The New York Times Throws in the Towel on “Overpopulation”  
Steven Mosher and Anne Morse

My guess is that you, gentle reader, will be as astonished as we were by the top-of-the-website The New York Times article discrediting the population alarmism of the past fifty years. In “The Unrealized Horrors of Population Explosion,” the newspaper has finally (several decades too late) thrown population control on the ash heap of discredited ideas.

The article included a video interview with Paul Ehrlich, the author of The Population Bomb. He was the butterfly scientist from Stanford who scared tens of millions with the specter of overpopulation—and the population apocalypse that would supposedly result. He predicted that by the 1970s the “population bomb” would explode—and hundreds of millions of people would starve to death in India and elsewhere. (India is still there, and doing quite well, thank you.)

But America’s “newspaper of record,” as it styles itself, failed to record the horrors themselves. There was no mention of the human costs when governments made population control a priority. No mention of the savage forced abortions and forced sterilizations that followed. No mention of the killing of baby girls through female infanticide and sex-selective abortion. No mention of the wasted money, the age and gender imbalances that continue to unfold for years to come. No mention of how the overpopulation panic helped to fuel the rise of birth control use and abortion.

Instead, when citing reasons why birth rates have dropped worldwide, the article offered more benign explanations. First, improved health standards mean that couples no longer need to have 5 children in the hope that 3 survive. Second, large families are not necessary in post-agricultural
As I read through the papal letter on the environment, *Laudato Si* (“Be Praised”), I was most struck by Pope Francis’ criticism of “reproductive health” programs. This will not surprise you, since we at PRI have been opposing such programs for 20 years. There the Pope writes:

“Instead of resolving the problems of the poor and thinking of how the world can be different, some can only propose a reduction in the birth rate. At times, developing countries face forms of international pressure which make economic assistance contingent on certain policies of “reproductive health.” Yet “while it is true that an unequal distribution of the population and of available resources creates obstacles to development and a sustainable use of the environment, it must nonetheless be recognized that demographic growth is fully compatible with an integral and shared development.” To blame population growth instead of extreme and selective consumerism on the part of some, is one way of refusing to face the issues. It is an attempt to legitimize the present model of distribution, where a minority believes that it has the right to consume in a way which can never be universalized, since the planet could not even contain the waste products of such consumption. Besides, we know that approximately a third of all food produced is discarded, and “whenever food is thrown out it is as if it were stolen from the table of the poor.” Still, attention needs to be paid to imbalances in population density, on both national and global levels, since a rise in consumption would lead to complex regional situations, as a result of the interplay between problems linked to environmental pollution, transport, waste treatment, loss of resources and quality of life.” (paragraph 50)

Here Pope Francis follows in the footsteps of Saint John Paul II by pointing out that some wrongly propose to cure poverty by “reducing the birth rate” and by conditioning economic aid on “reproductive health” programs. He is right to imply that you don’t eliminate poverty by forced-pace population control programs that eliminate the children of the poor, although I wish he had put the point more forcefully.

There are currently billions of dollars being spent to abort, sterilize and contracpet poor people around the world, often without their foreknowledge or consent. This is being done in a misguided effort to bring population into alignment with currently available resources, and is a grave violation of the natural right of parents to decide for themselves the number and spacing of their children.

But here’s the problem: The Holy Father seems to suggest, because he has been told, that the earth’s resources are fixed and finite. They are not. As science and technology advance through the action of human intelligence, available resources increase. The problems caused by our numbers—pollution, transportation, and waste are some that the Pope mentions—can and have been solved the same way.

Even more troubling, he also apparently believes that the only way that the poor can be lifted out of poverty is by reducing the standard of living of the wealthy. Thus he criticizes “extreme consumerism.” But who is to decide how much one is permitted to consume? The government? New international organizations with “the power to sanction?” And are these the same agencies that will redistribute “the excess?” As someone who has lived in a one-party dictatorship where everyone was “equal”, I can tell that, in practice, this kind of redistributionism would mean a quick descent into tyranny.

The poor desperately need to be encouraged to become the agents of
United States

*LifeSiteNews*—In a video recorded by Live Action, D.C. late-term abortionist Cesare Santangelo admitted to leaving babies to die after unsuccessful abortions. Santangelo was caught on film saying, “legally we would be obligated to help it, you know, to survive […] Let’s say […] you delivered before we got to the termination part of the procedure here, you know? Then we would do things—we would—we would not help it.” By “not helping it,” abortionist Santangelo is in violation of the Federal Born-Alive Infants Protection Act. The President of Live Action, Lila Rose, is asking the Attorney General to investigate and prosecute Dr. Santangelo.


Nigeria

*The Telegraph*—After enduring abduction and repeated rape at the hands of Boko Haram Islamists, roughly half of the 534 girls and women rescued by Nigerian forces are pregnant. Since this news emerged, the feminist movement has urged the United Nations Population Fund to provide access to abortions for these victims. Meanwhile, the United States government has refused to aid Nigeria in its fight against Boko Haram until Nigeria, a majority pro-life and Christian country, agrees to accept homosexuality, and funding for birth control and family planning.

Inspecting that these girls and women undergo abortions will further harm these already traumatized victims. Evidence from the Rwanda Genocide shows us that motherhood after rape is a healing process, one that provided many survivors of the genocide with a reason to live. Instead of encouraging abortion, Western NGOs could do more for these victims by “reduc[ing] the social stigma in their communities, and by providing practical help such as job training for the mothers and school fees for the children […] they [the victims] should be praised for being mothers to children who have done nothing wrong.”


Peru

*National Catholic Register*—Cardinal Juan Luis Cipriani of the Archdiocese of Lima met for a general audience with Pope Francis in early June. During the meeting, Cardinal Cipriani showed the Pope photos from Peru’s massive March for Life, which the Population Research Institute’s Carlos Polo helped organize. When the Pope saw the photos he expressed his joy to the Cardinal, saying, “Keep shaking things up!” His praise for Latin America’s largest ever March for Life encourages all pro-lifers to continue fighting for the unborn.

See the Source: http://www.omsrightswithoutfrontiers.org/blog/?p=2000

China

*Women’s Rights Without Frontiers*—Due to international and domestic media coverage, Chinese schoolteacher Qin Yi has been saved from having to undergo a late-term forced abortion. The Family Planning Commission in Guizhou Province, where Qin Yi works, gave her an ultimatum to either have her baby aborted by the end of May, or be fired from her teaching position.

In Guizhou, remarried couples, such as Qin Yi and her husband, are allowed a second child only if they have one child from their previous marriages. Officials in her home province of Anhui granted her permission to have a second child, because in Anhui, remarried couples are allowed a child of their own if each spouse had but one child from their former marriages. Although this is an exception to the One-Child Policy, the future of China’s youngest citizens remains uncertain, as the laws regarding abortion are not held uniformly throughout the county.

See the Source: http://www.omsrightswithoutfrontiers.org/blog/?p=2000
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May I Send You This Gift?

Your opportunity to better know the “one-of-a-kind” saint!

This book will give you a fascinating, up-close look at a saint who’s not a “typical” saint . . .


*For God & Country – The Heroic Life and Martyrdom of St. Joan of Arc* thoroughly explores St. Joan’s mission, courage, virtue, accomplishments, charity, piety and death for the Faith. This book is much better than just a “good read” because you’ll learn . . .

. . . how St. Joan integrated religion and patriotism in her life . . . little-known facts about her family . . . St. Joan’s religious development . . . her vow of chastity at age 13 . . . the apparitions of St. Michael the Archangel and the third century martyrs St. Catherine of Alexandria and St. Margaret of Antioch . . .

. . . Joan’s arduous and treacherous journey to convince the heir apparent to the French throne that she should be selected to lead the bedraggled French forces and expel the British invaders . . . the meaning of the symbols on the flag she carried into battle . . . the most tense moments of her victory in the Battle for Orléans . . . the living hell St. Joan endured while imprisoned by the British . . . and the horror of her execution by fire.

Plus, *For God & Country – The Heroic Life and Martyrdom of St. Joan of Arc* gives you prayers to St. Joan, including a prayer for her intercession, the Litany for St. Joan’s Feast Day and more.


I know you’ll agree with Cardinal O’Brien’s enthusiasm for this fascinating book, so may I send you *For God & Country – The Heroic Life and Martyrdom of St. Joan of Arc* today, to thank you for your much-needed gift of $40 or more?

Please use the enclosed Gift Reply to quickly receive *For God & Country -- The Heroic Life and Martyrdom of St. Joan of Arc* or use PRI’s secure donation link: http://pop.org/donate/prir
society since they are not needed to work the land, and therefore only make a densely populated city increasingly crowded. Third—
direct from New York City—
comes the motherhood slam:
“Women in many societies are ever more independent, socially and economically; they no longer accept that their fate is to be endlessly pregnant.”

In other words, The New York Times does not even begin to tell the whole story. The horrors of anti-human population control campaigns continue today.

Take India, for example. Over 60% of India’s women state they have been exposed to “family planning messaging” in the past few months; an impressive statistic considering only 64% of India’s women are literate. And the less educated are sterilized in much higher numbers. While 47% of Indian women with less than five years of education have been sterilized, only 20% of women with twelve or more years of education have accepted sterilization.

Lack of consent, painful and pervasive injuries, and death from negligence disproportionately affect India’s most vulnerable. Indian women are not having fewer children because they are becoming “more independent,” but because they are being coerced into undergoing sterilization by abusive population control programs, with their saturation propaganda and sterilization camps.

“The core message of [Ehrlich’s book]—population growth outstripping food supply—resonated quite a bit with India’s elites, with the middle classes,” economist Gita Sen told the Times. “They much preferred to believe that the poor were poor because of too many children rather than being poor because of an unfair and unequal economic system.”

In China—which now has below-replacement fertility—the Planned Birth Policy allows the state to control childbearing. Anyone pregnant without a valid birth permit falls afoul of the family planning police, and abortion and sterilization usually follow.

Chinese human rights activist Chen Guangcheng states: “In ancient Chinese culture we had a saying that your home is your castle, and that even the king will not be allowed to come in without your permission. But now in today’s China under Communist rule, they even put their hand into your body and grab your babies out of your womb, and they kill your babies in your face.”

In Myanmar—another country where fertility levels have fallen below replacement—President Thein Sein just signed a “Population Control” bill into law. The law implicitly authorizes the use of coercion and discrimination, especially against the persecuted Rohingya minority, who are already subject to a two-child policy.

In dying Uzbekistan, the authoritarian government is coercing tens of thousands of women into undergoing sterilizations.

The former president of Peru is currently on trial for crimes against humanity for a population control campaign in the 1990’s that sterilized over 300,000 indigenous women against their will.

The list goes on and on.

These are the true “unrealized horrors” of Ehrlich’s mad tale. The past half century has seen tens of millions of men and women sterilized without their consent and tens of millions of women forcibly aborted. These men and women are owed more than a one-off article from The New York Times saying, “Oh, oops. I guess we were all wrong.”

What’s more, The New York Times conveniently fails to mention that it helped to fan the flames of the overpopulation panic. It advocated setting up population control programs, and editorialized on behalf of the billions of dollars in funding that continues to fuel the anti-people movement down to the present day. A mea culpa would be nice, but we aren’t holding our breath.

And lest we forget, the grim game of controlling human numbers continues, albeit under a different name. Today, efforts to disable women’s reproductive systems are called “reproductive health” programs. Orwellian, isn’t it?
The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), is sending public funds to PROMSEX, the primary organization promoting the legalization of abortion in Peru. PROMSEX is then using this money to prepare LGTBI activists for participation in the upcoming Peruvian elections.

Their leaders, Susan Chavez Rossina Guerrero and Luis Távara, have been the voice of PROMSEX, leading all pro-abortion initiatives in Peru for the past decade. In June 2014, the organization’s members actively lobbied to legalize therapeutic abortion in Peru. Currently, they are supporting a bill which would legalize abortion in the case of rape, and Rossina Guerrero Vasquez, one of the movement’s leaders, has already presented it to Congress. According to their webpage, http://www.promsex.org/, they declare themselves as members of the Committee CLACAI, a committee which endorses abortion on demand using abortifacient drugs.

In addition to their efforts to legalize abortion, PROMSEX is preparing the LGTBI community for the July 2016 presidential and congressional elections in Peru. On their webpage they describe themselves as a “Escuela de Formación Política LGTBI,” or a “School for LGTBI Political Training.” It is an initiative “designed to strengthen the leadership of lesbian, gay, transgender, bisexual and intersex citizens that they might participate in political and electoral processes [...] for a free, equal, diverse, engaged citizenry with human rights.”

In other words, the United States is supporting the homosexual, pro-abortion agenda in Latin America by sending taxpayer money to PROMSEX. The citizens of Latin America emphatically oppose this intrusion into their internal politics and demand that this abuse to democracy in their countries cease.

Here in the United States, little can be done at the federal level, since in 2009 President Obama repealed the Mexico City Policy, which would have prevented nongovernmental organizations like PROMSEX from using government funds to promote abortion. The United States has always promoted democracy in countries receiving foreign aid; but by funding LGTBI activism, the U.S. is not promoting democracy, it is undermining it.
Another Baby Saved!
Written by Carlos Polo and Translated by Moriah Bruno

Evita is a Peruvian teenager who today celebrates the life of her three-month-old son, who has brought both meaning and joy into her life. Although their story ends happily, it began with the terrifying realization that she had gotten pregnant unintentionally. As happens all too often, the father of her unborn child and her own family both abandoned her after they discovered that she was pregnant.

Evita was one of the many Latin American teenagers who fall victim to “sexual education” programs. These programs, sponsored by governments and organizations that promote contraception and abortion, are taught under the rubric of “sexual and reproductive rights.” For four decades, these programs have wrongly suggested to Latin American teenagers that they can have sexual relations when they feel safe to “love without unintended consequences.” They encourage young women to use contraception and promise them sex without consequences. But for many, the reality comes all too soon. Every day thousands of young women experience that the meaningless sex promoted by these programs does not lead to a full and happy life. Instead, they find themselves in Evita’s situation: pregnant, alone, and contemplating abortion.

Desperate and with no one to turn to, Evita contacted a website that she thought offered free information about abortion and abortion services. What she got in return was encouragement to cherish and protect the little life within her, that little life which has since filled her heart with love.

The website Evita contacted was taken over by staff of the Population Research Institute in Latin America last year. We direct all incoming e-mails to the Latin American office of PRI, where PRI staff respond. They encourage women like Evita, the majority of them young, desperate, and poor, by assuring them that there are alternatives to abortion.

The next step is to put the young mothers-to-be (who of course are already mothers) in contact with pro-life psychologists who specialize in crisis pregnancy counseling. Where the young women need shelter (many of them have been put out of their homes by angry parents), they are given lodging in crisis pregnancy shelters such as “Hogar Gladys,” a shelter run by Catholics and funded by donations. There they also receive food, clothing, counseling, and prayers for the remainder of their pregnancies and in the months following the birth of their children.

Liliana was Evita’s counselor. A few days ago she received a cheerful e-mail from her former client: “Hi Liliana, I am sending a photo of my three month old baby. He is the most wonderful thing that has happened to me. Thank you for your support:) Eva”

Evita’s son is one of the many Latin American babies saved from abortion each year by the efforts of the staff of the Population Research Institute. Sergio Burga, manager of the Latin American office of PRI, was deeply humbled by the experience. “The truth is that each life we save always comes as a surprise to me, as if it were the first,” he said. “How shall I repay the Lord for all of His goodness to me?”

Rohingya to obtain a birth permit for just one child. But go outside the law and women are faced with fines or imprisonment. “Local officials line their pockets with bribes from couples desperate to have children,” she said. “Burma does not need a two-child policy,” Morse continued. “Ethnic violence cannot be solved by eliminating the minority, just as poverty cannot be solved by getting rid of the poor person. The most effective policy to deal with these problems is, as it has always been, to eradicate the hatred and the poverty by developing the human person.”

See the Source: https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/myanmar-forces-muslim-minority-to-space-children-3-years-apart
The Barefoot Lawyer: A Book Review

Steven W. Mosher

The Barefoot Lawyer: A Blind Man’s Fight for Justice and Freedom in China, by Chen Guangcheng

I have followed China’s brutal one-child policy from its inception in 1979. In fact, I was living in China at the time, and saw how poor village women were being arrested, detained, and tortured—forced to undergo sterilizations and even abortions—all in the name of controlling population growth. I left China with their cries for help ringing in my ears.

So when I read in 2005 that a blind lawyer by the name of Chen Guangcheng was attempting to seek justice for thousands of victims of this ongoing campaign, I sat up and took notice. I didn't think his class action suit would get very far in the Chinese Communist Party's make-believe courts, but I admired his courage for trying.

As it happened, the Party soon grew tired of Chen’s attempts to file a lawsuit, ordered the court to refuse to hear it, and had him arrested on trumped-up charges. After a farcical trial, he was sentenced to seven years in prison. Even the presiding “judge” (really just a Party official by another name) later privately apologized to Chen for this miscarriage of justice, explaining that he had no choice but to follow Party orders.

Chen spent the next four years in prison, until foreign criticism prompted the Party to move him back to his home in an impoverished Shandong village. Beijing claimed that Chen was there under “house arrest,” but in fact his entire village of 500 people was turned into an armed camp. Literally hundreds of plainclothes policemen were assigned to watch him and his family around the clock to isolate him from the outside world. Chen wryly notes that the Party created an entire “miniature security economy,” spending millions of yuan just to keep him under lock and key.

And they failed. Despite being surrounded by a small army of thugs, despite being weak from malnutrition and mistreatment, and despite being totally blind, Chen managed to escape. Sometimes walking, sometimes crawling, relying upon sounds and smells and sometimes, remarkably, on “a kind of bat-like echolocation,” he made his way to a neighboring village and from there to the U.S. Embassy in Beijing.

After welcoming the famous dissident with open arms, senior State Department officials—apparently on orders from Washington—soon began pressuring him to leave the Embassy. Hillary Clinton was due in Beijing for a summit meeting, and Chen had become an obstacle to the coming negotiations. He was taken to a state-run hospital for medical treatment where, despite promises from U.S. officials that they would stay with him, he found himself again isolated and alone, surrounded by Chinese guards.

Chen realized that his only hope now was to leave China. But unable to receive visitors and with his cell phone working erratically, how could he announce this to the world?

Back in Washington, Congressman Christopher Smith (R-NJ) had called an emergency hearing of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China specifically to discuss Chen’s plight. The Congressman called the hearing to order, then dialed Chen’s cell phone number—it was the middle of the night in China—and Chen answered. “I don’t feel safe in China and want to go to the United States,” he declared. His request for asylum was broadcast by the U.S. media, and won immediate congressional and public support. China’s leaders were furious, but they agreed to allow Chen, along with his wife and two children, to leave the country.

Hillary Clinton was later to claim that Chen’s release was a major accomplishment of her time as secretary of state. She devotes an entire chapter of her book, Hard Choices (2014) to the episode, using it to highlight her “defense of universal human rights.” She claims that she and her subordinates always tried to do what Chen said he wanted, but that he was “unpredictable and quixotic.”

Not according to Chen. He asserts that it was pressure from U.S. officials that forced him out of the safety of the U.S. Embassy. And that his release was due to “pressure from Congress and the American public,” not the intervention of the U.S. Secretary of State.

Chen Guangcheng is one of the most remarkable personalities modern China has ever produced. In a land where the blind are regarded as family embarrassments and kept out of sight, he learned how to read and taught himself the law. Even though he was only
an unlicensed “barefoot lawyer,” he successfully exposed local corruption, raised funds to build a village well, and won a lawsuit to protect handicapped villagers from being taxed unfairly. Then he attempted to take on abuses in the one-child policy, and brought the wrath of the Party-State down on his head.

One of the most chilling scenes in the book—among many—comes when Chen is kidnapped and beaten by Party thugs. So that he will understand what is happening, one of them turns on a tape recording: “Only through continuous armed struggle will the proletariat and the Party be victorious, and will the revolution be successful!”

If you want to understand what life is like inside the thuggish regime that dreams of ruling the world, read The Barefoot lawyer. “The Cultural Revolution has never ended,” notes Chen, “it has simply metastasized.”

This article was originally published in The Washington Times on May 15th.

Mercatornet

Recently published in peer reviewed journals, Dr. Deirdre Little’s research has found a link between the Gardasil Vaccine and premature ovarian failure. Three girls, ages 16, 17, and 18 were seen by Dr. Little after their periods suddenly stopped. Though pro-vaccination, Dr. Little found evidence to suggest that Gardasil was responsible for the girls’ premature menopause. Her study uncovers major errors in the safety testing of the vaccine to reveal the following: the vaccine was never tested against a saline placebo, it was tested against components of the vaccine itself; a majority of the girls used to test the vaccine were on hormonal contraception and were required to remain on them until seven months after their first Gardasil shot, masking any period changes that could have indicated early signs of ovarian failure; after seven months, only “serious adverse events” were recorded, any changes in the girls’ menstrual cycles did not qualify as a “serious adverse events;” Gardasil vaccination programs began in 2007, safety studies conducted since then focus on hospital visits, and missed periods do not usually require hospitalization. Dr. Little’s research also found that of the two safety studies conducted, the vaccine was only ever tested on a few hundred girls, boys were understudied, and that negative side effects were more common and more severe in virgins, with virgins being under-represented in the target group.

The Gardasil vaccine was intended to prevent two strains of the Human Papillomavirus that often cause cervical cancer, but at the cost of being rendered infertile?

On their website, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention maintains that, “research from before and after the vaccine were licensed show HPV vaccines are safe. As with all approved vaccines, CDC and FDA closely monitor the safety of HPV vaccines.” Dr. Little’s research has not only linked the Gardasil vaccine with premature ovarian failure, but also exposes a number of major problems with the methods used to test Gardasil; thus calling into question just how thoroughly the FDA and the CDC monitor the safety of vaccines, especially when permanent damage to women’s reproductive health is on the line.

See the Source: http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/how-safe-is-gardasil-for-young-girls/16071

National Catholic Register

A new study published in the Journal of Human Brain Mapping reveals that the combination oral contraceptive pill shrinks two areas of women’s brains. The study measured cortical thickness to find that women on the pill had brains with a thinner lateral orbitofrontal cortex and posterior cingulate cortex than women naturally cycling. “The lateral orbitofrontal cortex is involved in regulating emotion and response to rewards, while the posterior cingulate cortex regulates inward-directed thought, such as recalling personal memories or planning for the future.” More research is needed to determine if the thinning occurs only while women are on the combination pill, or if the effect is permanent. This study is part of a growing body of research exploring the inherent neurological difference between females and males.

Children with Down Syndrome are a gift. But today we are told that children have to be perfect. A retarded child will blow not only your speakers but your life. They will be a ball and chain that you'll drag for a lifetime. Apparently many parents have bought into that message. Dependable estimates indicate that as many as 90% of children with Down Syndrome are aborted. These days, it’s not hard to discover whether your unborn baby has Trisomy 21. Detection used to require a procedure called amniocentesis, which was both intrusive and dangerous to the baby. Now all it takes is a blood test. That test is provided by Genoma, a Swiss firm that charges about $800 for what it calls “the most accurate non-invasive prenatal trisomy test.” It’s called “Tranquility.” The company’s banner ads feature a giant-size picture of a girl with Down Syndrome, designed to shake down every possible pregnant mother for eight hundred bucks.

In reality, “Tranquility” is designed to tranquilize us—to cover our innate moral aversion to eugenics with the soothing sugarcoating of scientific jargon and a contrived promise of inner peace. Geneva-based Genoma is marketing Tranquility worldwide, its showboat extravaganzas replete with classy models, dazzling graphics, flowing wine, and bad music. Grotesque? Absolutely. Eugenics as Orwellian Agitprop. But inevitably, behind the glitz, the seamy underside gets plain ugly.

Where did that picture come from? Whose mother would allow her daughter’s likeness to appear in an ad for a death sentence?

Answer: her mother didn’t. “I was sitting beside my daughter’s bed in the Pediatric Oncology Clinic when I found out,” the girl’s mother writes on her blog. “She’s in her eighth month of chemotherapy, with nineteen more to go. . . Every small setback takes a toll, but she doesn’t let it keep her down for long. She’s tough. Tough and sweet and feisty, and a thousand unique qualities all her own. She is the joy of our life.” Yes, the beautiful child’s picture had been stolen from her family’s blog by an internet outfit in Turkey that sold it to Genoma. “On the front page of their website and [on] a building-sized banner in Spain: there’s her face, larger than life. My daughter has been made the poster child for a prenatal testing kit called Tranquility. As if she were a cautionary tale: ‘don’t let this happen to you.’” “They insulted and abused my innocent child in their pursuit of profit. They broke faith with common human decency.” “The world is watching,” she writes. Yes, Genoma’s world features videos of market launches in packed ballrooms, the promise of profit literally overflowing with the champagne. But they won’t show the murder of ninety percent of those smiling faces that are yearning to be born.

And their poster girl? They only stole her picture. We’ll never see the countless thousands of stolen lives. “She’s so beautiful. She can’t sin.” But we can.
Vietnam Poised to End Two-Child Policy

By Paul Wilson

Vietnamese outlet Thanh Nien News reports that the Vietnamese government is preparing to categorically reverse its two-child policy. If this happens, Vietnamese families will be able to decide for themselves how many children they can have, without government fines or punishment.

For decades, the Vietnamese government sterilized women after the birth of their second child, and employed coercive economic restrictions to punish families who had more than 2 children. In the September/October 1995 PRI Review, we noted: “[Vietnam] denies third children a birth certificate and offers a reward of $20 [in 1995 US dollars] to women who have a hysterectomy. Punishment for having a third child exists across Vietnam, but it appears the policy, which began in 1985, is most strict among the subsistence farmers who make up the poorer echelons of society. Families who violate the policy are denied land to grow rice—and thus effectively starved—until they fall back into line. They are also fined about $80 [in 1995 US dollars], a seemingly paltry amount that is in fact the equivalent of 10 months’ income. The government encourages women to undergo a hysterectomy following the birth of her second child, a procedure to which approximately half of all village women have been subjected.”

Several years later we returned to Vietnam, and our on-the-ground investigation once again confirmed that: “Vietnam’s family planning policy is universally coercive, and includes a two-child limit for cadres, manual workers, civil servants, soldiers, families living in a municipality or in the Red River or Mekong Deltas; and birth limitations for ethnic families in northern mountain provinces, Central Highlands and Northwest. Families that have more than the stipulated number of children must contribute “social support funds,” or face punishments stipulated by law by management agencies.”

Birth restrictions were temporarily loosened in 2003, only to be reinstated in 2009. Now it appears that they will be eliminated entirely, a shift in policy resulting from government alarm over the country’s precipitously falling birthrate. According to Thanh Nien News, “Years after Vietnam first asked families to have no more than two children, policy-makers are now seeking to remove the restriction, warning that the country’s birth rate has become alarmingly low.” Since 2009, the nation’s total fertility rate has dipped to 1.85, which is below the replacement rate.

Sadly, other Asian countries continue to deny families the right to choose their family size. Myanmar (also known as Burma) recently passed legislation giving the government the power to space the births of its citizens. Human rights groups fear this legislation will be used to disproportionately target the Rohingya, a Muslim group in the majority-Buddhist country. China, despite its supposed “loosening” of reproductive restrictions, still maintains its tight control over the reproductive lives of its citizens, requiring that women have birth permits before conceiving and bearing children.

We at PRI have long urged the Vietnamese government to reconsider its short-sighted one-child policy. We celebrate the fact that it is now on the verge of returning control of fertility back to the Vietnamese people. Couples have a natural right to determine the number and spacing of their children, a right which the Hanoi regime took away from them a half century ago. Let’s hope that other countries in Asia which restrict childbearing under a state plan, such as China, will follow suit. It would be an important step in the direction of respecting human rights.
their own development. The only way that poor countries and poor peoples can escape poverty is by producing more goods and services themselves, through their own efforts, within their own borders.

I wish the Holy Father had encouraged the poor to work harder, produce more, and lift themselves out of poverty. That is, after all, how the peoples of Europe, North America, Australia, and Asia became wealthy. This is how the people of Africa, Latin America, and, yes, Argentina, will one day escape poverty as well.

Instead, he complains that those who have already, through generations of hard work, escaped poverty are consuming too much. Don’t they have a right to the fruits of their labor?

Pope Francis is to be congratulated for pointing out the hypocrisy of the radical environmentalists in promoting abortion. Laudato Si points out that abortion makes women’s wombs incapable of sustaining human life by strip-mining them in surgical abortions and making them toxic dump sites in chemical abortions.

Since women’s wombs are where the next generation of humanity must reside before it can be born, environmentalists who demand unlimited abortion are treating humanity like a pestilence to be eradicated.

**Development Desk**

You understand that budgeting is key to financial responsibility. Automating your monthly donation helps with your budget, and helps Population Research Institute in the same way. When we know how much money we will have each month, we can better plan our future research investigations, and how many educational materials we can produce—all to promote and support the cause of life.

The PRI Sustainers program is an easy way you can improve the effectiveness of your gift! Here are some of the advantages to becoming a PRI Sustainer:

- You don’t have to remember to write a check during the month.
- You won’t need to use as many stamps.
- You will receive an Annual Giving Statement in time for tax preparation, each year.
- You give more support to PRI’s programs by lowering the processing costs of mailed checks. This means big savings for PRI which can be used for our life-saving projects!
- Furthermore, if your automatic monthly gift replaces our monthly appeal mailings, you reduce PRI’s postage, paper, and other mailing costs. Saving this paper is a great way to give more to both PRI and the people we serve, and the environment!
- And, you’ll receive the PRI Review, six times a year, to keep you up-to-date on what your support means to people around the world: in China, India, Peru, Kenya, the Caribbean...worldwide!