



## Race and the Culture of Death Videos Reveal the Dark Underbelly of the Abortion Industry

The recent release of a series of undercover videos by the Center for Medical Progress revealing Planned Parenthood officials and doctors negotiating the selling of organs from aborted babies sent shock waves through the media and the general public. This renewed the call from the pro-life movement and Republicans to end federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

The release of the third video in late July proved exceptionally damaging. This video showed Savita Gende, a Planned Parenthood official in Colorado, negotiating with someone posing as a buyer of fetal tissue. Dr. Gende is on film saying, “I think a per-item thing works a little better; just because we can see how much we can get out of it.” The third video revisited a clip from the first video, in which Dr. Deborah Nucatola, a Planned Parenthood official, declares, “I think for affiliates, at the end of the day, they’re nonprofit, they just don’t want to—they want to break even. And if they can do a little better than break even, and do so in a way that seems reasonable, they’re happy to do so.”

### Planned Parenthood’s Unsavory Roots

As the controversy over Planned Parenthood selling body parts to companies such as StemExpress (which subsequently canceled its contract with Planned Parenthood) heated up, the Internet sprouted discussions about Planned Parenthood, its origins and its history. Much of this discussion focused on Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood and an advocate of eugenics, the “science” of race betterment. Dr. Ben Carson, a black neurosurgeon running for the Republican presidential nomination, told Fox News in August, “Maybe I am not objective when it comes to Planned Parenthood, but, you know, I know who Margaret Sanger is, and I know that she believed in eugenics, and that she was not particularly enamored with black people.”

Planned Parenthood’s response to the videos was swift. In a manner typical of leftist counter-messaging, they first attacked the messenger by charging that the Center for Medical Progress had been out to get Planned Parenthood for a long time. Planned Parenthood spokeswomen claimed that the videos were highly edited. The problem was that the videos, however edited and whatever the motivation of those who filmed them, showed Planned Parenthood officials on film not only negotiating prices but behaving like, well, callous monsters. Chomping on salads at lunch, sipping wine, smirking and talking about getting the best price for baby parts was hard to cover up, even for an organization as skillful at public relations as they are.

### A Lame Defense

In the end, Planned Parenthood brought in a high-profile crisis communications firm, SKDknickerbocker, to launch a public relations counteroffensive. The star of this firm is former Obama communications staffer Anita Dunn, who herself had been caught on film giving a speech extolling the political philosophy of communist revolutionary Mao Zedong. (Nobody in Planned Parenthood saw the irony of hiring a PR firm whose communication director is an apologist for Mao, the dictator who killed millions of people through communist social engineering.) The SKDknickerbocker firm prides itself on its brass-knuckles approach to public relations. Its website boasts that the firm will create a “war room” to “quickly help create the most effective messaging.”

The firm responded quickly to their new client Planned Parenthood’s needs. They sent letters to reporters and producers warning them that undercover sting videos violate the privacy of patients. “Those patients’ privacy,” the letters contended, “should not be further violated by having this footage shared by the media” (<http://www.breitbart.com/big->

journalist/2015/07/28). It seemed beside the point that the undercover videos had not filmed any patient, but had filmed only officials from Planned Parenthood. Once again, the pro-abortionists turned to “privacy” as a legal defense.

Allies of Planned Parenthood came to the defense of the organization. Their response was not part of the SKDknickerbocker campaign but emerged instinctively. Hillary Clinton, the leading Democratic presidential contender who was having Internet problems of her own, did not need a computer-generated program to tell a crowd at a community college in Greenville, South Carolina, where she was campaigning, “For more than a century, Planned Parenthood has provided essential services for women. And I think it is unfortunate that Planned Parenthood has been the object of such a concerted attack for so many years. And it’s really an attack against a woman’s right to choose” (<http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/hillary-clinton-defends-embattled-planned-parenthood-n397476>).

Hillary Clinton’s defense of Planned Parenthood was Hillary *par excellence*. Avoid the issue, but suggest that there was a conspiracy afoot. Remember her explanation of why Hillarycare had failed in the 1990s under her husband’s presidency: A “vast right-wing conspiracy” had defeated her plan to nationalize health care.

### Sanger Urged ‘Race Betterment’

Still, apologists for Planned Parenthood needed to figure out how to spin their founder Margaret Sanger’s support for eugenics—“race betterment”—in the 1920s. Susan Reverby, an historian at Wellesley College, offered a defense of Sanger in an interview that appeared on National Public Radio (NPR) in August. She told NPR, “That Sanger was enamored and supported some eugenicists’ ideas is certainly true,” but she argued that Sanger was not really about eugenics because “Sanger thought people should have the children they wanted.” NPR pointed out that Sanger had worked closely with W.E.B. DuBois on a “Negro Project,” which she viewed as a way to get safe contraception to African Americans.

NPR did not disclose that DuBois himself was an elitist. In 1903, he wrote, “The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races” (<http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/>

the-talented-tenth/). DuBois was not a eugenicist, but that he spoke the same language of race betterment as did eugenicists.

NPR pointed out that eugenics became integral to Progressives at the turn of the 20th century, as if supporting measures such as birth control and forced sterilization was excusable because such measures were being promoted by Progressive reformers. But did birth control and sterilization programs target poor blacks in particular? When asked by NPR if this was the case, Reverby responded, “Was there overuse of birth control and sterilization in poor communities in some states? Absolutely. It’s a complicated story.”

Contrary to Reverby, the story is not that complicated. Birth control and sterilization programs, first on the state level and later on the federal level, targeted poor and black communities. Whether Sanger’s advocacy of eugenics was her sole motivation or not, or whether she later denounced Nazis in the 1930s, is really beside the point. Her articles and books are full of eugenic arguments.

### ‘Rising Stream of the Unfit’

Sanger’s eugenic views, which can be found in her writings, are best summarized in her essay “Birth Control and Racial Betterment,” published in *Birth Control Review* in February 1919. She begins her essay declaring, “Before eugenicists and others who are laboring for racial betterment can succeed, they must first clear the way for Birth Control. Like advocates of Birth Control, the eugenicists, for instance, are seeking to assist the race toward the elimination of the unfit. Both are seeking a single end but they lay emphasis upon different methods.” She is clear that both proponents of birth control and eugenic reformers share a common goal: racial betterment.

She continues in her essay, “While I personally believe in the sterilization of the feeble-minded, the insane, and syphilitic, I have not been able to discover that these measures are more than superficial deterrents when applied to the constantly growing stream of the unfit.” She adds, just so her readers are clear on her views, “They [sterilization measures] are an excellent means of meeting a certain phase of the situation, but I believe in regard to these as in regard to other eugenic means, they do not go to the bottom of the matter.” She explains, “Neither the mating of healthy couples nor the sterilization of certain recognized types of the unfit touches the great problem of unlimited reproduction whose housing, clothing, and food are all inadequate to physical and mental health.”

In the essay, she explores the relationship between eugenics and birth control, and how the two movements are compatible. She argues that birth control “not only opens the way for the eugenicist, but it preserves his [sic] work . . . . Birth control of itself, by freeing the reproductive instinct from its present chains, will make a better race . . . . The situation is too plain for argument.” Assured of her position, she provides concrete examples of how eugenic reform and birth control can work hand-in-hand. She points to programs in Holland, where birth control was being taught in clinics by trained nurses. The results of this work show that in Holland, because of birth control clinics, “The average stature of men has increased four inches in thirty years. Ninety percent of the men were fit for army service, while in the United States, 50 percent were.” She concludes that eugenics without birth control will be “a house builded [sic] upon the sands. It is at the mercy of the rising stream of the unfit.”

Her 1983 autobiography describes how warmly her speech was received by a female chapter of the Ku Klux Klan in Georgia in 1926 (Sanger, *An Autobiography*, p. 366). Interestingly, this page is missing in the digital copy on Google Books.

### Population Control of the Poor

Nazis gave eugenics a bad name. Witnessing the horrors brought about Nazi eugenic programs, which began with sterilization, then proceeded to the killing of the mentally disabled and eventually the genocide of Jews, gypsies and Slavs, American eugenicists distanced themselves from the Nazis. This was a genuine and heartfelt response. American advocates of eugenics were not advocating mass extermination programs. Lobbying for immigration quotas and state laws to sterilize the mentally ill, mentally challenged and criminally insane was not the same as advocating genocide.

After World War II, the American Eugenics Society changed its name. Those who spoke of bettering the human race now talked in terms of “positive” eugenic measures, such as sterilization and abortion of defective children and the need for genetic research to reduce defective genes.

In the postwar period, the birth control and abortion movement brought together population control, assisted suicide and feminism to promote federal and international programs. These forces found expression in the Planned Parenthood Federation of America and International Planned Parenthood, as well as in John D. Rockefeller III’s Population

Council. What these activists shared was an elitist impulse for social engineering. Were they explicitly racist? No, but their programs were aimed at the poor, who were largely African Americans, Native Americans and Hispanics. In the late 1960s, federal family planning, including contraceptive and sterilization programs, run through the Community Action Program, specifically targeted poor black communities. Shocking verification of targeting poor blacks came when it was revealed that a Community Action Program funded by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare sterilized two young sisters, Minnie Relf, 12, and Mary Relf, 14. (Donald T. Critchlow, *Intended Consequences: Birth Control, Abortion and Federal Family Planning* (1999).)

Internationally, these programs targeted poor Asians and Africans. Columbia University historian Matthew Connelly, although “pro-choice,” details in *Fatal Misconception* (2008) how United Nations and U.S. international programs forced tens of thousands of Indian and Southeast Asian peasants to undergo sterilization. These domestic and international advocates saw birth control and abortion as a means of reducing poverty, starvation and war. They developed social justice rhetoric and discovered that using the rhetoric of choice was particularly effective.

### Roe Lawyer’s Links to Social Engineers

Sarah Weddington, who argued the *Roe v. Wade* abortion case before the Supreme Court in 1971, illustrates how different motivations of these social engineers combined into the “pro-choice” cause. As a law student at the University of Texas, she was a New Left feminist activist in Austin. Her political associates in Austin published an underground newspaper, the *Rag*, which warned in articles of impending famine and economic crisis caused by rampant population growth.

Weddington’s husband, Ron, whom she would divorce shortly before her Supreme Court appearance, was a population-control fanatic as well. During the debate over the release of the morning-after abortion drug RU-486 in the 1990s, he wrote to Betsey Wright, Bill Clinton’s director of public outreach, in support of the new pill. He urged, “You can start immediately to eliminate the barely educated, unhealthy, and poor segment of our country.” He went on to assure Wright, “No, I’m not advocating some sort of mass extinction of these uninformed people. Crime, drugs, and disease are already doing that. The problem is that their numbers are not only replaced but increased by the birth of millions of babies to people who can’t afford to have babies.” He continued, “There, I’ve said it. It’s what we all know is true, but we only whisper it,

because as liberals we believe in individual rights, we view any program which might treat the disadvantaged differently as discriminatory, mean spirited..." (<http://judicialwatch.org>, "The Clinton RU-486 Files").

Although divorced, Weddington remained friends with her former husband. Perhaps he did not speak for Weddington herself, but in crafting the argument for *Roe*, Weddington worked closely with Roy Lucas, a New York attorney and president of the James Madison Constitutional Law Institute, Harriet Pilpel of Planned Parenthood, a population control advocate, and Nick Danforth, director of the Population Law Center, who after *Roe* went to work for the U.S. Agency for International Development organizing population-control programs. Another member of the team was Yale law student David Tunderman, who studied the links between environmental problems and overpopulation.

Weddington's associates show the deep connections between feminism, the pro-abortion movement, population control, and the environmental movement. The connections are apparent in the overlapping boards and donor bases within the movements' organizations, which encompassed advocacy for euthanasia as well. Canadian historian Ian Dowbiggin, in *A Merciful End: The Euthanasia Movement in Modern*

**WILL** you remember the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation in your Will? If you care to help us to continue our work, we would be most grateful! Our legal name is: Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation.

The Mindszenty Report is published monthly by  
Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation  
7800 Bonhomme Ave.  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
Phone 314-727-6279 Fax 314-727-5897

Subscription rate: \$25 per year  
Outside the U.S.A. \$35

The Mindszenty Report is not copyrighted, and subscribers are invited to have it printed in their local newspapers.

Contributions to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation are tax deductible as allowed by law.

Eleanor Schlafly, *Publisher*  
e-mail: [info@mindszenty.org](mailto:info@mindszenty.org)  
web site: [www.mindszenty.org](http://www.mindszenty.org)  
orders.inquiries@mindszenty.org

*America*, published by Oxford University Press in 2003, details these direct connections.

Are the advocates of birth control, abortion, population control—or earlier, the eugenics movement—racists? Not overtly. Yet behind the rhetoric of individual choice, privacy, women's health and social justice are programs that aim at reducing poverty by reducing the number of poor and people of color.

What drives advocates of abortion, such as the supporters of Planned Parenthood, is an elitist impulse for social engineering. This impulse has led to crass profiteering from the selling of baby organs (so-called "fetal tissue") so that the next step in social engineering, the most ambitious of all—genetic engineering—can be undertaken. This is all done in the name of science and progress and, yes, profit, but in the end our culture suffers and babies die.

**EAGLE COUNCIL XLIV  
EAGLE FORUM'S 44th ANNUAL  
LEADERSHIP COUNCIL**

Friday, Saturday, Sunday — September 11-13, 2015

St. Louis Airport Marriott Hotel

10700 Pear Tree Lane, Saint Louis, Missouri 63134

**(314) 423-9700 or toll-free (877) 264-8771**

Ann Coulter will be the Friday dinner keynote speaker.

## Mindszenty Report Reprints

**PUTINISM AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER.** Under its authoritarian leader Vladimir Putin, Russia has left communism behind in favor of an anti-American, anti-democratic nationalism allied with the Russian Orthodox Church. The nuclear-armed Russia continues to pose a threat to its European neighbors and to its internal dissidents. Ask for 8/15

**WHAT'S WRONG WITH TODAY'S UNIVERSITIES?** U.S. higher education engages in Orwellian speech control to promote left-wing ideology. Donors should demand better results for their money. Ask for 7/15

**STEADY PROGRESS IN COUNTERING THE EVIL OF ABORTION.** Valiant work by pro-life activists, advances in medical imaging of unborn babies, and incremental legislation in the last few years have changed public attitudes toward abortion in the U.S. Ask for 6/15