Who are the real nativists, bigots, and racists? You can start with Planned Parenthood, where black and brown babies die in far greater proportion than any others. A longtime member of Planned Parenthood’s national board once explained her particular passion — sterilizing Mexican women before they got across the border into the United States.

Some 30 years ago, Mrs. Alice du Pont Mills invited me to visit her in her expansive Virginia horse farm – several thousand acres of it – about an hour west of Washington.

At the time, I was Staff Director for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee’s Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, and Mrs. Mills told me that she was very concerned about the situation in Central America, where communist-inspired revolutionaries were creating chaos in several countries at the time.

Mrs. Mills was also an avid horsewoman. Since I had grown up around horses myself, I was glad to take the drive out into horse country. It quickly became clear that Mrs. Mills was not so interested in the warring factions of Guatemala, Nicaragua, and El Salvador thousands of miles away; no, she had other fish to fry.

Mrs. Mills was worried. After the Vietnam war, 10% of the Vietnamese population had become “boat people,” fleeing from communism and truly risking their lives – in fact, thousands of them died trying to escape.

But they had to leave by boat. There’s no ocean between the US and Mexico – just the Rio Grande river.

Well, back then, some 100 million people lived between the Rio Grande and the Panama
Canal.

And Mrs. Mills was dead set on preventing 10% of them from coming to the United States. In fact, because there was no risk of dying at sea, she was concerned that the percentage might be significantly higher.

I didn’t know it until later, but Mrs. Mills was a longtime member of the National Board of Planned Parenthood. She was a generous supporter and even worked with local Planned Parenthood groups in Virginia.

That explains why she revealed to me a surprising fact that rather startled me thirty years ago: Mrs. Mills was also active in Mexico.

Aware that it was illegal to sterilize immigrants once they were in the United States, she told me that she contributed heavily to sterilization clinics that were on the Mexican side of the US – Mexico border.

There, the poor Hispanic women coming towards the United States could be coaxed – often with money – to be conveniently mutilated without any untidy legal consequences. Sure, they could continue on into the States, but they couldn’t reproduce. Thus, a great danger was prevented.

Mrs. Mills said this so matter-of-factly that she assumed that any American in his right mind would feel the same way.

As I took my leave, she generously showed me some beautiful paintings which, I remarked, I thought I had actually seen before.

No, she explained, I had seen reproductions – everywhere. They were actually the gorgeous originals that her son-in-law, Jamie Wyeth, had painted. They were in a hallway, not well-lit museum-style, and there were several of them.

I knew that I was in the midst of old money. When we got to the door, I glanced off towards the barns beyond the pasture, turned down an invitation to visit the barns, and made my exit as cordially as I could.

Mrs. Mills died in 2002 ago at a ripe old age of 89. She was a generation younger than Margaret Sanger, to be sure – but Sanger lived until 1966, when Mrs. Mills was 54. If Mrs. Mills didn’t know Sanger personally, she undoubtedly knew that Planned Parenthood’s notorious foundress was a rabid racist and a grimly dedicated eugenicist.
Mrs. Mills was almost the personification of the highbrow super-rich Eastern secular elite (for the record, however, her obituary did state that she was an Episcopalian). She personified the searing-hot brand that PJ O’Rourke had burned into the rump of the Population Controllers: “there’s just enough of me, and way too many of you.”

Margaret Sanger’s eugenics crusade targeted brown and black people everywhere - including Italians and Greeks and Spaniards, apparently.

Yes, she was the classic nativist.

And this might go far to explain the immigration policy of America’s Catholic bishops, led by Los Angeles Archbishop Jose Gomez.

On reflection, this must be how bishops today view every opponent of amnesty for illegal aliens. They think that those who disagree with them are all Margaret Sanger’s. At least they talk like it - and so do their fellow bishops in Mexico.

After all, Archbishop Gomez was born in Monterrey, Mexico. He is a legal immigrant who became an American citizen the old-fashioned way - he followed the law.

Undoubtedly, the good archbishop is aware of those horrific programs advocated by Sanger, DuPont Mills, and company. Not only that, he attributes America’s 54 million abortions and counting to American individualism and our legal traditions, not to carnal lust or racial hatred.

Yes, there are Margaret Sangers and Alice DuPont Mills among us today, and they are still murdering the innocent and bragging about it. Fortunately, they are few in number, although they are culturally and politically powerful. We should pray that our bishops recognize the difference, if you will, between us and them - and direct their fire at the real racists who run the abortion lobby.

And here arises a contradiction that is hard to fathom for the average layman. While bishops assail critics of unlimited illegal immigration as xenophobes, bigots, and nativists, they will do nothing to stop the work of their largest worldwide partner, the eugenicist US Government monolith called the Agency for International Development, known as A.I.D.

Many bishops have called on Congress to stop funding Planned Parenthood with taxpayer funding. Why can’t the bishops call on Congress to defund AID, a defiant and brazen ally of Planned Parenthood?

The answer is simple. The bishops receive no funding from Planned Parenthood, but they
receive hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars a year from AID for their “charitable work.” This cannot stand.

The is the PRI Review from Pop.org. When we come back, we’ll examine whether permissive abortion laws reduce maternal deaths.

**Station Break**

The Population Research Institute is committed to ending human rights abuses committed in the name of "family planning" all of them.

Some fifteen years ago, PRI reported that the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), in its association with the National Population Council of Mexico (CONAPO), was supporting involuntary sterilization and coercive family planning in Mexico.

Yes, it’s been going on for a long time.

According to Mexico’s National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), which strongly denounced coercion in family planning programs throughout Mexico, "Public health servants have imposed methods of family planning on the native population without their consent and without informing them of the risks."

Threats and bribes are used to deprive men and women of their right to determine for themselves the timing and spacing of pregnancies, the commission reported.

It has also been found that CONAPO has established national quotas (for family planning users) which are fulfilled by regional hospitals and by teams of local family planning workers.

CONAPO's coercive family planning program, which involves forced sterilization, is heavily supported by UNFPA with financial, strategic, technical and medical support.

Unfortunately, President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made population control - including universal and free abortion - their number one foreign policy goal.

During the Bush Administration, the State Department denounced UNFPA for helping China to more effectively carry out its program of forced abortion. But not this administration.

According to Steven Mosher, president of PRI. "UNFPA supports forced abortion in China and other totalitarian nations. But free countries like Mexico have no business running coercive population control programs aimed at Mexico's most vulnerable citizens."
Do Permissive Abortion Laws Reduce Maternal Deaths? The answer is no, according to PRI researchers Carlos Polo and Moriah Bruno.

We at PRI have long argued that legalizing abortion does not reduce the number of women dying in childbirth. Now, out of Mexico, comes proof.

A recent study published in the British Medical Journal has found that laws that restrict or prevent abortion do not lead to higher maternal mortality rates. In fact, the study, based on recent data from Mexico, showed precisely the opposite: higher maternal mortality rates were seen in Mexican states that had relaxed their abortion laws, while lower maternal mortality rates were seen in states where laws restricting abortion were in place. These findings refute the contention of the abortion movement that the legalization of abortion will reduce maternal deaths by preventing complications from unsafe, illegal abortions.

The study is the first ever to analyze the impact of abortion legislation on maternal mortality rates using population data from a country—Mexico—that is carrying out a “natural experiment.” Mexico’s 32 states (including the Federal District) have abortion laws in place of widely varying severity or laxity. The study used the complete vital statistics of live births and maternal deaths from all of Mexico’s states for the period from 2002—2011, and controlled for 10 variables considered to be primary determinants of maternal health, such as literacy rates and access to clear water. The study conducted by a distinguished team of researchers led by Dr. Elard Koch, Director of the MELISA Institute, in close collaboration with Dr. Monique Chireau, epidemiologist at the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at Duke University, Dr. Fernando Pliego, sociologist at the Institute for Social Research at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, and several others.

The study divided the 32 Mexican states into two groups: states with lax abortion laws and states with strict abortion laws. The Mexican federal district (Mexico City and environs) permits abortion up to the 12th week of pregnancy. However, some states allow abortion after 12 weeks for specific cases. Abortion beyond the 12th week in the case of rape is legal in all 32 states. In 29 states, women are exempt from criminal prosecution in the case of “imprudent” conduct, such as alcoholism or drug addiction. In 25 states they are exempt when the mother’s life is at risk, while in 14 states they are exempt in the case of genetic or congenital malformation. The study used the 14 states in which abortion was permitted
beyond the 12th week for genetic or congenital malformation to represent states with more permissive abortion laws, and compared them to the remaining 18 states.

The study found that differences in maternal deaths were not explained by abortion legislation, but by other factors such as literacy rates among women, maternal health care, access to clean water, proper sanitation facilities, fertility rates, and the level of violence against women. Loosening abortion restrictions did not produce a drop in maternal mortality rates.

The study suggests that developing countries do not need to relax abortion laws in order to reduce maternal mortality rates. Rather, they should focus on:

● Increasing access to prenatal care and professional delivery care in maternal health care facilities

● Increasing the number of and access to emergency obstetric units

● Expanding specialized diagnostic centers and prenatal care for high-risk pregnancies

● Developing pre-conception counseling and family planning to promote healthy pregnancies before age 35, and to prevent unintended pregnancies in vulnerable groups

● Expanding and strengthening public policies aimed at increasing the level of education among women

● Improving the detection of violence against pregnant women during prenatal care and by providing intervention in domestic violence cases

● Increasing access to clean drinking water and proper sanitation

Planned Parenthood and the National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL, now NARAL Pro-Choice America) have long claimed that legalizing abortion reduces the number of women dying in childbirth.

Just one more lie from the blood-sucking abortion lobby.

This is the PRI Review from pop.org. We’ll be right back to catch up on other news about life and the family.

Station Break
Founded in 1989, the Population Research Institute is a non-profit research and educational organization dedicated to objectively presenting the truth about population-related issues, and to reversing the trends brought about by the myth of overpopulation. Our growing, global network of pro-life groups spans over 30 countries.

Our mission statement describes our goals.

Debunk the myth of overpopulation, which cheapens human life and paves the way for abusive population control programs

Expose the relentless promotion of abortion, abortifacient contraception, and chemical and surgical sterilization in misleadingly labeled “population stabilization,” “family planning,” and “reproductive health” programs.

Defund these programs by exposing the coercion, deception, and racism inherent in them.

Emphasize that people are the most valuable resource on the planet, the one resource we cannot do without.

Promote pro-natal and pro-family attitudes, laws, and policies worldwide.

Encourage programs to help the poor become agents of their own development.

And silently help those living under oppressive regimes to preserve life, love, faith, and family in spite of official hostility and government persecution.

PRI welcomes your spiritual support, and we need your financial support. Just go to our website, pop.org, and click the “Donate” button to contribute easily and securely. And be sure to look at the thoughtful gifts that we offer our donors in gratitude for their much-needed support.

Segment Three

Planned Parenthood has made “two key admissions” about its fetal tissue program, according to the Center for Medical Progress, the organization behind a series of undercover videos depicting Planned Parenthood executives discussing the sale of fetal organs.

The group has sent an open letter to Congress in response to a Planned Parenthood-commissioned report claiming the undercover videos released by the organization did not accurately portray conversations with their executives about the sale of fetal organs.
“While denying any wrongdoing, Planned Parenthood leadership has admitted to Congress and to the public their knowledge and support of the fetal tissue supply programs in operation at multiple Planned Parenthood affiliates,” the Center for Medical Progress’ David Daleiden, who led the project, wrote in the letter.

There are two key admissions in Planned Parenthood CEO Cecile Richards’ letter to Congress of August 27 that the investigating Committees should focus on particularly. First, Richards admits that multiple Planned Parenthood affiliates have recently received payments of $45 to $60 ‘per tissue specimen’ from various Tissue Procurement Organizations (TPOs). Second, Richard admits that abortion procedure ‘adjustments to facilitate fetal tissue donations’ may occur at Planned Parenthood facilities. We believe these two admissions, of payments for specimens of fetal tissue and changes to abortion procedures in order to get better specimens, constitute prima facie evidence of the three points CMP has raised all along: 1) That Planned Parenthood sells aborted fetal tissue, 2) That Planned Parenthood changes the abortion procedure in order to get saleable tissue, and 3) That there is knowledge and approval of these practices from the top of the organization on down.

Well, are pro-abortion members of congress interested in the truth? Apparently not.

When the Susan B. Anthony List invited Democrat staffers to see the Planned Parenthood videos themselves, only a handful, out of over a thousand, attended. The word had obviously come down from on high: Harry Reid and Nancy Pelosi did not want any seal of approval given to the videos at all. Moreover, they did not want their staffers, a large number of whom are women of childbearing age, to see pictures of the results of abortion, for fear that they might realize their pro-abortion bosses are advocates of genocide.

When House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte announced hearings on the planned parenthood videos, two of his colleagues, veteran Democrat members of the black caucus, called on him to investigate the group that made the videos instead. Congressman Elijah Cummings of Baltimore and John Conyers of Detroit – two cities where black babies are disproportionately killed before they are born – turned a blind eye to the racist Planned Parenthood slaughterhouses in their hometowns and pretended instead to be offended that their dirty little secret should be so widely publicized.

Planned Parenthood is pulling out all the stops, and Derek Obama and Hillary Clinton are pledging their undying support for the abortion organization. There are untold billions of dollars at stake when it comes to international family planning, and Planned Parenthood is
now the poster child for that campaign. Its leaders fear that the poster child will be torn apart like the babies it routinely subjects to vivisection while alive in the womb.

For over 25 years, PRI has helped successfully block $800 million in funding from Planned Parenthood and other anti-life groups.

But Congress keeps feeding the Beast – with your tax dollars!

Planned parenthood gets $528 million a year—40 % of its funding—from American taxpayers.

Help us Defund Planned Parenthood!

The Planned Parenthood scandal has shed light into the dark corner of another scandal – the thousands of pro-abortion politicians on the federal and state and even local levels who call themselves Catholic.

For instance, A study by a lay activist group has shown that most of the Catholics serving in the Massachusetts state legislature support Planned Parenthood.

The Catholic Action League found that 52 Catholics in the lower house were classified by the Planned Parenthood Advocacy Fund as either “champions” or “allies” of the group, while only 28 Catholic legislators were deemed “opponents.” In the upper house the results were even more striking, with 91% of the self-identified Catholics categorized as supporters of Planned Parenthood.

Graduates of Catholic colleges and universities were even more likely than other Catholic legislators to support the abortion lobby. Of the thirty members of the House who have received degrees from Catholic institutions of higher education, twenty-one, or 70%, supported Planned Parenthood.

In an analysis of the statistics, C.J. Doyle of the Catholic Action League wrote: “The number of Catholic political defectors from the pro-life to the pro-abortion side is too extensive to accurately recount.” He added that local observers could not cite a single case of a Catholic legislator moving from a pro-abortion stand to the pro-life camp. “All the movement has been in one direction,” he said.

America’s Catholic bishops routinely and almost reflexively condemn advocates of government restraint, the rule of law, and individual liberty and responsibility if it brings them into conflict with the Obama – Clinton welfare state complex.
Yet, it is a rare Bishop – in fact, they can be counted on one hand – that will publicly criticize Catholic members of their diocese, no matter how strongly they advocate abortion.

And there are far too many of them. Vice President Joe Biden of Delaware, Governor Jerry Brown and House Democrat Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi of California, Governor Andrew Cuomo and Mayor Bill DeBlasio of New York, and countless others.

What about your diocese? Are any of your Catholic elected officials pro-abortion? Is your bishop publicly called them to account as the public scandal that they are? If not, why not ask him why he hasn’t?

Last but not least, Kim Davis is out of jail. This valiant woman refused to bow to the dictatorial decision of Mister Justice Kennedy regarding so-called same-sex marriage. In refusing to issue marriage licenses to couples of the same sex, Kim Davis broke no law, either of the Commonwealth of Kentucky or the United States. Nonetheless, an ambitious federal judge named Bunning put her in jail for what he calls contempt of court.

His reasoning is wrong, but extremely revealing and – unintentionally of course – damning, not of Ms. Davis but of Judge Bunning. In admonishing Ms. Bunning in court, here is what he said, verbatim:

“The idea of natural law superseding this court’s authority would be a dangerous precedent indeed.”

This is a fascinating observation, coming from a judge whose court was established in order to preserve the liberties granted to all of us that are protected by the laws of nature and of nature’s God.

The natural law is that law that St. Paul says is written on our hearts. It’s what Doctor Martin Luther King Jr., writing from the Birmingham Jail, called the “higher law”. Yet judge Bunning perceives the natural law is a danger to the authority of his court, when in fact it is the source of authority for his court.

Judge Bunning, like many on the federal bench these days, has tossed the natural law to the winds, and with it, the foundation of authority that his court claims to have. Stated honestly, his view should go like this: “the idea of natural law superseding this court’s power would be a dangerous precedent indeed.”

Mister Bunning has abdicated his authority, and relies instead on his power to imprison and fine and otherwise punish those who appeal to a higher authority, the existence of which he
denies. He is wise to find it dangerous, because the natural law places implacable limits on
the power which he cherishes – and no one who loves power welcomes any limit on it,
especially from on high.

Those who love liberty, on the other hand, must not only cherish the laws of nature and of
nature’s God, but rise up to defend them when called upon by circumstance, principle, or
divine law. And there is no moment in history as demanding as the present time to gather
the fortitude and spiritual strength to do so.
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