

Notice a Pattern? (or The third holocaust)

In October of 2004 Slate.com published an article by Timothy Noah titled *Why Bush opposes Dred Scott It's Code for Roe v. Wade*.¹ In a condescending tone Noah mocks President Bush and the Christian right, evidently thinking himself clever for exposing what he thinks a secret tool of propaganda conservatives try to keep hidden among themselves. In his research for the article, Noah discovers many references comparing the two Supreme Court cases, but rejects them. He seems to think such comparisons are merely a political ploy, at best. Noah also seems to think the comparison between Roe and Dred Scott (the case in which the Supreme Court denied American citizenship to people of African descent, effectively also denying them human rights) is illegitimate. He is not the only one who thinks this way. Through ignorance, bias and other ailments, "abortion rights" advocates in general seem uninterested in understanding the agenda of the pro-life movement or its arguments, and instead prefer to assign a more sinister motive. Perhaps a more detailed comparison of the two Supreme Court cases will help explain the pro-life position. Better yet, in lieu of trying to persuade abortion advocates, the American people in general could benefit from seeing more detailed historical patterns among the Dred Scott case, the Nuremburg Laws of Nazi Germany, and Roe v. Wade. This essay is such an attempt.

One of the innovations of what is known as the Great American Experiment is the concept of "consent of the governed," which is the notion that government derives its power from the people. In Western Civilization, at the time of the American founding, most nations were governed by some form of monarchy. Also revolutionary was the attempt to eliminate class divisions, giving citizens an equal part and equal voice in their government. But to achieve unanimous endorsement of the new Constitution the thirteen states had to make certain compromises, most notably the concession that even if "all men are created equal," slavery was still to be permitted in states relying on slave labor.

Numerous compromises on slavery were made since the founding of the United States, particularly regarding the inclusion of new states. Some Americans sought the end of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 (which had previously outlawed slavery in much of the former Louisiana Territory) and they finally achieved their goal in 1854. In that year, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, designed by Democratic Senator Stephen A. Douglas, included, among other things, a "popular sovereignty" provision, allowing settlers in the territories to decide for themselves whether to allow slavery in those areas. At issue in this act was a change in Federal policy on slavery; by repealing the Missouri Compromise and adding a popular sovereignty provision, the Kansas-Nebraska Act made slavery a legal possibility in a region where it was previously forbidden.²

¹ <http://www.slate.com/id/2108083/>

² <http://www.ushistory.org/gop/origins.htm>
http://www.ushistory.org/gop/convention_1856.htm
<http://www.ushistory.org/more/timeline.htm>
<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-2536600773.html>
<http://ap.grolier.com/article?assetid=0245550-0&templatename>
<http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1G2-2536601224.html>
<http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1O48-KansasNebraskaAct.html>
<http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1O48-MissouriCompromise.html>

Taking this “moderate” stance on slavery essentially resulted in its legal sanction (much like the Three-Fifths Compromise, where only three-fifths of the slave population would be counted as “people” for purposes of representation). Outrage over the de-facto support of slavery (as well as other issues) prompted several individuals to organize their opposition. Thus, these Republican activists formed a new political party, and claimed the Kansas-Nebraska Act proved a powerful class of influential slaveholders (pejoratively called “Slave Power”) was conspiring to gain control of the federal government and spread slavery nation wide; the same was said of the Dred Scott case of 1857. Political rhetoric of the Republican Party included claims that free market labor of free men was better than slave labor, and slavery posed a threat to the premises of American liberty. The party spread quickly through out the northern states, especially among abolitionists. Most Republican talking points centered on opposition to slavery.³

In the 1856 elections John C. Fremont was the first Republican nominee for president. He did not win the general election, but the endeavor showed Republicans had a very strong presence in northern states, and almost no presence in the South.

The case against slavery was bolstered in 1857 when the U.S. Supreme Court finally handed down its decision on Dred Scott v. Sandford. In that case the Court ruled that people of African descent could never be citizens of the United States. The Court’s decision also affirmed the notion that slaves were property, and could not be taken from their owners without due process.

The main reasoning in the case was based on a technicality of citizenship. The Court ruled that states could not confer what was effectively “federal” citizenship upon a person. The Court’s jurisdiction in the matter, as they saw it, was restricted by the concern of citizenship; Dred Scott technically was not a citizen because he was property. Thus, he had no legal standing to bring a case before the court. Therefore the claim that Mr. Scott’s substantial time spent in free territories and states and he therefore had a right to claim his freedom was moot, as the issue was deemed beyond the Court’s purview.

Despite its own conclusion it had no jurisdiction to rule on the case, rather than dismiss the action, the Court nonetheless proceeded to hold that Scott was not a free man, that the U.S. Congress had no power to ban slavery in the Kansas or Nebraska territories (addressing the contemporary conflict with the Kansas-Nebraska Act, an issue not even raised by Dred Scott), and this somehow meant people of African descent (whether slave or free) could not be citizens of the United States. In making such advisory rulings, the Supreme Court blatantly violated the separation of powers as prescribed in the U.S. Constitution, ignoring written law to manufacture preferred law. This new interpretation of the Constitution would temporarily trump its explicit language. In Dred Scott, the Court was required, by its own rules, to dismiss the case because it determined it had no

³ http://www.conservapedia.com/Republican_Party
<http://www.gop.com/About/AboutRead.aspx?Guid=a747a888-0ae6-4441-94f4-2a3a6561f872>
http://en.citizendium.org/wiki/U.S._Republican_Party,_history
http://en.citizendium.org/wiki/Slave_Power
<http://www.mrlincolnandfreedom.org/inside.asp?ID=10&subjectID=2>

jurisdiction on the issues.⁴ This astoundingly unconstitutional ruling was made to suit the personal preferences of a few the justices, instituting those preferences as erroneous law for the rest of nation.

Chief Justice Taney thought the decision of the Dred Scott case would forever resolve the issue of slavery in the U.S. In reality it had the opposite effect. Republican opposition to slavery intensified, as did calls for secession by southern Democrats. The political situation for pro-slavery Democrats in the North also became more precarious. In attempting to protect their political capitol, they characterized Republicans as being divisive and extremist, and refusing to accept the Supreme Court's decision as the law of the land. Incidentally, reactions to the Dred Scott case seem to have cemented the two sides of the soon to be American Civil War, which began less than five years later.

The contention over legal maneuvering on the issue of slavery prompted more than the birth of a new political party; it also motivated a practicing Illinois lawyer to return to politics. In 1854, responding to the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Abraham Lincoln delivered his famous "Peoria Speech" in which he described the obvious hypocrisy in America's indulgence in slavery. The Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 gave both men opportunities to eloquently make their cases for or against slavery and strengthened political momentum leading up to the 1860 presidential election. Lincoln's "House Divided" speech of 1858 rallied Republicans across the north, and he eventually won the Republican nomination for the upcoming presidential race.

Mr. Lincoln won the election of 1860, becoming the first Republican President of the United States in November of that year. When he assumed office in March of 1861, seven southern states had already seceded from the union under then president James Buchanan, largely because of Lincoln's anti-slavery position. The first shots of the American Civil war were fired at Fort Sumter in the following month.

More than a year into the war, in July of 1862, President Lincoln delivered his Emancipation Proclamation, announcing the passage of the Second Confiscation Act, which freed the slaves in slave states. The Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution later officially abolished slavery in the United States in 1865.⁵

Both sides of the slavery issue in the United States, as well as the Civil War, claimed the support of the Almighty. The northern position was heavily influenced by both a natural desire for liberty and the notion that God created all men equal. Anti-slavery

⁴ <http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1E1-DredScot.html>
http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0060_0393_ZS.html
http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme_court/landmark/dredscott.html
<http://www.tax-freedom.com/ta34003.htm>
<http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history.do?action=Article&id=4813>
<http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/advisory+opinion>
<http://www.tourolaw.edu/patch/Scott/Curtis.asp>

⁵ <http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1E1-LincolnA.html>
<http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1G2-3404703891.html>
http://afroamhistory.about.com/library/bllincoln_dred_scott.htm

organizations, many of which formed even before the founding the United States, were largely composed of religious persons, particularly Quakers. Such individuals and groups rejected claims that God decreed or that the Bible sanctioned slavery, as was the opinion of many slavery advocates, especially given that slavery described in Scripture and that practiced in the New World were very different from each other. The anti-slavery movement in the United States tragically did not have the strength it ought to have had. In Britain, William Wilberforce showed that the legal system (rather than war) could be used to abolish slavery, if only that system would be utilized properly (the movie *Amazing Grace* focuses primarily on the legislative battle to accomplish that goal). But politicians in the U.S. could not muster the strength to reproduce that accomplishment.

There was little more success on the religious front. It was easy for the Church in northern states to condemn slavery, where it was already illegal. But with Christianity in the South it was a different story. According to C. C. Goen's *Broken Churches, Broken Nation*, weak politicians were not the only reason slavery lingered in the United States for so long:

The real problem was the perception on the part of the evangelicals that an antislavery church would necessarily remain a very small church. Slaveholders made it known that they would more readily "part with their church privileges rather than with their slaves." The churches persuaded themselves that their main mission was to "Christianize the nation" by multiplying converts and their phenomenal success on this score seemed to justify the priority that placed "winning souls" above freeing slaves. But the soul winning campaigns maintained their emotional momentum only by studious avoidance of all controversial issues. The churches' growth strategy depended on their not requiring converts to face the hard moral discipline demanded by Christian sensitivity to the evil of human bondage. So long as God seemed to smile on their zeal to bring in the unchurched, it was difficult to entertain any charge of fundamental wrongdoing. If slavery troubled a few sensitive spirits, its solution could still be delayed until a more convenient season.

Through their deliberate choice of expansion by evasion, the churches fatefully undermined whatever antislavery witness they might have had by consistently applying church discipline against slaveholding members. Every passing year found them entangled more inextricably with slavery, thus adding to the difficulty of dealing with the approaching conflict...The moral anomaly was becoming so malignant as to threaten the very life of the body that sustained it.

...Yet one must note that all controversial subjects were deliberately excluded from the prayer meetings- the means by which revivals spread -and that whatever "judgment" existed brought few slaveholders to the mourners' bench.

The impotence of moral suasion is quite understandable in the context of a "revival" that deliberately suppressed all discussion of controversial issues.

Thus, in the period when American society was breaking apart, the churches found themselves unable to exercise effective leadership for the sake of social health and wholeness. Confronted with the glowering problem of slavery, revivalists were interested primarily in individual conversions, reformers naively urged pietistic solutions, independent Southerners set up a cry of *laissez nous faire*, and ecclesiocrats purchased a tenuous tranquility by refusing to deal with the issue at all. The ethically sensitive urged at most a form of charity, but few called for systemic justice. That would have required fundamental changes in the institutional structure of American society, and no one could envision precisely what such changes might entail...⁶

Permitting slavery in the United States was an American self-contradiction, given the precept of individual freedom. What's worse, the culmination of Constitutional language, subsequent legislation, and the Dred Scott ruling which officially made the African slaves non-citizens, effectively also made them non-persons. Laws permitting slavery were usually based on a particular interpretation of property rights, reinforced with contortions of religious doctrine, and applied in a savage, unspeakable manner. As non-persons, slaves had no rights. The New World was born in an era of common slave trade among many countries across the globe, with the western slave trade growing out of the African

⁶ <http://www.dutyisours.com/professorC.htm>

tradition. African slaves (sold by their fellow African owners) were not considered “people.”⁷ They could be bought and sold, or killed at whim, with no legal repercussions for their abusers. Innumerable Africans were murdered with the full sanction of the law. This dark chapter in western history could be aptly called a Holocaust.

The American founders had to make certain compromises to establish a form of government, any form of government. But because slavery was allowed to fester for so long (by the Church and by the State) factions developed and cemented among the American people. Slavery is overtly inconsistent with the spirit of the U.S. Constitution, and the precepts that form its basis. Yet the legal precedent permitting it established the foundations for future conflict. Sadly, that conflict resolved nearly a century later, and with a costly war in which more than 600,000 lives were lost.

The capacity for people to rationalize what they want is mightier than the pen. Even with the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments in place in U.S. Constitution, the slave-holder mentality persisted after the Civil War and through much of the twentieth century with Jim Crow laws. From Reconstruction after the Civil War, slavery-inspired discrimination continued to contaminate state laws (which had the support of the Supreme Court again, via the Plessy v. Ferguson case of 1896, which established the “separate but equal” doctrine). Such laws and practices were created, strongly promoted and implemented by Southern Democrats, who created the Ku Klux Klan. The KKK’s presence reached even into some northern states. Lynchings, sometimes even of white Republicans, typically went unprosecuted – Tuskegee Institute records show 4,730 people were lynched between 1882 and 1951. Many of the 1,293 white victims were lynched because of their support for the black community or their opposition to discrimination. In addition to lynching, blacks were frequently disenfranchised at the voting booth, either by intimidation, being turned away from the booth, or their votes were simply thrown out. They were also forced to live as second class citizens.

It wasn’t until the Supreme Court decision *Brown v. Board of Education* of 1954 that racial discrimination was finally challenged on a national level, at least within the confines of public schools. In that case, the Court decided “separate but equal” wasn’t so equal after all. In the Civil Rights Act of 1957 the U.S. Congress officially addressed the lingering problem. The longest filibuster in the history of the American government up to that time occurred when then Democratic Senator Strom Thurmond attempted to prevent the Act (proposed to Congress by Republican President Dwight Eisenhower) from becoming law. The Act was designed to officially ban infringing upon the right to vote, often denied to black Americans.⁸

⁷ <http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1B1-378861.html>
<http://www.encyclopedia.com/beta/doc/1E1-abolitio.html>

⁸ http://www.eisenhower.utexas.edu/dl/Civil_Rights_Civil_Rights_Act/CivilRightsActfiles.html
http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/briefing/Filibuster_Clature.htm
<http://www.answers.com/topic/civil-rights-act-of-1957?cat=biz-fin>
<http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=482>
<http://www.zianet.com/web/dimterror.htm>
<http://www.yale.edu/ynhti/curriculum/units/1979/2/79.02.04.x.html>
<http://faculty.berea.edu/browners/chesnutt/classroom/lynchingstat.html>
<http://www.jimcrowhistory.org/history/overview.htm>

Though the law was passed, it unfortunately was not enough to end racism at the polls. Other Civil Rights Acts, in 1960 and 1964, were proposed to further protect voting rights. Again, with another record long filibuster, Democrats attempted to prevent anti-discrimination legislation from becoming law.⁹ These acts were passed none-the-less. But, yet again government legislation was not enough to fix the problem. A new movement grew out of the continued injustice suffered by black Americans. This Civil Rights Movement was championed by, among others, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King implemented a non-violent means of accomplishing the goal of true equality among the races, with the ultimate aim that race would no longer be a factor in American society. While activists in the movement were encouraged to remain non-violent, many sit ins, beatings, arrests, and some deaths later (such as church burnings), Dr. King's assassination on April 4, 1968 finally inspired a reluctant Congress to move forward and pass another civil rights act, which occurred a week later on April 11. This Act, also known as the Fair Housing Act, failed to gain enough support for a majority vote until Dr. King's death. Thankfully, much social progress has been made since that time.¹⁰

In contemporary American life racism is a very energetic issue, particularly in political circles. From examples of genuine racism to innumerable false accusations and the politicizing of race (often called "playing the race card" or "race hustling") American society today still feels painful remnants of slavery, with no end in sight. Possibly the greatest objective of Dr. King was that race should eventually become irrelevant in American society. Yet many of today's civil rights defenders, who fiercely condemn racism, often promote race-based preferences, particularly with government enforcement, known as Affirmative Action.¹¹ Some call it reverse racism, while others tend to think of it as an insult to minorities, as if minorities were inferior and unable to survive without the aid of government. All the while, modern rhetoric seems to minimize the tremendous progress made for civil rights. Using divisiveness and scare tactics, any disagreement with a certain political agenda is supposedly tantamount to reinstating slavery.

Dr. King did not promote wallowing in victim hood or class divisions or paranoia or dependence on government; instead he advocated an attitude of unity, forgiveness, brotherhood, and hard work. Dr. King promoted justice and equality before the law, not vengeance or special treatment. Empty political promises, race baiting, pitting groups against each other and pandering to special interests will not achieve Dr. King's dream. Neither will branding successful African Americans (such as Colin Powell or Condoleezza Rice) as "traitors to the race." Ignoring the problem or blindly following divisive leaders perpetuates racism. One may wonder if Dr. King's dream has been lost among the political rhetoric we hear today. We the people should expect and demand

⁹ <http://www.answers.com/topic/civil-rights-act-of-1964?cat=biz-fin>
<http://www.answers.com/Civil%20Rights%20Act%20of%201960>
<http://www.africanamericans.com/CivilRightsActof1960.htm>

¹⁰ <http://www.hud.gov/offices/fheo/aboutfheo/history.cfm>
<http://www.answers.com/Civil+Rights+Act+of+1968?cat=biz-fin>
http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/about_king/
<http://www.africanamericans.com/HousingRightsActof1968.htm>

¹¹ http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=30745

more of our leaders, and from ourselves. A racially colorblind society can be achieved if we are willing to work toward that end.¹²

Not long after the ratification of the U.S. Constitution, Napoleon Bonaparte began a series of wars of conquest in Europe. As one result of this war effort, the concept of “nationalism” spread from France to other European countries. This nationalist movement sparked a Pan-Germanic movement among German speaking peoples. Through the following generations of the next century this Pan-Germanism had the widespread effect of a superiority complex of sorts, showing it self particularly in racist attitudes. One respected writer, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, authored *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, published in 1899, which became one of the many references for the pan-Germanic movement of the early twentieth century. Among other things, Mr. Chamberlain’s book promoted the concept of the “Aryan race.”

National Socialist philosophy coalesced after World War I, which ended with Germany’s defeat in 1918. The Treaty of Versailles, the declaration that formally ended the war, proved immensely painful for the Germans, who began the conflict. Germany experienced an economic depression exacerbated by the hefty sanctions imposed by the Versailles treaty (though this was still far better than what Germany planned for Britain and France, had it won the war). Life for German citizens was very difficult, which made them more open to any voice that promised to help. In the increasingly anti-Semitic environment Jews were commonly blamed for Germany’s loss, with accusations of sabotaging the war effort internally. The growing, nation-wide anti-Semitism, coupled with Chamberlain’s ideas, later became fundamental in the philosophy for the National Socialist Workers Party, also known as the Nazi Party. Chamberlain even joined the Nazi Party and contributed to its publications.

A young German idealist greatly admired the ideas of Houston Chamberlain, Gustave Le Bon, Friedrich Nietzsche and others, and freely embraced the new Europe-wide post-Darwin theory of racism. He joined the German Workers’ Party in 1919, the first incarnation of the Nazi Party. He felt the central government of the Weimar Republic had essentially betrayed Germany with the loss of the war, and the subsequent loss of German prestige and power in the world. In November of 1923 this young man tried to seize control of the government in a coup, known as the Beer Hall Putsch, which failed. He was arrested and convicted of treason later that month. During roughly a year in prison he dictated his most famous work, *Mein Kampf* (translated *My Struggle/My Battle*). The two volume work is essentially an autobiographical and political treatise fomenting a vast Jewish conspiracy of sorts. In it Adolph Hitler also explained that Communism and Judaism were the world’s “twin evils” and detailed his plan for promoting and achieving the “master race.”

The Nazi Party openly embraced the idea of a “superhuman,” which in German thinking, could realistically be achieved by eliminating “undesirables” in a form of un-natural selection via eugenics and extermination, primarily of Jews (which is a sanitized way of

¹² http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/publications/speeches/address_at_march_on_washington.pdf

saying the murder of millions of people). Hitler also praised the United States for its oppression of the black population in the Jim Crow era.¹³

Hitler learned from his study of history that the tactics he would use to accomplish his goals had to be done “legally.” The Nuremberg Laws of 1935 showed striking similarity to the 1857 Dred Scott case in the United States. The first law utilized semantic games in equating any non-Aryans with “Jews” and banned marriages and extramarital intercourse between “Jews” and “Germans.” The second law denaturalized anyone considered not of German blood. This second law essentially made it impossible for anyone not truly “German” to be a citizen of Germany. Like slavery in the United States before it, this deprivation of citizenship essentially made non-Aryans non-persons, with no legal rights. In fact, those deemed not “German” enough were often forced into slave labor. Even from the early months of 1933 (when Hitler became the national leader of Germany) the Nazi Party began removing Jews from the country as the core of Hitler’s “cultural revolution.” Many were taken to concentration camps, and ethnic Jews were often taken to the death camps, where they were murdered in gas chambers dozens at a time. Nazi propaganda often justified these actions as being for the betterment of mankind, which actually meant the domination of the world by the Aryan race.

Hitler knew his control of the Nazi Party and of the German empire he wanted to forge could be prolonged indefinitely by properly controlling the populace. In 1938 the Nazis implemented gun control laws, which compelled Jews to turn over to the state any firearms (and even stabbing weapons) in their possession.¹⁴ Thus, the concern of armed Jewish rebellion was legally removed, and with little recourse for the Jews. The only other domestic obstruction in Hitler’s way was Christianity.

Many Nazi leaders subscribed to a mixture of contemporary scientific theories, as did Hitler himself, or mysticism or occultism. Christianity in Germany was in decline at the time, essentially being replaced with an attitude that challenged “traditional” western viewpoints. Nazism, which many German Christians accepted, claimed to adhere to “Positive Christianity,” an attempt to replace traditional Christian beliefs. A “National Reich Church” was created with numerous points to be imposed on the culture, such as:

- The National Reich Church claims exclusive right and control over all Churches.
- The National Church is determined to exterminate foreign Christian faiths imported into Germany....
- The National Church demands immediate cessation of the publishing and dissemination of the Bible.
- The National Church will clear away from its alters all Crucifixes, Bibles and pictures of Saints.
- On the altars there must be nothing but Mein Kampf and to the left of the altar a sword.

¹³ <http://www.answers.com/napoleon>
<http://www.answers.com/topic/pan-germanism>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adolf_Hitler
<http://www.answers.com/adolf%20hitler>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beer_Hall_Putsch
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazism>
<http://www.answers.com/topic/nazism>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mein_Kampf
http://www.eugenicsarchive.org/eugenics/topics_fs.pl?theme=41&search=&matches=

¹⁴ http://www.jpfo.org/filegen-a-m/GCA_68.htm
<http://www.jpfo.org/filegen-n-z/NaziLawEnglish.htm>

Christianity was, by some German leaders, deemed incompatible with Nazism; others said the Christian religion was fundamentally Jewish, and therefore flawed. To further encourage the acceptance of Nazism, Christianity was often labeled as something like a naïve man's faith. Thus, with the Church sufficiently pacified, there was no longer significant domestic resistance facing Hitler. He was now free to proceed with his plans publicly laid out years before in Mein Kampf.

Through numerous altercations and violations of the Versailles Treaty Germany was able to annex land and resources with little meaningful response from other nations. The moderate doctrines of appeasement and containment essentially emboldened Germany and its allies, with Germany continuously taking new territory, and Europe conceding each time. The United States adopted a position of neutrality at first, and refused to get involved. Diplomatic efforts with Germany produced the Munich Agreement and other pacts, which proved very useful for Hitler, giving false security to the Allied forces. With the encouragement these diplomatic efforts provided to the Axis powers, Hitler grew more confident in his belief that no one would stop him from taking what ever he wanted. Even the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 (which basically outlawed war among the world's major powers) failed to stop Germany from invading Poland in 1939; other European powers responded with military action, but by then the Axis powers were very well armed and posed a tremendous threat to a pacifistic Europe, and to the rest of the world. In the following years World War II claimed as many as 70 million lives.¹⁵

The Holocaust is generally defined as the genocide of six million Jews at the hands of Nazi Germany. If other persecuted groups are included in this genetic cleansing the death toll could be as high as eleven million. This was done legally. And it was not merely the Nazi Party, the political organization, who participated in this genocide. Nazi public policy became a way of life. Michael Berenbaum, a holocaust scholar, writes that Germany became a "genocidal state."

Every arm of the country's sophisticated bureaucracy was involved in the killing process. Parish churches and the Interior Ministry supplied birth records showing who was Jewish; the Post Office delivered the deportation and denaturalization orders; the Finance Ministry confiscated Jewish property; German firms fired Jewish workers and disenfranchised Jewish stockholders; the universities refused to admit Jews, denied degrees to those already studying, and fired Jewish academics; government transport offices arranged the trains for deportation to the camps; German pharmaceutical companies tested drugs on camp prisoners; companies bid for the contracts to build the ovens; detailed lists of victims were drawn up using the Dehomag company's punch card machines, producing meticulous records of the killings.¹⁶

¹⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazism_and_religion
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II
<http://www.answers.com/topic/world-war-ii>
<http://www.answers.com/topic/nazism>
<http://usa.usembassy.de/history-ww2.htm>
<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/imt/kbpact.htm>

¹⁶ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuremberg_Laws
http://www.answers.com/Nuremberg_Laws
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holocaust>
<http://www.answers.com/topic/holocaust>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazi_Germany
<http://www.berenbaumgroup.com/>

Essentially, officially denying citizenship to “undesirables” made it easy for them to be de-humanized by the rest of German culture, much like the black population was treated in the United States. Again, the murder of millions of people occurred with the full sanction of the law, with no consequences for the abusers, until they were defeated and captured by Allied forces. Of course, a growing number of people today, particularly those calling for the elimination of the state of Israel (as well as many promoting the extermination of the Jewish race), claim the Holocaust was a vast Zionist conspiracy. The massive number of photographs, film footage, personal testimonies, the Diary of Anne Frank, and other historical research, the Holocaust deniers will argue, are collectively a gigantic work of fiction. We may see in our own lifetimes what this propaganda yields. Again propaganda campaigns designed to sow doubt and distrust about an entire group of people are targeted at Jews, and in some cases Christians or even all Americans.

Nazi Germany was not the only nation to embrace eugenics, a social philosophy advocating the improvement of humanity via un-natural selection, and euthanasia, which is medically assisted death. These philosophies also became popular in the other western nations during roughly the same period, including the United States.

Thanks to Charles Darwin, racism had become “scientific” and spread throughout the western world. The idea of the “unfit” became vogue among western elitists. Margaret Sanger was a strong advocate of eugenics, particularly focusing her efforts on “negative eugenics”, or reducing the reproduction rates of those she deemed “genetically unfit,” such as those she considered of inferior mental capacity. She also criticized certain moral tenets such as charity, compassion and equality, that she thought hindered the development of civilization by aiding the “unfit” in their survival and procreation.¹⁷

In 1921 Sanger founded the American Birth Control League (first named the National Birth Control League, established by Mary Dennett in 1916). Mike Richmond’s essay *Margaret Sanger, Sterilization, and the Swastika* describes that because of the “Nazi smell” this organization needed some cosmetic changes¹⁸, thus its name was later changed to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc in 1942. With the two agendas of negative eugenics and promoting the virtues of birth control, Sanger continued several national and international campaigns promoting “race hygiene” and “social hygiene,” all in the name of women’s reproductive education and freedom (particularly where it resulted in fewer pregnancies). She gained vital funding from John D. Rockefeller’s Bureau of Social Hygiene from 1924 onwards (anonymously, at first).

Sanger's efforts were publicly targeted at legalizing birth control. Many of her written appeals to possible patrons, donors, statesmen and the public, ironically appeal to one's sense of compassion for the “disadvantaged” and for women in general, arguing lowering birth rates among such groups would help them and improve their situation in life. There

¹⁷ http://www.humanlifereview.com/1999_winter/messall_w2000.php

¹⁸ <http://www.spectacle.org/997/richmond.html>

have been many accusations that Sanger's promotion of "women's rights" and freedom were merely a façade designed to conceal her eugenic agenda.

Though Sanger's writings indicate a disapproval of the genocidal tactics employed by the Nazis (but she didn't publicly condemn them), her agenda for humanity shows striking similarities with the goals of Nazi Germany. For example, she appointed Lothrop Stoddard as a board member of the Birth Control League; referring to forced sterilizations of so-called undesirables and others, Stoddard praised Nazi eugenic methods of "weeding out the worst strains in the Germanic stock in a scientific and truly humanitarian way." In her 1932 essay "A Plan for Peace," Sanger writes of a "Population Congress" which would have several responsibilities, such as:

- a. to raise the level and increase the intelligence of the population.
- b. to increase the population slowly by keeping the birth rate at its present level of fifteen per thousand, decreasing the death rate below its present mark of 11 per thousand.
- c. to keep the doors of immigration closed to the entrance of certain aliens whose condition is known to be detrimental to the stamina of the race, such as feeble-minded, idiots, morons, insane, syphilitic, epileptic, criminal, professional prostitutes, and others in this class barred by the immigration laws of 1924.
- d. to apply a stern and rigid policy of sterilization and segregation to that grade of population whose progeny is already tainted, or whose inheritance is such that objectionable traits may be transmitted to offspring.
- e. to insure the country against future burdens of maintenance for numerous offspring as may be born of feeble-minded parents, by pensioning all persons with transmissible disease who voluntarily consent to sterilization.
- f. to give certain dysgenic groups in our population their choice of segregation or sterilization.
- g. to apportion farm lands and homesteads for these segregated persons where they would be taught to work under competent instructors for the period of their entire lives.¹⁹

BlackGenocide.org details the history of the Negro Project, one of Sanger's programs designed to "help" the black community by lowering the rate of its population growth. This program embodies Sanger's Plan for Peace with efforts to reduce the populations of those who seemed chronically poor, as though such affliction could never be changed. It seems as if the Negro Project was an experiment in negative eugenics.²⁰

In her 1938 autobiography Sanger describes a lecture to the Women's Auxiliary of the Ku Klux Klan, and that the lecture was so well received she was offered a dozen invitations to speak again. In 1930 she met with Nazi anthropologist Eugen Fischer at her home; Fischer was one of those responsible for developing the scientific justifications for Nazi racism and racial hygiene.²¹ Some questions arise: why would a WKKK group extend a dozen invitations to speak and why would a Nazi scientist wish to meet with Sanger? Do these two groups have anything in common?

Many quotations of Sanger's writing are said to be taken out of context. Sometimes this accusation is legitimate, and sometimes it is used merely to divert attention away from

¹⁹ http://www.abortionfacts.com/learn/sanger_address.asp

²⁰ <http://blackgenocide.org/negro.html>

²¹ <http://www.answers.com/topic/margaret-sanger>

statements that do and should damage her reputation. For example, in a 1939 letter to Dr. Clarence Gamble, Sanger says this:

We should hire three or four colored ministers, preferably with social-service backgrounds, and with engaging personalities. The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We don't want the 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.

One might wonder why a well read and eloquent writer and speaker, highly respected by many today, and evidently favored by the KKK and the Nazis, would use the phrase “we don't want the word to go out...” or “rebellious members” in the previous statement. It is possible Sanger was merely trying to allay concerns the black community might have about her attempt to “help” them, such as regarding the Negro Project as an extermination plot. However, it is also possible an extermination plot was precisely the purpose of the Negro Project. This brings us back to Sanger's definition of the “unfit” and the questions, does it include the black race, and why does this look so much like eugenics rather than “help” for a community? In a more lengthy selection, from her *The Pivot of Civilization* (1922) Sanger says:

Our failure to segregate morons who are increasing and multiplying ... demonstrates our foolhardy and extravagant sentimentalism ... [Philanthropists] encourage the healthier and more normal sections of the world to shoulder the burden of unthinking and indiscriminate fecundity of others; which brings with it, as I think the reader must agree, a dead weight of human waste. Instead of decreasing and aiming to eliminate the stocks that are most detrimental to the future of the race and the world, it tends to render them to a menacing degree dominant ... We are paying for, and even submitting to, the dictates of an ever-increasing, unceasingly spawning class of human beings who never should have been born at all.

Sometimes a single sentence is all that is needed to communicate a point. In the highly controversial *The Woman Rebel* Sanger speaks of the need for birth control. Her observations of poverty and hardship focus particularly on financially struggling families with several children. In this light, in the first issue of *The Woman Rebel* (Vol. 1, No. 1, 1922) Sanger writes:

The most merciful thing that a family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.²²

Eugenics was not the only method of improving the state of humanity supported by Sanger's colleagues. Many of Sanger's fellow birth control advocates promoted forced sterilization such as in Ernst Rudin's *Eugenic Sterilization: An Urgent Need*, and euthanasia and the murder of children of the “unfit,” such as in William Robinson's book *Eugenics, Marriage and Birth Control (Practical Eugenics)*. On occasion, Sanger fought for the freedom of women to make their own decisions and to control their own bodies, though in some cases she did advocate state coercion and intervention:

The undeniably feeble-minded should, indeed, not only be discouraged but prevented from propagating their kind.²³

²² <http://www.margaretsanger.blogspot.com/>
http://www.humanlifereview.com/2004_fall/eugenics.pdf

²³ <http://www.answers.com/topic/margaret-sanger>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugenics#Meanings_and_types_of_eugenics
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euthanasia>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planned_Parenthood
<http://www.spectacle.org/997/richmond.html>

Katharine O'Keefe's 1993 essay *AMERICAN EUGENICS SOCIETY* illuminates some alarming comparisons among eugenicists of the early twentieth century and the trend from then to the present. One section in O'Keefe's essay mentions some goals of the American Eugenics Society. Quoting from a 1956 Frederick Osborn lecture:

The very word eugenics is in disrepute in some quarters ... We must ask ourselves, what have we done wrong?

I think we have failed to take into account a trait which is almost universal and is very deep in human nature. People simply are not willing to accept the idea that the genetic base on which their character was formed is inferior and should not be repeated in the next generation. We have asked whole groups of people to accept this idea and we have asked individuals to accept it. They have constantly refused and we have all but killed the eugenic movement ... they won't accept the idea that they are in general second rate. We must rely on other motivation. ... it is surely possible to build a system of voluntary unconscious selection. But the reasons advanced must be generally acceptable reasons. Let's stop telling anyone that they have a generally inferior genetic quality, for they will never agree. Let's base our proposals on the desirability of having children born in homes where they will get affectionate and responsible care, and perhaps our proposals will be accepted. (from "Galton and Mid Century Eugenics" by Frederick Osborn, Galton Lecture 1956, in *Eugenics Review*, vol. 48, 1, 1956)²⁴

In 1970, attorneys Linda Coffee and Sarah Weddington filed suit in a U.S. District Court in Texas on behalf of a pregnant woman named Norma L. McCorvey. McCorvey falsely claimed her pregnancy was the result of rape.²⁵ She did not want to go through the process of birthing her child. At the time, terminating a pregnancy to preserve the convenience of the mother was generally illegal in the United States. Through a series of appeals the case eventually made its way to the U. S. Supreme Court three years later. As in the *Dred Scott* case, the Court violated its own rules in order to reach a preferred result. The majority opinion ostensibly stated on the question of when life begins:

When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy, and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer,

and yet that is precisely what the Court proceeded to do. In establishing the term "potential life" the Court contradicts its professed reluctance to speculate, and ruled where it was admittedly unqualified. The Court also issued an advisory opinion in creating the trimester system in which it deemed what was legal and what was not – explicitly usurping the constitutional powers reserved to the legislature.²⁶

In the landmark 1973 decision *Roe v. Wade*, the Court did not base its ruling on the concept of citizenship; instead it overtly denied "personhood" to the unborn, because if the fetus were defined as a person under the Fourteenth Amendment it would therefore have a right to life. Thus, the Court placed abortion in the realm of privacy, and determined it to be a woman's Constitutional right.²⁷ Again, as in the *Dred Scott* case, the Supreme Court made a blatantly unconstitutional ruling to suit the desires of a handful of Justices, and that ruling is to this day erroneous law.

²⁴ <http://www.all.org/abac/contents.txt>

²⁵ http://www.forerunner.com/forerunner/X0474_Roe_v_Wade.html

²⁶ <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=CASE&court=US&vol=410&page=113>

²⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roe_v._Wade

Since 1973, Planned Parenthood has become the largest provider of abortions in the U.S. On its website you can find calls to take action on numerous issues, such as lobbying Congress; opposing abstinence only education programs; it labels any disagreement with its agenda as “anti-choice;” it brands killing pre-born children as a matter of “women’s health” and more. At a rate of 300,000 abortions a year (just in the United States), Planned Parenthood almost seems more interested in birth and population control than in women’s health or reproductive rights.²⁸

In numerous news stories you can find that Planned Parenthood opposes parental notification laws for providing abortions to minors, it solicits millions in tax payer funds for its business, and drives the bulk of its American political support to the Democratic Party. Some news stories reveal such a strong paranoia about alleged threats to Roe v. Wade that pro-abortion groups even oppose laws prohibiting forced abortions or laws defining a child that survived an attempted abortion as a “person.” You may have even heard the abortion industry promote the idea that killing the child could even be what is “best” for it, under certain circumstances, such as when its parents are financially poor.²⁹

There have been many accusations that Planned Parenthood continues in the alleged racist tradition of its founder. Organizations such as L.E.A.R.N., National Black Pro-Life Union, and many others have researched these allegations and made their findings publicly available. World Net Daily published a news story in February 2008 detailing an undercover investigation in the allegations of illegal activity in American Planned Parenthood clinics. According to the story, this activity included covering up an instance of statutory rape (so as to proceed with performing an abortion) and gladly embracing donations accompanied by explicitly racist requests. Blackgenocide.org claims 78% of Planned Parenthood clinics are located in minority communities, and “Blacks make up 12% of the population, but 35% of the abortions in America.” Dr. Alveda King, niece of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., actively endeavors to educate the black community on this disproportionately high rate of abortions.³⁰

²⁸ http://www.townhall.com/columnists/StarParker/2008/06/30/planned_parenthood_and_the_marketing_of_meaninglessness?page=2

²⁹ <http://www.lifenews.com/state2974.html>
http://www.townhall.com/columnists/TerenceJeffrey/2008/01/16/more_on_obama_and_babies_born_alive
<http://www.lifenews.com/nat3339.html>
<http://www.newmediajournal.us/staff/huston/09062007.htm>

³⁰ <http://www.blackgenocide.org/planned.html>
<http://www.speroforum.com/site/article.asp?id=8265>
<http://www.worldnetdaily.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=57526>
<http://www.worldnetdaily.com/?pageId=62426>
<http://www.abortionfacts.com/learn/learn.asp>
<http://www.plannedparenthoodmd.org/index.cfm?gid=5&id=273>
<http://www.plannedparenthood.org/issues-action/take-political-action/advocacy-campaigns.htm>
http://www.citizenreviewonline.org/special_issues/population/the_negro_project.htm
<http://www.lifenews.com/state2436.html>
<http://www.nationalblackprolifeunion.com/>

The Rev. John J. Raphael, SSJ, has a scathing piece on the effects of abortion on the black community. In it Rev. Raphael mentions statistics from the CDC showing abortion to be the leading cause of death among African Americans. Among many other items, Rev. Raphael also includes a lengthy quote from a 1977 essay published in *Right to Life News*, written by the Rev. Jesse Jackson:

The question of "life" is *The Question* of the 20th century. Race and poverty are dimensions of the life question, but discussions about abortion have brought the issue into focus in a much sharper way. How we will respect and understand the nature of life itself is the over-riding moral issue, not of the Black race, but of the human race.

The question of abortion confronts me in several different ways. First, although I do not profess to be a biologist, I have studied biology and know something about life from the point of view of the natural sciences. Second, I am a minister of the Gospel and therefore, feel that abortion has a religious and moral dimension that I must consider.

Third, I was born out of wedlock (and against the advice that my mother received from her doctor) and therefore abortion is a personal issue for me. From my perspective, human life is the highest good, the *summum bonum*. Human life itself is the highest human good and God is the supreme good because He is the giver of life. That is my philosophy. Everything I do proceeds from that religious and philosophical premise.

Another area that concerns me greatly, namely because I know how it has been used with regard to race, is the psycholinguistics involved in this whole issue of abortion. If something can be dehumanized through the rhetoric used to describe it, then the major battle has been won.... That is why the Constitution called us three-fifths human and then whites further dehumanized us by calling us "niggers." It was part of the dehumanizing process. The first step was to distort the image of us as human beings in order to justify that which they wanted to do and not even feel like they had done anything wrong. Those advocates of taking life prior to birth do not call it killing or murder; they call it abortion. They further never talk about aborting a baby because that would imply something human. Rather they talk about aborting the fetus. Fetus sounds less than human and therefore can be justified.³¹

One would hardly expect the Rev. Jackson so say such things today. What is particularly astonishing is when public statements unintentionally reveal a controversial worldview. For example, in a political speech running for the 2008 Democratic Presidential nomination, Senator Barack Obama made a careless statement that having a baby was a form of punishment for making a certain mistake.³² Sadly, the view that a baby is a form of punishment is consistent with rhetoric used to justify a eugenic worldview, such as Margaret Sanger's birth control movement, and Planned Parenthood's abortion movement: that a child is an undue burden. Such attitudes are examples of what the pro-life movement calls a "devaluing of human life." Ironically, these attitudes are often branded "compassion." "Pro-choice" supporters typically market abortion as being about "women's rights," and consider it a political issue. Abortion opponents typically argue it is about killing unborn children, and consider it not political, but a moral issue.

Another ploy used to justify abortion is the claim "women will do it anyway" and so the government should be involved, to make abortion legal and safe. Sadly, many deaths have occurred because of botched legal abortions. One particular news story shows Planned Parenthood got itself in trouble for causing the death of one of its customers, and delayed reporting it. In fact, so many deaths have occurred from legal abortions that the names of these victims have been collected in what is called the Blackmun Wall, named after Supreme Court justice Harry Blackmun who wrote the *Roe v. Wade* decision. The Blackmun Wall lists hundreds of women who died from legal abortions. The abortion

³¹ http://www.nbccongress.org/features/abortion_silent_no_more_01.asp
http://www.nbccongress.org/features/abortion_silent_no_more_12.asp

³² <http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/new.php?n=12231>

drug RU-486 is also responsible for the deaths of some mothers. Thanks to the Clinton Administration, the Food and Drug Administration rushed RU-486 through the approval process, apparently neglecting the safety guards put in place to protect the American public from dangerous consumable products.³³

Norma McCorvey, the plaintiff “Jane Roe” in the 1973 case, released the book *I Am Roe* in 1994, which explained her story behind *Roe v. Wade*. That year she was met by Flip Benham, who worked with Operation Rescue, an anti-abortion organization which established an office next door to the abortion clinic where McCorvey worked. The staff eventually formed a relationship with McCorvey, and she later converted to Christianity. In 1997 McCorvey announced she had become an advocate of the Pro-life movement, with the ultimate goal of overturning *Roe v. Wade*. In her book, *Won By Love*, McCorvey writes:

"I was sitting in O.R.'s offices when I noticed a fetal development poster. The progression was so obvious, the eyes were so sweet. It hurt my heart, just looking at them. I ran outside and finally, it dawned on me. "Norma," I said to myself, "They're right." I had worked with pregnant women for years. I had been through three pregnancies and deliveries myself. I should have known. Yet something in that poster made me lose my breath. I kept seeing the picture of that tiny, 10-week-old embryo, and I said to myself, that's a baby! It's as if blinders just fell off my eyes and I suddenly understood the truth--that's a baby!"

I felt crushed under the truth of this realization. I had to face up to the awful reality. Abortion wasn't about "products of conception." It wasn't about "missed periods." It was about children being killed in their mother's wombs. All those years I was wrong. Signing that affidavit, I was wrong. Working in an abortion clinic, I was wrong. No more of this first trimester, second trimester, third trimester stuff. Abortion—at any point—was wrong. It was so clear. Painfully clear."³⁴

There is remarkable similarity between pro-slavery propaganda prior to the Civil War and pro-abortion propaganda of today. Abortion rhetoric commonly accuses opponents of being divisive or extremist, and refusing to accept a Supreme Court decision as the law of the land. Millions of people have been killed with the full sanction of the law, under the guise of someone else's “rights.” There are also some notable differences between the two issues. Today, judges nominated to high courts meet with fierce opposition if they show any hint of disagreement with *Roe v. Wade*, almost as a sort of litmus test. The Hippocratic Oath has been edited to allow for abortions, which previously made abortion, assisted suicide, and sexual relations with medical patients explicitly forbidden. And today the political establishment in the nation's capital (both Democrats and Republicans) seems to agree more than disagree on the issue, siding with the so-called “abortion rights” agenda.³⁵

³³ <http://www.lifenews.com/state2372.html>
http://www.lifedynamics.com/Pro-life_Group/Pro-choice_Women/
http://www.lifedynamics.com/Pro-life_Group/Botched_Abortion/
<http://www.lifeissues.org/ru486/deaths.htm>
<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,188248,00.html>
<http://www.ru486.org/>
<http://www.judicialwatch.org/abortionpill.shtml>
<http://www.lifeissues.org/ru486/approval.htm>

³⁴ <http://www.leaderu.com/common/roev.html>
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1689/1689-h/1689-h.htm>
<http://www.margaretsanger.blogspot.com/>

³⁵ http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/doctors/oath_classical.html
http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/doctors/oath_modern.html

Denying person-hood to the pre-born has denied them all human rights. Since the 1973 decision more than 40 million abortions have been performed in the United States alone.³⁶ American slavery, the Jewish Holocaust, and abortion share a common principle: the victimized groups are treated as non-human, as non-persons, and therefore have no legal rights. American slavery used the argument of property rights. Germany justified its mass murder as the improvement of human kind. Today nations around the world claim abortion is about women's reproductive rights and health. All three episodes in western history have resulted in the legal killing of millions of the particular disenfranchised group. And all three episodes could rightfully be called Holocausts. One might even call a nation which permits convenience-based abortion, and even funds it with government money, a "genocidal state."

Western Civilization may at some point treat abortion with the same contempt and shame it treats slavery and the Nazi holocaust, but this is indeed a lofty goal. Accomplishing this end will undoubtedly require relentless attention. Politics and government are not the answer to all of life's problems; none-the-less this moral battle must be fought in the political arena, since it is that arena which made abortion-on-demand a legal reality. Political movements gain strength from grassroots effort. As long as so-called "pro-choice" politicians and other public servants occupy public offices and bureaucratic positions, changing the legal standing of abortion will remain a very difficult and near-impossible task. Pro-life individuals are desperately needed in political office, yet public apathy toward politics only delays any change on this front.

In this Constitutional Republic "we the people" have a voice and the government supposedly requires our consent; therefore we share responsibility in the actions of our government. Politicians are likely to do what ever will get them reelected; ironically, this works best when they are essentially ignored by their constituents.³⁷ Many elected officials successfully paint themselves as something they are not (for example, some pro-abortion Republicans pretend to be pro-life during an election year) and voters are often left with the belief they have no alternatives. It is a dangerous environment when the governed expect those with power over them to be unethical, and effectively condone their actions by reelecting the same people. Another fallacy is the belief that politicians do not affect one's home (ask a Jew about that, particularly one who was alive in the 1930s). If the people will pay closer attention to the political process they can apply greater pressure to their elected officials, and encourage them to make wise decisions. With enough cultural momentum built by an informed and engaged public, the political establishment can be forced to acknowledge the wrong that is convenience-based abortion and change the legal landscape that makes it possible, much like the Civil Rights movement before. Few issues can garner such public support to change an entire culture; legally killing babies should be one of them.

Relying exclusively on the good will of politicians to change the legal status of abortion is inadequate, at best. It seems most politicians go to Washington for career, not to serve.

³⁶ http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss5609a1.htm?s_cid=ss5609a1_e

³⁷ http://www.townhall.com/columnists/MichelleMalkin/2008/06/04/planned_parenthoods_obscene_profits

History has a way of repeating itself. Like slavery before it, abortion is permitted to fester and contaminate American life because too few government officials are willing to act against it, while many others are more than willing to act for it. The strife over slavery was stoked by an illegitimate Supreme Court ruling, as has also happened with abortion. People have passionately taken sides on the issue, one saying abortion is immoral, and the other saying it is a constitutional right, just as happened with slavery. If historical patterns continue, the battle over abortion may tragically end in a way similar to the battles over slavery or Nazism, but this does not have to happen. The Rev. King gave us an example of how to accomplish noble goals without resorting to war, though his method was also quite costly for those in the battle. Peaceful protests can affect politicians, as Dr. King showed us. Phone calls and personal letters (rather than emails) can also have a great impact on elected officials.

If abortion opponents continue to speak out and praise good alternatives more women can learn that adoption and parenthood are good choices. Unless abortion rhetoric is challenged and made to defend itself, the concept of compassion will continue to mean an act which results in the death of a child. One may wonder why so many women's rights groups are far more supportive of abortion than adoption.³⁸ Such groups have a strong lobbying presence in the U.S. Congress, and therefore significant influence. To compete with such influence, we the people must organize and focus the pro-life message.

The public must get involved. STOPP International, another anti-abortion group, showed one example of how local communities can significantly impact a large-scale social battle. When ordinary people decided to do something together, Planned Parenthood encountered a challenge it never expected, and its goal of establishing 2000 facilities in the United States by the year 2000 failed.³⁹ Currently, there are fewer than 1000 PP clinics in the U.S. Building the necessary grassroots movement to support the political fight against abortion-on-demand is a daunting task, but it can be accomplished by two primary approaches: cursing the darkness and praising the light. Both are necessary.

Abortion propaganda must be challenged. Accepting the premises and talking points of "abortion rights" allows the abortion industry to establish the battle field and define the permitted language. Contrary to popular propaganda, it is a perfectly valid position to believe killing babies is a moral issue, not a political one. There is nothing inaccurate, illegal or wrong with believing abortion is about killing babies, rather than women's rights. Believing a pre-born baby is a person is not equivalent to repealing a woman's right to vote or the right to use birth control. Opposing abortion is not the same as opposing a right to privacy. Abortion propaganda often touts compassion for the pregnant woman, but none for the unborn child, except in a context of "sparing" it a life in poverty or deformity. Also, this compassion for the mother suggests bringing the pregnancy to term will somehow trap her in raising the child, as though giving up the child for adoption were not possible. We are told it is only "religious dogma" that compels anyone

³⁸ http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=30522
<http://www.citizenlink.org/CLNews/A000004840.cfm>

³⁹ <http://www.all.org/stopp/plan.htm>

to argue the fetus is a human being; this is precisely the argument one should expect from a person who desires sexual anarchy with no social stigma attached to their choices.

Chris Floyd, in his June 2008 article *Sex Crime: A New 'Surge' in the War Against Women*, feels confident in branding the pro-life movement as a lie, whose true agenda allegedly is about controlling women. Floyd portrays all anti-abortion groups as being opposed to contraception, thus favoring policies that would actually increase abortions and endanger women's health (it is true that Catholic pro-life groups often oppose contraception, but many Protestants have a different opinion on that issue). Floyd continues his piece quoting rants that label Christians as extremists and compare them to Islamist extremists in a supposed "war against women."⁴⁰ Of course, nowhere in Floyd's article does he mention the taking of a life in abortion, unless it is the tragic loss of the mother's life; instead the article is about freedom and control of women's fertility, as if those were the only relevant issues at hand.

In main stream news stories a pro-abortion bias can often be found; abortion is typically portrayed as a civil rights issue, and there is often the suggestion that those who oppose it are a fringe group who may also oppose all other progress made in the name of women's rights. The Democratic Party treats "abortion rights" as a major component for its political and social agendas, despite a large pro-life segment of its grassroots members.

In its essence, abortion rhetoric is about the convenience of the people responsible for a "potential" child's life, insisting it is something analogous to a natural right that sex can exclude the possibility of procreation (a "right" invented only in the Twentieth century). The pro-life movement does not have to allow the argument to be defined by those who promote killing babies as a constitutional or natural right. Having to explain why children in the womb are people is as ridiculous as having to explain why black people are people; no explanation should be necessary, though at one time it was.

If "we the people" are truly entitled to our opinions, that right should extend to abortion opponents (as well as those unable to voice their opinions). The United States of America provides legal and ethical means of fighting cultural battles. Physically attacking abortion clinics is rightly illegal, and should be condemned. Such acts also make it far more difficult to make long term gains in this battle, and feed pro-abortion hysteria and encourage government officials to infringe upon the First Amendment rights of the pro-life movement. There is a legal process for fighting the abortion battle, if only we would use it appropriately. However, this process can be abused, as when the IRS is used to threaten and intimidate churches who voice their opposition to killing unborn babies. Spirit One Christian Center in Wichita, Kansas is one such church. That congregation and its pastor vocally oppose abortion on moral grounds, but abortion supporters have labeled the church's activities as "political action", which would be a violation of 501c3 rules if they were right. Many examples of religious discrimination against the pastor of SOCC can be found on their website.⁴¹

⁴⁰ <http://www.baltimorechronicle.com/2008/061008Floyd.shtml>

⁴¹ <http://www.christiannewswire.com/news/845823902.html>
<http://www.spiritonecc.org/subpages/currentevents.html>

Hopefully, in this battle for unborn children the pro-life movement will prefer a method of praising the light. While challenging abortion rhetoric is essential, reducing demand for abortions will also prove a key factor. What ever is leading women to believe abortion is their best choice is our main enemy in this fight. For some girls/women, killing the child is seen as a better option than letting anyone know she is pregnant. For others, pressure from family or friends may be the cause. Others have bought into the notion that abortion “empowers” women, or the lie that there are no negative consequences from it.⁴²

Adoption is widely considered a better alternative to killing a child, and this option could prove the most significant dynamic in overturning Roe v. Wade. Pro-life advocates, already strongly favoring adoption and even offering their own homes to this endeavor, can make immeasurable progress on this front. If you are considering adopting a child (as many are and have) you can help pregnant women considering abortion. A kind word offering your home to the woman’s unborn child can make the difference between life and death. This is already happening, but much more is needed.

Many abortion opponents are told they have no authority to speak on the matter (as if free speech no longer applies). The unborn deserve to have their rights protected just as much as women, or the poor, or any disenfranchised group, by anyone willing to help. There is a group of people with personal experience who can join the fight but fear revealing themselves: post-abortive women. Many women who have had abortions can explain to the world that it is not the glorious answer to a woman’s problems we are lead to believe it is. Norma McCorvey is now a champion for the pro-life movement. Likewise, a post-abortive woman can help in this fight like few others can. From the testimonies of these women we can see there are many who wish to help.⁴³ One major obstacle preventing many of them from using their pain for ministry is the fear of being condemned or ostracized. These women know better than most of us the peccant nature of abortion. They need encouragement, and better yet, invitations to speak publicly. Likewise, medical doctors who at one time performed abortions can help. Practicing in Colorado, Dr. MacArthur Hill no longer performs abortions, but instead helps other abortion providers realize and admit to themselves what they are actually doing when performing such procedures. His efforts also stem from personal experience and carry moral authority like few other groups.⁴⁴

When slavery was banned in the United States, involuntary servitude was not completely banned with it – convicted criminals could still be held against their will by the state. Likewise, no person in the jurisdiction of the United States has complete autonomy over their own body; for example, one cannot legally smoke a tobacco product in certain public areas, or consume certain illegal substances, or legally consume alcohol prior to a certain age, or legally drive a car without wearing the seatbelt, or engage in prostitution

⁴² <http://www.wf-f.org/03-1-Abortion.html>

⁴³ <http://www.afterabortion.org/>
<http://www.lifenews.com/int649.html>

⁴⁴ <http://www.proliferaction.org/providers/hill.htm>
<http://www.physiciansforlife.org/content/view/691/26/>

(thus far), or engage in sex with a minor (thus far – keep an eye on these latter two issues). It seems hypocritical to defend the right of women to control their own bodies as if that right were unlimited, yet deny that same right to a child in the womb. There is also something odd about the energy and organized public outcry devoted to the poor or the environment or AIDS, yet far less for the unborn.

There are some instances in which a problematic pregnancy could result in the death of both the child and mother. Few nations in the world have medical care even close to the caliber that Americans have developed. For this reason, and the unlikelihood that a complete ban on all pregnancy terminations would ever be a legal reality, it is suggested by this writer that *Roe v. Wade* be overturned, and that pre 1973 state abortion laws be reinstated, which typically permitted abortions if the mother's life were in danger, among other concerns. Leading by example, the United States can show the world that valuing innocent human life is a virtue, and that destroying it for the sake of convenience is not. Ultimately, this may be accomplished by passing a Human Life Amendment to the constitution (already unsuccessfully tried several times in Congress), declaring the pre-born child to be legally a person, entitled to all rights and privileges guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. If Islamic terrorists captured on the battlefield are entitled to the protections of our constitution, why shouldn't the unborn be entitled to them as well?⁴⁵

Another question might be asked about abortion: does it matter if it is legal? Advocates of abortion certainly think so. This seemingly innocuous question may not sound so unassuming in a different context. For example, does it matter if slavery is legal? Does it matter if rape is legal? Does it matter if murder is not a crime? What does it say about a culture (and the state of morality or religion in that culture) which condones and even praises such things? There were many voices in America who praised slavery despite its egregious nature. The same is happening today with abortion.

In 1994, Mother Teresa of Calcutta said:

But I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself.

And if we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another? How do we persuade a woman not to have an abortion? As always, we must persuade her with love and we remind ourselves that love means to be willing to give until it hurts. Jesus gave even His life to love us. So, the mother who is thinking of abortion, should be helped to love, that is, to give until it hurts her plans, or her free time, to respect the life of her child. The father of that child, whoever he is, must also give until it hurts.

By abortion, the mother does not learn to love, but kills even her own child to solve her problems.

And, by abortion, the father is told that he does not have to take any responsibility at all for the child he has brought into the world. That father is likely to put other women into the same trouble. So abortion just leads to more abortion.

Any country that accepts abortion is not teaching its people to love, but to use any violence to get what they want. This is why the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion.⁴⁶

This battle **is** about killing pre-born children. The goal should be to end elective abortion and the demand for it, not to punish those who practice or promote it. Vengeance is not

⁴⁵http://www.townhall.com/columnists/HughHewitt/2008/06/12/the_united_states_supreme_court_versus_america_awarding_the_privilege_of_habeas_corpus_to_terrorists

⁴⁶<http://www.priestsforlife.org/brochures/mtspeech.html>

ours to take. Praying for the situation to change is all too often used as an excuse to do nothing else; action is desperately needed as well. The anti-abortion movement should use any legitimate help it can get (including prayer). We can devote individual efforts to any number of the suggestions made here. Other ideas may come up if people talk about it. If we all do something our collective efforts can achieve a profound victory for the pre-born. The moral stain of elective abortion matches and may even surpass the travesty that was slavery. May God have mercy on us for letting it go this far.