and the promotion of "self-control" instead of "birth-control" be implemented, were continually ridiculed.

The medical profession has lost credibility and respect for treating fertility—one of the greatest gifts God has given to us—as a disease that must be controlled, destroyed, regulated, altered, or manipulated at will. Most doctors do not encourage couples to practice natural family planning, preferring to hold to the pharmaceutical and abortion-industry hysteria of a poor effectiveness-rate. In reality, independent studies worldwide have proven that the latest and most scientific Ovulation Method, for example, has a 98-99% effectiveness.

Governments, schools and universities in the United states apparently hold

to this same fallacious ideology. They throw condoms, pills and other technologies to boys and girls who, they presume, are incapable of living chaste lives. Isn't it time we challenge our younger generation to practice self-control instead of birth-control? Not only will it bring back respect and appreciation for the natural laws and their gift of fertility, but it will also serve as a remarkable teaching-tool that will have positive impact on young people in many other areas of life. Only through this approach can we begin to reverse the shameful statistic that one in every five Americans has a sexually transmitted disease. Of course, this is largely because of the irresponsible promotion of birth-control products by medical, academic and government institutions.

It is high time to recognize that, historically, every country that has embraced the contraceptive mentality has invariably succumbed to the legalization of abortion. Furthermore, national and international population-control programs—which ignore cultural and religious traditions of peoples throughout the world—are not only very expensive for the taxpayers, but very lucrative for the industries involved. To the poor countries of the developing world it becomes a financial nightmare, for the following reason. While the West can absorb the enormous medical costs associated with artificial birth-control, lesser developed countries who can barely treat common diseases, are unable to cope with the expenses for treating such serious side effects. The international programs have been dismal failures, heartbreaking and destructive to the people of the Third World. As the influence of such programs spreads, so do divorce rates and other socially troubling behavior.

The only beneficiaries of these programs are entities such as Planned Parenthood, whose strong influence was felt throughout all UN conferences, the pharmaceutical industry, and the irresponsible physicians who continue to prescribe the harmful chemicals and mechanical devices. They seem insensitive as they go about destroying both human life and the health of uninformed men and women.

Abortion, which was unthinkable a mere 30 years ago, has become the most commonly performed surgical procedure in the United States. The medical profession should be up in arms rather than embracing and promoting what they have pledged to oppose: “first do no harm.”

Nowhere in the Constitution of the United States or that of any country of the Western World do we find a statement requiring or even encouraging these governments to impose population-control programs all over the world, violating their sovereignty. While most poor nations naturally appreciate true humanitarian aid, it is time to stop the abuses in the name of

“humanitarianism.”

According to the Beijing document, which would have the force of international law by treaty, unlimited access to birth-control and other population-control measures would be considered the norm. In fact, poor countries would be expected to advocate population-control programs and policies strongly. It is ironic that this policy was being pushed in Communist China where the Ovulation Method of Natural Family Planning was tested and found to have a 98.7% effectiveness-rate. But that would not fit into the overall, ideologically-based agenda. Whenever we advocated the use of natural family planning, the Norwegian delegate, backed by the U.S. delegate, would reply that “it is not natural for couples to have to abstain”, or “we will have to check and see if natural family planning is an acceptable method of birth-control.” In other words, the laws of nature, created by God, are being questioned by men.

When the Western delegates promote sex-education, they mean from kindergarten on. By the time children get to the fourth grade, they are to be instructed on condoms as the most effective barrier against AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. But the Family Research Council raises this fact: “In 1984, 7% of San Francisco’s homosexuals were HIV positive; seven years of safe-sex later, the figure is 50%.”ⁱⁱⁱ Further, C. M. Roland, editor of *Rubber Chemistry and Technology* for the National Research Laboratory, wrote:

[T]here exists direct evidence of voids in condom rubber. Electron- micrographs reveal voids 5 microns in size (50 times larger than the virus), while fracture-mechanics analyses, sensitive to the largest flaws present, suggest inherent flaws as large as 50 microns (500 times the size of the virus).^{iv}

This means that over the course of a year, the average woman whose partner uses condoms has one in six chances of becoming pregnant. The chance of contracting AIDS is even higher because HIV is 500 times smaller than a human sperm and one-tenth to one-third the size of the smallest detectable hole in a condom. Moreover, while a woman can become pregnant only one hundred hours each month, given the nature of her ovulatory cycle, HIV can be transmitted at *any* time.

Whether among heterosexuals or homosexuals, AIDS is clearly linked to promiscuous and/or unnatural sexual activity, such as sodomy (anal intercourse), as well as intravenous drug use.^v Consider the following breakdown:

male homosexual/bisexual contact	61%
intravenous (IV) drug-use (female and heterosexual male)	21%

male homosexual/bisexual contact and IV drug-use	7%
heterosexual contact	5%
receipt of contaminated blood-transfusion or tissue	2%
other/undetermined	3%

A recent UN program of several million dollars suggested for Guatemalan kindergarten and primary-school children was recently drafted. The goal was to implant in their innocent minds the notion that human beings are destructive, and therefore there should be less of them. They also presented these children (kindergarten to second grade) with explicit pictures of their anatomy, asking them to give the “correct” names, plus the appropriate function of each organ of the body.

The UN wants documents demanding that children have complete confidentiality (meaning, of course, that we parents cannot find out what our children are doing) in matters of sexuality. They can get pills, condoms, IUDs, Norplant, abortions, and so on—all without parental knowledge. After all, it is argued, it is best that parents do not know about such things. Once again, government-officials, bureaucrats, and radical anti-family movements are telling parents how to raise their own children.

HOMOSEXUALITY: STOPPING PREGNANCY

The most controversial discussion, which contained the topic of "sexual orientation," was left for the last day of the conference. The anti-family coalition knew that the developing nations would not accept any language in the document that promoted or condoned homosexuality.

Once it was brought to the floor, Benin, Egypt, Sudan, Jordan, Iran, Ecuador, Syria, Uganda, Belize, Senegal, Ghana, Guatemala, Bangladesh, Algeria, Ivory Coast, and Yemen strongly objected. There were another 25 or 30 countries seeking to be recognized as well, all of which wanted “sexual orientation” deleted from the document. It was an overwhelming response. They said it offended them, irrespective of religious beliefs, or their ethical and aesthetic sense. They said, “We came here to discuss the problems of hunger and poverty, not the things some women—with very few worries or things to do—want to do by imposing abnormal practices on the rest of the world. Such delegations want to legalize illegality.”

There was a dramatic response from the poor nations of the world. The countries wanting to retain the language of “sexual orientation” included Canada, the United States, the European Union, New Zealand, Switzerland, South Africa, Slovenia, Cuba, Barbados, Chile, Latvia, Brazil, Colombia, and Cook Island. The chairman stopped the deliberations because it was apparent that there was an overwhelming number of countries requesting the

floor to speak against it and there was no point in continuing the debate. The chairman removed the topic from discussion and deleted “sexual orientation” from the paragraphs. Canada, which had brought the issue to the floor for approval, was angry about the defeat of this provision, as was the United States. Both twice requested that the language be reinserted.

“SHOW ME A WINDOW OF YOUR PARADISE”

A Sudanese delegate was engaged in an interesting conversation with a French delegate at the UN Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing:

“Why are you so angry?” the Sudanese delegate asked. “You have all those rights you want us to accept—artificial birth-control, sterilization, abortion, fetal experimentation.”

“Because we want the whole world to have them,” the French delegate responded.

Then the Sudanese delegate replied: “But please show me a little window of your paradise, because you have all of these things and you are still not happy. All I see in your world is increased promiscuity among young people, increased divorce, increased abortion, homosexuality, venereal diseases in epidemic proportions. I don’t see your paradise.”

The French delegate turned away in anger.

In another tragic incident, the Western delegates were trying to pass a dubious proposal entitled “Sexual Rights.”

“Sexual rights!” the Moroccan delegate exclaimed in exasperation at the insistence of the West to push programs and so-called rights that would not be even in the imagination of the poor of the world. “I have no idea what level of affluence you people are coming from, but our people need food, clean water, clothing, housing and you are fighting for ‘sexual rights.’ Can you imagine what my people would think if I go back to my country and I tell them, I did not get you food, I did not get you water, I did not get you clothing or housing, but.....I got you SEXUAL RIGHTS!!! They would think I had gone mad!”

Delegates opposed to any section of the Beijing document had the right to make a “reservation” at the end of the conference. “If you don’t like what we are doing,” we would be told over and over again, “make a reservation.” Needless to say, those reservations can be deleted by a new administration that receives more pressure from the West to accept the whole document.

It is a matter of basic principle that family, motherhood, parental rights and moral values do not belong in a “reservation.” The words *God*, *marriage*, *husband*, and *father* are nowhere to be found.

We pleaded repeatedly with Western delegates to renounce such

impositions on our poor nations. Our countries are poorly equipped and would be unable to handle the accompanying consequences of a promiscuous lifestyle, as is happening in the West—sexually transmitted infections in epidemic proportions resulting from the increase in promiscuity among young people, increase of cancer resulting from hormonal therapy and artificial birth-control, increase in prostitution, infections from massive sterilization, artificial birth-control programs and abortion. Why does the West insist on exporting failure? So a few organizations and corporations can make billions of dollars? So a narrow ideology can be imposed on the entire world?

The truly sad reality is that the programs being imposed through the Beijing document are already being practiced in the countries of the West, much to the detriment of their own people. We are talking about abortion, fetal experimentation, sterilization, sex-education programs without morals and values, the usurpation of parental rights, marketing of human organs, the expansion of homosexual practices, and so on. What the Western delegates now want is to expand these evil and degrading programs to the poor nations of the world. After all, poor people are defenseless and they know their only hope is that someone will stand up for them. The poor countries are courageously trying to defend themselves from such calamities, but often they give in so that the Western nations will not single them out and deny them future international loans and assistance.

WHAT CAN ALL OF US DO?

Words are most inadequate to express to the world the drama taking place behind closed doors. Most people on the street ignore the strategies plotted against humanity taking place at the United Nations. The principal questions for us as teachers and educators are "Why?" and "Who is behind it?" Such clever manipulations orchestrated with such precision, particularly over the last thirty years, are no coincidence.

How is it possible that Supreme Court Judges, as well as the President of the most powerful nation on earth, who received, supposedly, the best education from the most prestigious institutions of learning, apparently learned nothing about the difference between good and evil? Surely, they must have been taught that the violation of the natural law, the killing of an innocent human life, born or unborn, is murder. In their pride and arrogance, such heads of state and legislators are questioning the wisdom of the Creator of Nature and the natural law as though they were superior to them. Their blindness is leading us ever deeper into the culture of death, that which the Holy Father has been warning us to change.

THE CULTURE OF DEATH

We are living in a world where a minority of powerful groups and individuals are imposing a secular humanist doctrine on the rest of the world. The sophisticated ways in which these powerful adversaries disguise their programs as benevolent protectors of the family are repugnant. The majority of the citizens of the West are not aware that this culture of death, funded with their own taxes, is contributing to their own destruction. In addition, Western populations have been depleted below replacement-levels. According to the UN, the population of the world will begin its decline at the beginning of the next century, at which time, it is predicted that their retirement systems will tumble.^{vi} The countries of the West already do not have enough tax-paying young people to finance the retirement of each retiree. Hence, the next step of the advocates of the culture of death will be to eliminate the elderly and handicapped by officially legalizing euthanasia by using the subtle arguments of "death with dignity" and "living wills." Already we are witnessing the brainwashing of these populations, preparing people to accept less health-care and to be "considerate" by not becoming a financial burden to future generations. The linguistic "warfare" against the powerless is already taking place. Just as they legalized the killing of the unborn child, they are rushing to pass the legalization of the elimination of the disabled and infirmed.

A few decades ago, an abortionist would be put in jail for his crime. Today those who protest the massive murder of innocent life are the ones being punished and incarcerated. The inborn modesty and natural innocence of the young are being destroyed under the disguise of "sex-education" without morals and values, totally excluding the rights of their parents. Sodomitic practices once considered an abomination are now being protected by law. The statistical failure of such programs is ignored and the epidemic of deadly venereal diseases keeps expanding all over the world while special-interest groups continue to profit from the consequences of promiscuous behavior.

THE CULTURE OF LIFE

The future of humanity is in our hands. We must rescue the family from the jaws of darkness. As we enter the third millenium, we must unite with those who are sincerely concerned about the future of mankind. As Pope John Paul II said in his Sunday Angelus address of February 13, 1996, "Authentic love is not a vague sentiment or a blind passion. It is an inner attitude that involves the whole human being. It is looking at others, not to use them but to serve them. It is the ability to rejoice with those who are

rejoicing and to suffer with those who are suffering. It is sharing what one possesses so that no one may continue to be deprived of what he needs. Love, in a word, is *the gift of self*... The family, the great *workshop of love* is the *first school*, indeed, a lasting school where people are not taught to love with barren ideas, but with incisive power of experience. May every family truly rediscover *its own vocation to love!* Love that absolutely respects God's plan, love that *is the choice and reciprocal gift of self* within the family unit."

Our influence as parents and educators can defeat the forces of darkness. We must not underestimate the power of self-control that young people naturally possess and should be challenged to put into practice. "True love waits for marriage" is the answer to their future happiness.

Married couples do not have to remain slaves to the lucrative market of artificial birth-control, sterilization or abortion. By respecting the natural functions of the human body, and being able to space children through the natural regulation of conception (Natural Family Planning), the couple can also increase communication and respect for each other, resulting in dramatically low divorce rates (between 2% to 5%).

In his October 1995 speech to the UN General Assembly, His Holiness Pope John Paul II said:

We must not be afraid of the future. We must not be afraid of man. It is no accident that we are here. Each and every human person has been created in the "image and likeness" of the One Who is the origin of all that is. We have within us the capacities for wisdom and virtue. With these gifts and with the help of God's grace, we can build in the next century and the next millennium a civilization worthy if the human person, a true culture of freedom. We can and must do so! And in so doing, we shall see that the tears of this century have prepared the ground for a new springtime of the human spirit.

NOTES

i. Doctors from around the world include Drs. Evelyn and John Billings from Australia, Kevin Hume from Australia, Sr. Dr. Brigitta Schnell from Tanzania, Dr. Andrew Kjura from Kenya, Dr. Maria Lorena de Casco from Honduras, Dr. Maria Ines Girault from Mexico, Dr. Christine Vollmer from Venezuela, and Dr. Julian Simon from the United States.

ii. "The Human Laboratory" in *Horizon* (Nov. 6, 1995).

iii. *Washington Watch*, October 1991.

-
- iv. Letter to the Editor, published in *The Washington Post* on July 3, 1992.
- v. Robert A. Hatcher, Felicia Stewart, James Trussell, Deborah Kowal, Felicia Guest, Gary K. Stewart, and Willard Cates, *Contraceptive Technology: 1990-1992*, 15th rev. ed. (New York: Irvington Publ., 1990) 70-71.
- vi. See the graph of this decline in *World Tables*, 3rd ed., Vol. II, World Bank, Recent Demographic Developments in the Member States of the Council of Europe (1986).