

Washington Watch

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Set Free by the Truth Page 2
 Education Battle Ahead Page 3
 Religious Liberty Page 4
 Constitutional Law Evolves – Strangely Page 5
 Life and the Blessing of Liberty Page 6
 The Christ of Politics Page 7
 A Look at the Heart Page 8

You're INVITED
March for Life Open House
 January 24
 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

PUBLISHED BY FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL

The LORD is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The LORD is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? – PSALM 27:1 (KJV)

'Bad Seed Brings Forth Bitter Harvest' The Legacy of Planned Parenthood

Margaret Sanger's soft beauty and gentle appearance give no indication of the cruel motivations that inspired her as the founder of Planned Parenthood. She died in 1966, but her evil agenda lives on. Planned Parenthood is not a benign institution devoted to family values. George Grant, in his compelling book Grand Illusions, unveils the historical face of Sanger and the current agenda of Planned Parenthood. The following is excerpted from his current book, which will be republished as a fourth edition in Spring 2000 by Cumberland House:



Photo credit: Archive Photos

On January 1, 1900, most Americans greeted the twentieth century with the proud and certain belief that the next hundred years would be the greatest, the most glorious, and the most glamorous in human history. . . .

What they did not know was that dark and malignant seeds were already germinating just beneath the surface of the new century's soil. Josef Stalin was a twenty-one-year-old seminary student in Tiflis, . . . Ukraine. Benito Mussolini was a seventeen-year-old student teacher in the quiet suburbs of Milan. Adolf Hitler was an eleven-year-old aspiring art student in the quaint upper Austrian village of Brannan. And Margaret Sanger was a twenty-year-old shy and out-of-sorts nurse-probationer in White Plains, New York. Who could have ever guessed on that ebulliently auspicious New Year's Day that those four youngsters would, over the span of the next century, spill more innocent

blood than all the murderers, warlords, and tyrants of past history combined! . . . No one in his right mind would want to rehabilitate the reputations of Stalin, Mussolini, or Hitler. Their barbarism, treachery, and debauchery will make their names live on in infamy forever. Amazingly, though, Sanger has . . . somehow managed to establish an independent reputation for the perpetuation of her memory. . . .

Because of her Malthusian and Eugenic connections, [Sanger] had become closely associated with the scientists and theorists who put together Nazi Germany's "race purification" program. She had openly endorsed the euthanasia, sterilization, abortion, and infanticide programs of the early Reich. . . . [W]hen World War II broke out and the grisly details of the Nazi programs began to come to light, Margaret was forced to . . . cover up her complicity. The Great Depression had been a boon for racist and eugenic arguments, . . . but now that Auschwitz and Dachau had become very much a part of the public conscience, she realized she would have to do something, and quickly.

Her first step . . . was to change the name of her organization. "Planned Parenthood" was a name that had been proposed from within the birth control movement since . . . it connoted a positive program and conveyed a clean, wholesome, family-oriented image. . . . By 1942, it was decided. The organization would be called

Continued on page 4

Life's Blood

by Robert G. Morrison

"I know you right to life people," the student said. "I worked with you on the referendum to cut off state funding of abortions." He continued: "I'm glad you won that referendum in Michigan because the numbers of abortions have gone way down since we stopped taxpayer funding." I should have seen the *but* coming. "But I learned this about you: you are very self-righteous and you hate your pro-choice neighbors," he concluded.

I wasn't prepared for that knock and it hit me hard. After all, we were at a small Christian college in Michigan. Concordia College in Ann Arbor is known for its pro-life witness. Still, we should be grateful for the friend who tells us the truth *as he sees it, even if it is painful for us to hear it.*

I stammered out an answer. "We should," I told him, "take our inspiration from Jesus who told us to love our enemies. We should consider the example of Lincoln, who said we should have 'malice toward none,' but act 'with charity for all.'" True as these answers were, I could tell my student questioner was not persuaded.

So I continued: "I saw a poster advertising a campus blood drive on my way to this class. There are people who need blood who can't give it. Like homosexuals and those who have had any form of cancer. Young women may hemorrhage while undergoing abortions; they need blood desperately. We can give blood. We can give it even for people who don't like us, who don't agree with us and whose actions are against what we believe is right."

Continued on page 7



CHAMPIONS of FAITH

Choosing Between Career and Truth

by William L. Saunders

In 1979, Steven W. Mosher, a doctoral student in cultural anthropology at Stanford University, was invited to work in China. He was the first foreign social scientist to be afforded such an opportunity since the Communists came to power in 1949.

Steve worked in a rural area in south China, not far from Hong Kong. He was accepted by, and won the trust of, the local people. One day, in 1980, a local official told him of a new policy decree from the Communist Central Committee. The birth rate was to be restricted to 1 percent because of feared "over-population." Thus began China's infamous "one-child policy."

Steve saw first-hand, this policy at work. He witnessed women, who already had their one allotted child, being forced to abort and being sterilized against their will. He heard their wails of anguish and grief. He learned of the house-to-house searches by police for those with "illegal" pregnancies.

When he returned to the United States, Steve began to write about what he had seen. He denounced this inhumane policy of forcible population control.

The Chinese were incensed. They threatened to end the entire program of scholarly exchanges with the United States if he were not silenced.

Steve's university, Stanford, had a close and privileged relationship with the Chinese government, hosting the first visiting scholars from China in 1978. Rather

than support its frequently enunciated principle of academic freedom, Stanford tried to censor Steve.

Steve faced a dilemma. Unless he ceased publication of wholly factual – but in China's eyes "defamatory" – accounts of its one-child policy, he would be kicked out of the university's doctoral program.

Steve's experience in China had convinced him of two things – abortion was the killing of a human being, and there is a God (who holds us accountable for our inhumane acts). He knew he could not cease writing

about China's forced population policies without implicitly denying both. If abortion were murder, he reasoned, forced abortion was state-ordered murder, and if God existed, He would demand that injustice be exposed. Steve felt a compulsion to be faithful to the truth and he refused to be censored. As a consequence, his academic career was ruined.

In sacrificing his academic career for the higher good of fidelity to the truth, Steve made a choice that would shape the rest of his life. It is no surprise that a couple of years later, Steve embraced the One who is truth itself and became a Christian.

Neither is it a surprise that Steve, having learned in China that children are a gift from God, is the father of eight, with another on the way.

Steve has turned his formidable gifts to spreading the pro-life message and demolishing the lies spread by Planned Parenthood and its allies. He is now president of the Population Research Institute in Front Royal, Va. PRI has exposed forced sterilization in Peru and continues to deplore human rights abuses in China. It has sounded the alarm about the true "population crisis" – the *de*-population that is about to sweep across Europe and the developed world.

All this because Steve Mosher found the truth, and it set him free. Clearly, what man – that is, Stanford and China – meant for evil, God meant for good. **WW**



Washington Watch is published by Family Research Council. For more information, contact Family Research Council, 801 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Phone: 202-393-2100. Fax: 202-393-2134. Legislative information line (toll call): 202-783-HOME. Toll-free publication order line: 1-800-225-4008. Internet address: <http://www.frc.org>. E-mail address: corrdept@frc.org.

Executive Vice President: Charles A. Donovan. Senior Editor: Karl Day. Assistant Editor: Amber E. Dawson. Contributors: Kenneth L. Ervin; George Grant; Maj. George T. Havrilak (USAF Ret'd.); Janet M. LaRue, Esq.; Darren L. Logan; Jennifer A. Marshall; Stephanie M. Mollins; Robert G. Morrison; Janet Parshall; Crystal M. Roberts, J.D.; William L. Saunders; David M. Wagner, Esq.; Jennifer J. Wotochek.

Family Research Council is exempt from taxation under IRC 501(c)(3). Contributions to FRC are tax-deductible. © 2000 Family Research Council. All rights reserved. International copyright secured. Family Research Council and Washington Watch are trademarks of the Family Research Council, Inc.





WTO Meltdown in Seattle? On December 5 the Seattle meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO) ended with a whimper. Following a week of protests reminiscent of the Vietnam era, Seattle and the WTO had nothing more to show for their labors than broken glass and ransacked stores.

At a time when the very purpose of the WTO is being re-examined, it is essential for pro-life and pro-family Americans to understand what impact, if any, WTO membership would have on the world's fastest growing trade partner and one of the worst abusers of fundamental human rights: the People's Republic of China (PRC).

The question Congress now faces is whether, at this point in history, bringing the PRC into a permanent and privileged trading relationship with the United States will make it act more humanely toward its own people. China's abysmal human rights record over the last 20 years and its growing military threat

against Taiwan indicate that now is not the time. — *DLL*

Mobil Oil Redeemed by Merger.

With the recent merger between Exxon and Mobil Oil comes a long prayed for benefit — respect for marriage. In a move that has spawned outrage amongst homosexual activists, Exxon has carried its pro-family policies into the merger and has decided to end Mobil's policy of extending benefits to the sex partners of homosexual employees. To thank Exxon Mobil for making the right decision concerning sex partner benefits, contact L.R. Raymond, CEO, Exxon Mobil Corp., 5959 Las Colinas Boulevard, Irving, Texas, 75039-2298. Phone: (972) 444-1000; fax: (972) 444-1348, or go to www.exxon.com/contact/index.html. — *KLE*

Hawaii Supreme Court Affirms Will of People.

On December 10, the Hawaii Supreme Court upheld a 1994 ban on "same-sex marriage." Citing a 1998 amendment to the state constitution that

places the power to reserve marriage to opposite-sex couples in the hands of the legislature, the court rendered moot, attempts by homosexual activists to dissolve the 1994 ban. Hawaiian voters approved the Constitutional amendment by a 2-to-1 margin. — *KLE*

Trading Income for Respect.

According to Omni Hotel Vice President of Marketing Peter Strebel, the 40-hotel chain has decided to phase out its association with the pornography industry. Omni will be completely porn-free by June 2000, a move that will cost Omni roughly \$3 million in income annually. To express your gratitude to Omni for its stand for decency, contact: Robert Rowling, owner and CEO, and/or James Caldwell, president, Omni Hotels, 420 Decker Dr., Suite 200, Irving, Texas 75062-3952. E-mail: kserafin@omnihotels.com; phone: (972) 730-6664; fax: (972) 887-9240, or go to www.omnihotels.com. — *KLE*

Education: Congress has Divided ESEA but will it Conquer?

by Jennifer A. Marshall

At the midway point in the 106th Congress, much of the debate over pro-family education concerns lies ahead. During this two-year period, Congress is rewriting the largest K-12 federal education act, the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA). Last authorized in 1994, ESEA covers more than 50 programs, funded at a total of \$12 billion.

The House has divided ESEA into several legislative pieces, two of which it has already passed, the *Students Results Act* (H.R. 2), which included programs for disadvantaged youth, and the *Teacher Empowerment Act* (H.R. 1995). The next installment of ESEA in the House, will deal with educational technology provisions, the *Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act* and numerous smaller programs in ESEA.

While these latter programs receive far less funding than those in the H.R. 2 and H.R. 1995 bills, they will cover critical issues. One subject of technology debate will be the installation of Internet filters in schools that receive federal technology funding to protect children from pornography and other harmful material online. The *Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act* currently advances comprehensive health education, which has included explicit sex education in the past, and provides grants for schools to prevent so-called "hate crimes." Another title of ESEA called Coordinated Services (Title XI) promotes the turning of schools into social service centers. ESEA is linked throughout its titles to *Goals 2000* and *School-to-Work*, which passed in 1994 just

prior to the last reauthorization of ESEA (September 1994).

These same issues will be debated in the Senate when it considers ESEA as a single piece of legislation. Moderate Sen. Jim Jeffords (R-Vt.), who chairs the Senate education committee, has outlined an ESEA plan that also would introduce new issues of concern to the debate, including a new \$7 billion federal child care program. Sen. Jeffords resists reform ideas, such as the *Academic Achievement for All Act* (Straight "A"s; H.R. 2300/S. 1266), that the House has advanced.

Straight "A"s remains the most significant shift in the debate over ESEA. Straight "A"s would allow a state to opt out of most of the programs under ESEA while retaining the funds to use for state education priorities. Although Sen. Jeffords does not support the Straight "A"s concept, the majority of the Republicans on the Senate committee do support the bill, sponsored by Sen. Slade Gorton (R-Wash.), and are working to make sure it is considered in the Senate ESEA debate.

In the end, the House and Senate are expected to treat Straight "A"s and the entirety of ESEA in one conference committee, appointed to reconcile differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. With such a significant amount of material to consider at that time, it is critical to make sure the details of the bills considered now by the House and Senate are individually as strong as they can be. **WWW**



Sen. Slade Gorton

Bad Seed

Continued from cover

the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. ...

Just as a nation's "head" defines the character and vision of that nation, so an organization's "head" defines the character and vision of that organization. This is a very basic Biblical principle. It is the principle of "legacy." It is the principle of "inheritance." Planned Parenthood is a[n] illustration of this principle. Margaret Sanger's character and vision are perfectly mirrored in the organization ... [a]nd the leaders that have come after her have in no wise attempted to have it another way. ...

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

Thus, virtually everything that she believed, everything that she aspired to, everything that she practiced, and everything that she aimed for is somehow reflected in the organization and program of Planned Parenthood, even today. The frightening thing about Planned Parenthood's historical legacy is that ... it is as current as tomorrow morning's newspaper.

Abortion. In her book *Women and the New Race*, Margaret Sanger asserted that "the most merciful thing a large family can do to one of its infant members is to kill it." ... Today, Planned Parenthood's commitment to that philosophy is self-evident. The organization is the world's number one abortion provider. ... It has made killing infant members of large families its highest priority.

Promiscuity. ... Margaret Sanger was not content to keep her lascivious and concupiscent behavior to herself. She was a

zealous evangelist for free love. ... Today, Planned Parenthood's commitment to undermining the moral values of teens is evident in virtually all its literature. It teaches kids to masturbate. It endorses premarital fornication. It approves of homosexuality. It encourages sexual experimentation. It vilifies Christian values, prohibitions, and consciences.

Greed. ... Sanger and the other Village elitists were revolutionaries only to the extent that Socialism did not conflict with wealth, luxury, and political influence. Today, Planned Parenthood's commitment to the revolution continues to hinge on that unswerving pursuit of 'filthy lucre.' From its dogged preoccupation with government contracts, grants, and bequests, to its commercial ventures, investments, and vocations, its mercenary avariciousness is everywhere apparent.

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

Deceit. Throughout her life, Margaret Sanger developed a rakish and reckless pattern of dishonesty. She twisted the truth about her qualifications as a nurse, about the details of her work, and about the various sordid addictions that controlled her life. ... Today, Planned Parenthood faithfully carries on her tradition of disinformation. The organization continually misrepresents the facts about its lucrative birth control, sex education, and abortion enterprises. Bad seed brings forth bitter harvest. The legacy continues.

© 1998 George Grant.



ON THE HILL



Rep. Jerry Weller



Rep. David McIntosh

Anti-family Tax on its Way Out?

During the first session of the 106th Congress, Family Research Council worked closely with Reps. Jerry Weller (R-Ill.) and David McIntosh (R-Ind.) to advance legislation that would reduce, and eventually eliminate, the marriage tax penalty. Marriage penalty relief remains one of FRC's top legislative priorities for the next congressional session. FRC staff have been meeting with key members of Congress who may introduce marriage tax relief legislation as early as February, in hopes that Congress will have the opportunity to vote by mid-summer on a stand-alone bill that contains only marriage penalty relief. Elimination of the marriage penalty has overwhelming public support so we may see an end to this anti-family tax soon. — SMM

Protect the First Amendment –

RLPA Now! When the Senate returns, it will begin debating the *Religious Liberty Protection Act* (RLPA), which requires states and municipalities to demonstrate a compelling interest (public health or safety) to justify generally applicable laws that substantially burden religious exercise. Senate action follows the House's overwhelming passage of RLPA (306-118) on July 15. RLPA's enactment is long overdue – public school students nationwide are prohibited from wearing crosses and other religious symbols, prisoners' rights to religious worship and expression are denied daily, and zoning boards continue to selectively zone out unpopular religions and home Bible studies. RLPA is a response to a 1990 U.S. Supreme Court ruling that substantially

weakened a religious person's ability to challenge regulations that substantially burden religious exercise. — CMR

Internet Pornography Filters.

A measure requiring all schools and libraries that receive federal funds to install Internet filters has been included in a juvenile crime bill (H.R. 1501) that will likely be addressed this year. Promoting mandated use of Internet filters to protect children from the dangers of pornography remains one of FRC's top legislative priorities. FRC's education policy and legal studies departments are working to insert filters legislation into any relevant portion of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, which is the largest federal education bill expected to be debated this year. — JJW



World Congress of Families II

by Robert G. Morrison

The World Congress of Families II met Nov. 14-17 in Geneva, Switzerland. The gathering brought together delegates from all continents and represented many major religious communities. The purpose of the congress was to draft a declaration affirming the natural human family as “established by the Creator” and necessary for society.

Significantly, the opening session of the congress took place in the Palais des Nations, a U.N. meeting place. The location of this session was symbolic because of the threats posed by the U.N. agenda for the family. U.N. population and development programs have been implicated in forced abortion programs like those of Communist China as well as compulsory sterilization campaigns that

have been waged against the people of India. U.N. conventions, which have the force of law when ratified by the U.S. Senate, pose a clear and present danger to parental rights and U.S. sovereignty.

FRC Vice President Tom Atwood chaired the declaration committee, while senior staff members Bob Maginnis and Bob Morrison gave presentations. Rabbi Daniel Lapin, an Orthodox Jewish leader from Washington state, led the delegates in a closing night program. He moved to adopt the declaration. In a speech strongly reminiscent of Benjamin Franklin’s at the U.S. Constitutional Convention of 1787, he

said there were parts of the declaration he disagreed with, but that it represented the best effort for unity and strength.

Humorously, Rabbi Lapin stated that although he had not done the hard work of drafting, he endorsed the final product. His speech was met with laughter and applause and the final declaration was approved by acclamation.

During the congress, FRC leaders established close contacts with other Christian pro-family organizations in Japan, Europe, Britain, Australia and Canada. Future cooperative efforts are planned to respond to the U.N.’s agenda. [www](http://www.worldcongress.org)



by David M. Wagner, Esq.

Roe v. Wade and the Deformation of Constitutional Law

It is without precedent in U.S. history – or, indeed, in all of history as far as this writer knows: every year, crowds of up to half a million persons gather to protest one particular judicial decision. Many rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court have been controversial, but no other has given rise to such reliable – one might almost say, ritual – protests. That decision, of course, is *Roe v. Wade*, handed down on January 22, 1973.

Roe has had an incalculable impact. Naive supporters of legalized abortion back in the early ‘70s thought legalization would merely accommodate the small number of abortions then being performed. Instead, *Roe* opened the door to millions of abortions, leading to the complete “mainstreaming” of what had once been a (justly) marginalized practice. So complete has this mainstreaming been that, when weighing whether or not to overrule *Roe*, the Supreme Court in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* actually cited the fact that so many people rely on the availability of abortion as a reason for sustaining the *Roe* decision.

Apart from the damage to unborn children and their mothers and fathers is the damage done to constitutional law. In order to reach its result in *Roe*, the Court had to cast aside long-accepted guardrails of constitutional interpretation, namely, text and tradition. First you look at the text; then, if any questions are left, you look at how that text had been understood at the time it was enacted and in subsequent legal history. This methodology, properly applied, would never have led the Court to its conclusion in *Roe*. There is no right to abortion in the Constitution; the very idea would have horrified almost all Americans, both when the Constitution was being ratified between 1787 and 1789, and when the 14th Amendment (which is where the Court *found* the abortion right) was being ratified in 1868. In fact, the citizens of

1868 would probably have found the idea even more noxious than the citizens of 1789, because of advances in the study of early fetal development in those intervening decades.

Yet the right to abort a child is so important to most of our legal academics that, since 1973, *Roe* has been the touchstone for constitutional theory rather than the other way around. Instead of jettisoning *Roe* because it is incompatible with the concept of restraints on judicial power, law professors have mostly chosen to jettison restraints on judicial power because they are incompatible with *Roe*. Several generations of lawyers have now been trained in approaches to constitutional law that were crafted primarily to accommodate *Roe*.

In the 1992 *Casey* decision, the Court reversed some cases that had taken *Roe* even further, but it left *Roe* itself in an even stronger position than before. *Roe* had claimed that the abortion right is based on a constitutional right to privacy; the fact that this right is not mentioned in the Constitution had led to some criticism of *Roe*. In *Casey*, the Court quietly threw privacy aside and pointed to “liberty” as the basis for the abortion right – and “liberty” is in the 14th Amendment. The problem is that the 14th Amendment was intended to make sure states follow proper legal procedures whenever they interfere with liberty (or life or property). Its drafters and those who ratified it could not possibly have had in mind the bizarre, postmodern concept of “liberty” adopted by the Court in *Casey* to wit: “At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.” This definition reflects more of Nietzsche or Sartre than of Madison or Lincoln. Unfortunately, for the time being, it is the last word of our Supreme Court on why there is a constitutional right to abortion. www

Securing the Blessings of Liberty, Starting With Life

by Stephanie M. Mollins

The Year in Review. In 1999 we saw many pro-life victories in the U.S. Congress with the passage of numerous bills by the House and the Senate. The only bill that the House did not take up in 1999 is the *Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act* (S. 1692), which passed the Senate in October, and has passed the House several times in recent years. The House will likely take up the *Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act* by the end of the summer. The Senate will address a number of pro-life items early this year, each of which already passed the House in 1999.

Victory in the House, Now on to the Senate. The *Unborn Victims of Violence Act* (H.R. 2436/S. 1673), is an important step in Congress' public recognition of the humanity and personhood of the unborn child. It recognizes that the unborn child may be a victim of violence in the same way that any other person may be victimized. The *Act* would establish that if an unborn child is injured or killed during the commission of a federal violent crime, the assailant may be charged with a second offense on behalf of the second victim, the unborn child. Twenty-five states already have such measures protecting the unborn from acts of criminal violence. The *Unborn Victims of Violence Act* simply provides that same protection in areas where the federal government has jurisdiction.

The *Child Custody Protection Act* (H.R. 1218/S. 661) would make it a federal offense to knowingly transport a minor female across state lines (by anyone other than her parents) for the purpose of obtaining an abortion and to circumvent her home state's parental involvement laws. This legislation provides some protection for the rights of parents who wish to raise their children as they see fit. Through the enforcement of parental notification and consent laws, families are protected from those who would harm their children's safety and physical and emotional health by evading state laws.

The *Pain Relief Promotion Act* (H.R. 2260/S. 1272) reaffirms doctors and encourages them to use controlled substances to aggressively treat patients' pain and discomfort, while outlawing their use of such drugs to deliberately kill patients. The bill also establishes a program to develop and advance scientific understanding of palliative care, as well as education and training programs at the local, state, and federal levels regarding the use of controlled substances in pain management. Both the National Hospice Organization and the American Medical Association (AMA) have endorsed this important legislation.

President Clinton Angers Pro-abortion Friends. In an appropria-

tions agreement in fall 1999, President Clinton reluctantly signed into law pro-life restrictions on taxpayer funding of overseas "family planning" programs. The agreement represents a major victory for life and is the first time since Clinton became president in 1993 that any pro-life restrictions have been placed on these funds. The agreement, known as the "Mexico City Policy," states that 96 percent of the \$385 million of taxpayer money that funds overseas "family planning" may not go to organizations that promote or perform abortion. As part of the agreement, the president was allowed to waive \$15 million (the remaining four percent) from the pro-life restrictions, which he has already done. In exchange for that waiver, a "penalty" of \$12.5 million of the remaining "family planning" money will go to child survival programs. Pro-abortion leaders have publicly criticized the President for accepting pro-life restrictions.

What Lies Ahead? Congress is likely to consider a number of other important pro-life issues during 2000. We anticipate that congressional committees will hold hearings on the issue of trafficking in the bodies and organs of aborted children, which we wrote about in the December issue of *Washington Watch*. For information on these and other pro-life legislative items, please contact FRC at 1-800-225-4008.



Around TOWN

Fourth Circuit Strikes Down Law Aimed at Barring Religious Activist. For several years, Ms. Rita Warren, 71, has displayed a live-action Nativity display at Christmas and a live Roman centurion guarding a cross at Easter in the grassy area in the middle of the Fairfax County government center. She sits with the display, playing seasonal music from a portable stereo. In 1996, the county rewrote the regulations to exclude use by nonresidents. Ms. Warren is a resident of nearby Fairfax City, which is separate from the county. After losing in federal district court and before a three-judge panel of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Ms. Warren prevailed when the full court reviewed the case in *Warren v. Fairfax County* and held the law to be unconstitutional. The county has decided not to appeal. — JML

Just Say No – Please! Teen-agers 15 years old and younger who have used drugs, even infrequently, are four times likelier to have had sex than those who don't use drugs, according to a study released by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse on December 7. The study illuminated the connection between drug and alcohol use and illicit sex, especially among teens. Researchers noted, "Alcohol-using teens are twice as likely and drug-using teens are three times as likely as those who do not drink or use drugs to have had multiple sexual partners (four or more sex partners)." — MNH

Permission to Copy. The portions of this newsletter which are owned by Family Research Council may be reproduced, without alteration, for non-commercial purposes without prior permission. Portions indicated by the symbol © may not be reproduced. They are owned by other copyright holders. Please contact FRC regarding all other uses.

Notes & Quotes

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

– The Unanimous Declaration Of the Thirteen United States of America, In Congress, July 4, 1776

Life's Blood

Continued from cover

There, in that midwestern classroom, the spark of an idea came to me: Life's Blood. I threw down a challenge to the student. If he would give blood at the campus blood drive, I would return to Washington to promote a blood drive at the Family Research Council. As the blood drive posters remind us: "Every twenty seconds, someone needs blood." In dreadful parallel, because of abortion, every twenty seconds in America, an innocent person's blood is shed.

Family Research Council is going to fulfill its part of the challenge by holding a blood drive in our Washington headquarters January 24, 2000, the day of the March for Life. Members of our staff will donate blood for our neighbors in the District of Columbia. We have been given this precious gift – the very stuff of life – by God and have a unique opportunity to share it.

The impression many Americans have of pro-lifers is not very different from that of that plainspoken student in Michigan. Sometimes, sadly, it is even worse. Some Americans even believe Planned Parenthood's lies that we pro-lifers advocate bombing abortion centers and murdering abortionists.

By donating blood, we may change public opinion. Giving Life's Blood is not just a slogan; it's a way of communicating our beliefs and our hearts' commitment to those around us. The pro-life movement must emphasize education, organization, and legislation, but there are times when a simple gesture can smooth the roughest paths.

When the Promise Keepers came to Washington in 1997, teams of Christian men came in early to clean up and help repair dilapidated schools. Even liberal columnists saw that PK was something different and many conceded as much in their columns.

This year, as we observe the 27th anniversary of the infamous *Roe v. Wade* decision, we know that this act of "raw judicial power" has given us abortion on demand in our country. We also know that innocent blood has been shed in this land for nearly three decades. When we roll up our sleeves to give blood for our neighbors' sake, we are doing what we have been commanded to do and that is in the best traditions of America. We give our Life's Blood because He first shed His blood for us. **WWW**



The Christ of Politics

by Janet M. LaRue, Esq.

During the presidential debate in Iowa in December, candidates were asked "what political philosopher or thinker do you most identify with and why?" One said, "Christ, because he changed my heart. When you turn your heart and your life over to Christ, when you accept Christ as the Savior, it changes your heart. It changes your life. And that's what happened to me."¹

Would I have said that on national television in that context? How could Christ be considered a "political philosopher" when He said, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36)?

"Political" relates to the conduct and policy of government. A "philosopher" is one who expounds a theory in a particular area of experience. Rousseau described the work of the legislator:

In order to discover the rules of society best suited to nations, a superior intelligence beholding all the passions of men without experiencing any of them would be needed. This intelligence would have to be wholly unrelated to our nature, while knowing it through and through; its happiness would have to be independent of us, and yet ready to occupy itself with ours; and lastly, it would have, in the march of time, to look forward to a distant glory, and, working in one century, to be able to enjoy in the next. It would take gods to give men laws.²

In celebrating Christ's birth, we are reminded "the government will rest on His shoulders. ... There will be no end to the increase of His government or of peace" (Isaiah 9:6). The Apostle Paul informed the political and religious philosophers on Mars Hill that Christ was relevant to Athens because He is God over all nations: "He made from one, every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed times, and the boundaries of their habitation, that they should seek God...because He has fixed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness through a Man whom He has appointed, having furnished proof to all men by raising Him from the dead" (Acts 17:26-27, 30-31). Although the United States is not a theocracy there is no wall that will separate the state from Christ's judgment.

Another candidate explained the relevance of Christ's teaching in the political realm: "I was hungry and you fed me, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me. Christ, with those words, taught all of us about our obligations to each other, to the unborn child, to those living in poverty, the need for us to be together regardless of the color of our skin."³

We Christians should take every opportunity to influence the current political philosophy through our work and our words. Whether these candidates spoke "from pure motives" or merely "selfish ambition," we can say with the Apostle, "Christ is proclaimed, and in this I rejoice, yes, and I will rejoice" (Philippians 1:17-18). With God's help, we must all proclaim Him. **WWW**

¹ Federal Document Clearing House, Inc., FDCH Political Transcripts, Dec. 13, 1999, p. 34.

² J.-J. Rousseau, *Contrat Social*, Bk. 2, ch.7.

³ See note 1, p. 36.



A Videotape into the Heart

by Janet Parshall



The videotape shows Eric Harris sitting in a chair with a bottle of Jack Daniels and a sawed-off shotgun he's named Arlene. Dylan Klebold, his friend and soon to be co-murderer, sits next to him declaring that they are "not trying to copy anyone." Were they really original in their thinking, and even more tragically, in their actions? I think not.

Eric and Dylan were consumed by hatred for a great number of people: blacks, Hispanics, Jews, homosexuals and Christians. In the videotape, Dylan says, "I hope we kill 250 of you." As the mother of four precious and irreplaceable children, I long to know where that kind of hate originates and how to prevent it from taking root in my children's hearts. Was the hate passed down from the parents? Did they get it from the video games they played and the movies they watched? One of their favorite movies was *Reservoir Dogs*, a film that is filled with violence ... and pretend bullets. The bullets Eric and Dylan used were far from pretend. Their rampage left 15 dead, including themselves.

Perhaps most disturbing about the videotapes is the recognition that "out

of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks." Eric and Dylan had hearts filled with rage and hurt. Eric said, "We're going to kick-start a revolution." He noted that people would fall for every lie he told. He said, "I can make you believe anything." But both boys were wrong about starting a revolution. The revolution had already begun. It is a revolt against transcendent truth, the universal belief in a code of right and wrong.

The videotape shows Eric quoting Shakespeare. He recites part of *The Tempest* with the words, "Good wombs hath borne bad sons." Is the Bard right? Are we powerless to help or guide our children? I believe that we have the humbling opportunity and obligation to raise our children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." We have a Biblical mandate to teach our children about Truth when we "sit in our houses and when we walk along the road and when we lie down and when we rise up."

The older I get, the more I realize that what is required of me as a parent, cannot be done *in absentia*. I must intentionally choose to be involved in my children's lives. I must be bold in sharing my values with them. It is imperative that I let them know what I believe and why I believe it. I must model those values in my own life. Values, after all, are caught *not* taught. It is my responsibility to know what they are listening to, what they are

watching, and who their friends are. Eric loaned a girl an album shortly before the killings entitled *Bombthreat Before She blows*. Was he sending a message that no one heard or paid attention to?

What makes the difference between an Eric Harris and a Cassie Bernall? Both lost their lives on that April day in Littleton, Colo., but the two died in very different ways. One left this dusty planet angry and alone and the other ended her journey knowing exactly where she was going. Cassie had parents who dared to tell her that there was certain music she could not listen to and certain friends that were off limits. They, in essence, stepped into the life of their daughter and directed her on a path that would preserve and protect her. When the cold barrel of a gun was pressed against her temple, Cassie did not flinch or retreat when asked if she believed in God.

My heart grieves for the families of all those who lost a child at Columbine High School. The lesson I have learned from Columbine is that I must choose to build into my children the knowledge of right and wrong and listen to them not only with my ears but also with my heart. Most important of all, I must introduce them to the One who loves them more than I ever could. I may not be able to change the world, but with God's help, I must try to guide the hearts of my children. **WWW**



Don't Ask, Don't Tell – Must Go

by Maj. George T. Havrilak, USAF-Ret'd.

The pro-homosexuality policy *Don't Ask, Don't Tell* that the Clinton administration crafted in 1994 to circumvent a 1993 law that banned homosexuals in the military, may finally be unraveling. The danger is that unless the emerging public debate is properly focused, homosexual activists may succeed in convincing Congress to repeal the ban on homosexuals in the military.

FRC holds the position that the policy is a dishonorable compromise between the Clinton administration, which supports the homosexual agenda, and Congress, which codified the military's ban on homosexuals. The policy permits homosexuals to serve as long as they do not identify themselves, and it pre-

vents the military from asking recruits whether they are homosexuals. If, however, it becomes known that a service member is homosexual, he or she is released from service.

The problem with the Clinton policy is that it perpetuates a lie that can have deadly consequences. It may lead homosexual individuals to erroneously believe the military condones them and their behavior. When they find out the truth on active duty, they then may perpetuate the lie by hiding their behavior from discovery. Alternatively, they may announce their behavior and be released from service. If they choose to remain on active duty, they may become targets of verbal or physical harassment.

The solution is to rescind the 1994 *Don't Ask, Don't Tell* policy and to revert to the 1993 law that bans homosexuals in the military. Then the armed services must revisit the question of how to implement the law. **WWW**