

THE FAMILY DEFENSE HANDBOOK
5TH EDITION—EXPANDED, UPDATED AND REVISED

STAND
For
the **FAMILY**

Alarming evidence and firsthand accounts
from the front lines of the battle

**A call to responsible
citizens everywhere**

by Sharon Slater
President, Family Watch International

Stand for the Family
By Sharon Slater

Copyright © 2010 Sharon Slater

Copyright, 5th edition, © 2016 Sharon Slater

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the author, Sharon Slater.

Visit us at www.familywatchinternational.org

480.507.2664

fwi@familywatchinternational.org

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Slater, Sharon.

Stand for the family : alarming evidence and firsthand accounts from the front lines of the battle : a call to responsible citizens everywhere / Sharon Slater. -- Gilbert, Ariz. : Ingelstone Publishing, c2009.

p. ; cm.

ISBN: 978-0-9778814-9-9

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Family policy.
2. Families--Sociological aspects.
3. Marriage.
4. Same-sex marriage.
5. Homosexuality.
6. Abortion. I. Title.

HQ519 .S53 2009
306.8/5--dc22

0908

Editing: Cecily Markland

Cover photo: Helen Robson, www.CapturedMiracles.org

Cover layout and design: Leslie Thompson

Book layout and design: Janalee Cox, Legend eXpress Publishing,
www.legendexpress.biz

Fifth Edition

Updated January 2016

Printed in the United States of America

Ingelstone Publishing, Litchfield Park, Arizona



About the Author

Sharon Slater has dedicated nearly two decades of her life to defending marriage, family and life. Whether in a remote village in Africa, addressing 1.5 million people at a pro-marriage rally in Spain, or opposing challenges to family values in the United States, Canada or at the United Nations, Sharon is an internationally recognized leader in the effort to protect and promote the family and family values at the international, national and local level.



In 1999, Sharon co-founded Family Watch International (FWI), a nonprofit organization in consultative status with the United Nations, and she currently serves as its president. Among other activities, Sharon writes a biweekly column for *The Family Watch* a free e-newsletter with readers in over 160 countries around the world.

Sharon's extensive involvement in international adoption issues, including her own efforts to adopt three Mozambican AIDS orphans, also led her to develop FWI's Families For Orphans project. She has also been active in defending marriage and the family in her local community and was selected to represent American Mothers, Inc., as the 2007 Arizona Mother of the Year.

In all of her activities to protect the family, Sharon, along with her husband Greg, has worked as an unpaid volunteer. She has assigned all proceeds from this book to Family Watch International or its affiliates to support efforts to defend the family and family values.

Sharon holds a Bachelors degree in Family Sciences. Before becoming involved in family issues, Sharon was a certified interpreter for the deaf and an instructor of American Sign Language at the university level. She also is fluent in Spanish and Portuguese.

Sharon and her husband Greg are the parents of seven children, four biological and three orphan siblings from Mozambique whose parents died of AIDS. She and her family reside in Gilbert, Arizona.



Bulk Order Discounts on *Stand for the Family!*

This, the fifth edition of *Stand for the Family*, has been expanded, updated and extensively revised. Far and away, by a huge margin, the most common comment we hear from readers is that they feel an urgent need to share the information with their family and friends. To make this easier, we have established our Family to Family program, whereby you can purchase five or more books for only \$10 each with further discounts depending on how many you purchase. To take advantage of this special offer and to purchase books to share today, please go to www.standforthefamily.org

Table of Contents

Introduction	vii
1. Witnessing the Assault at the International Level.....	1
2. Deceptive Tactics.....	13
3. The Case for the Traditional Family Structure	29
4. The Sexual Rights Movement.....	55
5. Debunking Common Arguments Used to Advance Homosexual Rights ..	77
6. The Assault on Motherhood.....	101
7. The Assault on Life	117
8. The Assault on Parental Rights	137
9. The Assault on Our Children’s Sexuality	155
10. Who Could be Against the Traditional Family and Why?.....	173
11. The Assault on Gender	189
12. Defending Traditional Marriage	229
13. Pornography’s Assault on the Family	245
14. The Assault on Religion	267
15. Ten Key Strategies Used by Sexual Rights Activists	285
16. Immunizing Your Family Against the Assaults.....	295
17. Will You Stand for the Family?.....	303
Appendices:	
About Family Watch International	307
The “I Stand For the Family” Petition	319

Chapter 1

Witnessing the Assault at the International Level

“*Who are you?*” the United Nations delegate urgently asked me. My heart was beating fast as she dragged me into the hall during a brief break in an intense UN negotiating session in Geneva, Switzerland.

Who was I? I was a full-time mom. But somehow I had managed to help this UN delegate support her pro-family position during heated negotiations.

That UN conference was one of the pivotal points in my life. At the time, I was a typical stay-at-home mom with all the trimmings—carpooling, soccer games, a busy husband, and four active children, the youngest just entering kindergarten. I had never been actively involved in a cause and didn’t even like to get a babysitter for an afternoon, let alone to travel across the world to a United Nations conference.

Yet, at that UN meeting, I came face to face with disturbing events that would change the course of my life. There, I had my first glimpse of the calculated, organized, worldwide assault on the family and witnessed for myself destructive forces that are affecting our nation and the world as a whole.

So how did I end up at a UN conference in the first place? In 1999 my husband Greg received an e-mail from

his former law professor describing an experience he had in defending the family at the UN. The account had a powerful impact on both my husband and me. We wanted to learn more, so we attended a World Congress of Families² in Geneva, Switzerland. A World Congress (not to be confused with a UN conference) brings together government, religious and community leaders; scholars; experts in family issues; and concerned citizens who are working to preserve the family around the world.



At that UN meeting, I had my first glimpse of the calculated, organized, worldwide assault on the family.



²The World Congress of Families (WCF) is a biennial conference chaired by Dr. Allan Carlson of the Howard Center for Family, Religion and Society. (See www.worldcongress.org.)

Although several speakers at the World Congress described the attacks on the family that occurred at the UN, I still found this hard to believe. I had never been exposed to anyone who was actually trying to undermine the family. I wondered why anyone would be against the traditional family. Little did I know that I would soon have the chance to see for myself just who and what was working against all I hold dear.

My First UN Experience

A few months later, I was invited by a friend to attend my first United Nations conference, also held in Geneva.³ There, we quickly found ourselves surrounded by people seeking to undermine the family.

Much of the opposition to the family was initiated by the “radical feminists” and other special interest groups in attendance, representing nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)⁴ from all over the world.

By radical feminists I do not mean women who are working to further the legitimate rights of women. I mean women who espouse a militant, anti-patriarchal ideology that all men oppress women and who work to legalize abortion and to promote lesbian, transgender and homosexual rights, among other things.

These NGO representatives were working closely with the majority of the UN member states, intent on ensuring that the document to be negotiated would promote their anti-family views. I was appalled by their tactics.

I was especially surprised to see my own country, the United States, leading the charge to promote policies harmful to the family. I wondered if anyone on Capitol Hill knew what the U.S. delegates at the UN were doing. I was certain the majority of the people in the United States had no idea.

At the opening session, the chairperson announced that the UN delegates would be negotiating various segments of the conference document simultaneously in different rooms. This immediately put poor nations at a disadvantage as many did not have enough delegates to

³This conference was a regional preparatory meeting, part of the five-year review of the progress made on the UN Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action from the Fourth World Conference on Women, originally held in September 1995. This five-year review also is known as Beijing +5.

⁴There are more than 3,000 NGOs in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. These UN-accredited NGOs are essentially special interest groups that are authorized to participate in UN conferences and they greatly influence the goals, policies and programs of the UN. Out of the more than 3,000 UN-accredited NGOs, only about 20 work together in a small coalition to try to protect the family; and, of those 20, only a small number regularly participate in UN conferences.

send to each room. It is the developing nations that usually support pro-family positions at the UN, so it seemed this was a calculated move by the conference planners.

My friend and I recognized a man we had seen at the World Congress of Families, and we introduced ourselves to him. Fortunately, he was a veteran pro-family lobbyist. He asked me to monitor negotiations that were being held in a small room.

NGO representatives and UN delegates alike crowded around a small table trying to listen and to get close enough to grab one of the few copies of the document⁵ as it was passed out. Incredibly, some official UN delegates even found it difficult to obtain a copy of the very document their country was supposed to be negotiating.

There were no translators and, since the negotiations were conducted in English, those who had a good command of English had a major advantage. This meant people from the United States, Canada, and fluent English speakers from the European Union dominated the proceedings.

There was standing room only. Since the bag I was carrying was heavy and bulky, I set it down in the corner and moved toward the front so I could hear. Some UN delegates also had to remain standing even though NGO representatives, who are supposed to be observers, had prominent places at the table. One NGO representative proceeded to present her feminist “wish list” of proposed amendments to the document. It seemed that the feminist NGO representatives were running the show, and it was difficult to distinguish between them and the UN government delegates.

I had been instructed by the more experienced pro-family lobbyist to note which delegates made comments favorable to pro-family positions. My page remained blank. It appeared there wasn’t a single pro-family delegate in the room.

Instead, I heard outrageous demands. Many of the radical ideas discussed in an earlier women’s caucus meeting were being proposed for inclusion in the document. (See examples of the feminist agenda pushed at this conference in Chapter 6, “The Assault on Motherhood.”) I was shocked that these controversial ideas were even being considered for

⁵ Each year the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations holds conferences on social issues. The goal at these UN conferences is to produce an influential resolution or, on occasion, a binding treaty on the topic of the meeting. Every sentence of every paragraph is discussed and negotiated word by word until “consensus” is reached and an outcome document is adopted that member states agree to implement.

inclusion in a UN document and found it hard to believe that not even the U.S. representative was opposing them.

Finally, a woman across the room raised her hand and meekly requested that respect for “religious” diversity be added to the document.

Her suggestion sounded benign, so I was surprised when all the delegates—including the delegate from the United States—strongly opposed it. The other delegates actually laughed at her and condescendingly remarked that it was neither necessary nor appropriate to include respect for religion in the document.

At the time, I didn’t know that “respect for religious and cultural values” is one of the most controversial phrases in UN negotiations. This is because the radical feminist agenda runs directly counter to all of the world’s major religions, and if countries are required to respect religious values, the feminists cannot force their agenda on the world.

Radical feminists see religion—and particularly denominations they consider “patriarchal”—as the major barrier to women’s “empowerment.” In other words, this was a very significant addition.

The delegate, trying to defend her proposal, insisted that respect for religion was already included in several other UN documents and the other delegates challenged her to prove it. The delegate’s English skills were limited, so she fumbled and stuttered.

I started shaking. I realized that in my bag in the far corner of the

I realized that in my bag in the far corner of the room I had the very tool that would help this delegate defend her position.

room I had the very tool that would help this delegate defend her position. My bag contained a small language guide⁶ that identified UN consensus language in favor of the family from previously negotiated UN documents. The section on religion contained the exact citations this delegate needed to support her position.

Could I possibly squeeze my way over to the corner where my bag was, find the language guide with the citations, and hand it to the delegate before I was thrown out?

⁶Roylance, S. *A Guide for Language Supportive of the Natural Family in the Six Core International Treaties and the Seven Major UN Conference Documents*. (1999). South Jordan, UT: Worldwide Organization of Women & United Families International.

Nervously, while everyone in the room was distracted with the tension of the argument, I made my way through the tightly packed room back to my bag, found the guide, and opened it to the right page. Though I could tell those around me were becoming annoyed, I squeezed back through the crowd, made my way over to the brave delegate, and stood behind her. My heart was pounding. I wasn't sure that UN protocol allowed me to hand her information during negotiations. I waited until attention was diverted from her for a moment, discreetly placed the booklet into her hands, and pointed to the references on religion. Because she was flustered and didn't know who I was or what I was handing her, at first she didn't even look at it. The argument continued.

After what seemed like forever, the delegate suddenly realized that I had handed her just what she needed. She quickly raised her hand, announcing that she had found the citations.

After the delegate read them to the group, the chairman announced, "The Beijing Platform! You must find precedence for your suggestion in the Beijing Platform for Action, as that is the document we are reviewing."

At no point had the chairperson asked anyone else to similarly support their amendments. The delegate's face fell. How could I help her now? I then remembered that the night before, when I had stayed up late studying a copy of the Beijing Platform, I had underlined and starred the references to religion.

Could I squeeze back through the crowd to my bag again? I had already been the recipient of several hostile looks, and I needed to make sure I wasn't too obvious. The room was warm, and someone had just opened a window, so I acted as if I needed to get some air and made my way to the window. Then slowly, I pushed my way around the perimeter of the room until I reached my bag and found the needed references.

In the meantime, someone had handed the delegate a thick booklet containing the Beijing Platform, and she was frantically trying to find a reference to religion. I made my way back over to her, handed her my booklet with the underlined references, and told her it was the Beijing Platform. She looked very stressed and nervous, and I felt exactly the same. Because I was unsure of the UN rules for NGOs, I was worried I might do something out of order and get thrown out.

She raised her hand and exclaimed that she had found the Beijing references and then asked for permission to leave the room to consult. She

then pulled me into the hallway, introduced herself as the delegate from the Holy See (that is, the Vatican, which has observer status at the UN), and asked, “Who are you?”

I was a nobody by UN standards. However, I just happened to be in the right place at the right time with the right tool to help a UN delegate support her pro-family position during intense UN negotiations. The whole experience was quite surreal.

I just happened to be in the right place at the right time with the right tool to help a UN delegate.

The delegate explained that it was difficult for her to follow the arguments as she was new to the UN and her English skills were limited. Using the Beijing Platform and my UN language guide,

she and I discussed possible rebuttals to the arguments being presented.

It was a life-changing experience to be an eyewitness to what occurred and to see that someone as inexperienced as I could actually play an active role in influencing UN negotiations.

Peer Pressure Impacts Negotiations

After that experience, I joined my friend in another room to witness negotiations calling for a worldwide repeal of all laws against homosexual acts. The tension in the room was almost palpable. Again, the organizers had chosen a small room, and people were standing wall to wall.

Among those standing was the Vatican delegate I had helped earlier. I tried to get inside the room so I could send her a friendly look to give her some moral support, but the room was too crowded. She had been standing through several hours of exhausting negotiations, and she looked totally frazzled. She was being pressured by all the countries represented in the room to agree to the homosexual provision.

She had firmly held her ground to that point, but since these negotiations required consensus⁷, the entire room was pressuring her to cave in.

⁷Consensus at the UN is generally defined as the absence of a formal objection. If one or more UN member states speaks up and refuses to accept a provision under negotiation, they can usually prevent it from being adopted. However, there is tremendous pressure put on delegates during negotiations to not hold up consensus. Often delegates who are opposed to a provision that the majority of countries are in favor of are pressured into entering a reservation to that provision, stating their country will not be bound by it. They can also issue a statement clarifying their interpretation of provisions in a negotiated document.

The pressure against her intensified until, finally, she left the room to call her superior on her cell phone. She then charged back into the room and interrupted the proceedings. With all eyes on her, she announced that the Vatican was withdrawing its opposition to the homosexual provision.

I was stunned. I wondered how a representative of the Vatican could have caved on an issue so important to the Catholic faith.

The room erupted with cheering and clapping, and there was an air of jubilation as they thanked her. The opposition had won! They did not even continue to negotiate the last few paragraphs of the document because they now had what they really wanted. It seemed that the whole conference had been organized to pass that one phrase.

The Vatican delegate later told us that her superior had decided it was not worth the struggle because these were just preliminary negotiations. She said the homosexual provision would be taken up in later negotiations in New York where they would have more support from other delegations not present at this regional meeting.

I did not fully understand, but I commended the delegate for her efforts and tried not to show my disappointment. She looked relieved that it was over and thanked us for our support. She said it made a big difference to see us there. She said just knowing that she was not alone filled her with peace. She apparently held out as long as she did because of the support she felt from us.

It was unbelievable to me that peer pressure and intimidation could play such a crucial role in UN negotiations that affect the entire world. At that moment, the idea was indelibly impressed upon my mind that if more people had been there to give her moral support, she may not have caved in.

Processing it All

After returning home from that first UN conference, I had even more questions.

Yes, I had seen some pretty disturbing things but, I wondered, did these obscure UN negotiations occurring halfway across the world matter? Could these UN documents have any impact on my family? Did a mom living in Gilbert, Arizona, even need to worry about any of this?

One thing that was clear was that many of the UN participants had made it their life's work to influence UN negotiations. If they thought it was so important, maybe it was. I wondered if there were similar influential

people or groups or other policymaking bodies around the world with the same drive to destroy the family. What about in my local community? Or in my children's schools?

Round Two

In my journey to find answers to my questions, a few months later I participated in a continuation of these negotiations at a UN conference held in New York. Again, the pro-family NGOs were vastly outnumbered by the feminists and sexual rights activists. Again, I was disturbed to observe Canada, the European Union and the United States (under the Bill Clinton administration) together pushing a sexual rights agenda.

It is important to note that Muslim countries often are fearless in standing up for the family. A delegate from Pakistan, nicknamed "Superman" by one of my colleagues, led the battle on the floor this time. He gave an impassioned plea to Western countries to stop wasting the delegates' time with sexual rights provisions and, instead, to start working on the issues that matter most to women in poverty—i.e., basic health care, clean water, food and shelter. The head of the Nigerian delegation later asked me, "So why is the West so obsessed with sex?" I looked at him, shrugged my shoulders, and replied, "I wish I knew."

Delegates from Sudan, Iraq, Poland, Syria, Nicaragua and other countries all rallied to squelch the efforts that had been mounted. Fortunately, with the help of the pro-family coalition, they defeated some bad provisions. However, the victories did not come easily.

Raining on Their Parade

Each night at the UN, the feminists held an official caucus meeting. As we entered their meeting room, it was clear that these women were angry with the pro-family contingent. Apparently accustomed to controlling a lot of what happens at the UN, they were extremely unhappy that we were present. I was dumbfounded to witness the "weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth" as woman after woman vented, some literally shedding tears.

The protocol seemed to be to introduce yourself, state the organization you were with, and then proclaim, "... and I am a lesbian." Again, I found this shocking at a UN forum. After such introductions, they would

either cry or yell, complaining about the pro-family presence. One young girl, who looked to be about 18 years old, began to cry and said, “I am a lesbian, and I am so angry at these people! So many years of hard work to help women, and it is all being destroyed!”

Another young girl declared, “This used to be the only safe place for us, and now they’ve ruined it!”

For years, the UN has been the stomping grounds for radical feminists and sexual rights activists to effectively and quietly push their agenda upon the world with little or no opposition. We were ruining their party.

Finally, an older woman announced, “I am a lesbian, and I am so angry that I just want to go home, but if I do, they will win!”

After listening to this for some time, I raised my hand. When I began to speak, some of the women tried to stop me, but the chairwoman, who was head of the Women’s Environment and Development Organization (WEDO), firmly reminded them that I had just as much right to be there and to express my opinion as they did.

I said, “I am a woman, and I care about other women just like you do. I know it may not seem like that to you, but it is true. I and others who are here with me just believe in helping women in a different way than you do.”

The meeting ended and my colleague Lynn Allred and I went up to the chairwoman, introduced ourselves and thanked her for being fair. She responded that it was an open meeting. Then she looked at us and said something to the effect of, “You girls are young and obviously not acquainted with much of the world, and you are naïve. When you get older and are wiser, you will see the world in a different way. You are in the minority. The world is changing.”

Just before this conference, on March 7, 2000, the State of California had overwhelmingly passed Proposition 22 defining marriage as the legal union of a man and a woman.⁸ Lynn looked the chairwoman in the eye



The UN has been the stomping grounds for radical feminists and homosexual activists.



⁸ Since this conversation in 2008, California’s state constitution was amended to define marriage as only between a man and a woman. A federal district court decision declaring the amendment unconstitutional is being appealed by man/woman marriage supporters. Ultimately this case is expected to be considered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

and asked, “If we are in the minority, then why is it that California, one of the most liberal states in one of the most liberal countries in the world, just decided by an overwhelming majority to affirm that marriage should be between a man and a woman?” The chairwoman was speechless. There was nothing she could say.

On a lighter note, at one point a member of a prominent feminist NGO approached us and said there was a disturbing rumor that the pro-family coalition was importing “attractive young women to seduce the delegates.” She demanded that we explain ourselves. We frumpy mothers looked at each other and tried not to laugh as one of us replied, “Look around. This is as good as it gets, and if we qualify under your definition of attractive young women, then we’ll take that as a compliment!”

Our Message Impacts Negotiations

As the UN conference continued, the negotiations proceeded at an excruciatingly slow pace. Social liberals and conservatives locked horns on

Social liberals and conservatives locked horns on issues related to sexual orientation and sexual rights.

issues related to sexual orientation, reproductive rights (abortion), sexual rights, parental rights, and language in support of the family. Both sides were frustrated with how slowly the work was moving. The mood spiraled downward, and the verbal attacks increased.

As a way to counteract the accusations and provide a reality check, the pro-family coalition leaders planned a blitz to pass out flyers to all of the conference participants. One of our flyers said, “If the West was not so preoccupied with sex, the document would be done.”

There were about 30 people in our ad hoc pro-family group. We spread out and distributed flyers to as many delegates as we could. Somehow, it appeared to the opposition that there were hundreds of us. Within 10 minutes it seemed everyone had a copy. I had stationed myself at the bottom of the escalator and asked those getting off, “Did you see this yet? Come have a look!” Most everyone took one. Some thanked me, and others gave me dirty looks.

One lady looked at me, crumpled the flyer, and threw it at my feet. Several smiled sarcastically and said they had already seen it. Warm reception

or not, our flyer definitely had an impact, and the tide started to turn in our favor as more and more UN delegates felt emboldened to speak out on family issues without fear of being accused of “holding up the document.” The other side became less strident in their efforts to promote their sexual agenda.

What happened to the actual document under negotiation? All references promoting abortion and broad sexual rights were eliminated. It was a huge victory for the pro-family coalition.⁹

Why Focus on the UN?

You will soon see exactly how negotiations at the UN and at other international meetings are undermining families worldwide. Also, once you understand the strategies and attacks on the family at the international level, you will more readily recognize them closer to home where the same tactics are used—sometimes by the same groups or their affiliates.

So, while part of this book focuses on what happens at the UN and how that is endangering families worldwide, other parts show how similar groups and people are working at the national, state and local levels to undermine the family.

Forces Working to Destroy the Family

Experts agree that, worldwide, the traditional family as an institution is slowly disintegrating. Yet, how exactly is this coming about? What forces are at work to destroy the family? Of course, it is not just one person, group, law, policy or movement that is the root cause of the breakdown of the family. Rather, there are multiple forces that, when combined, are having a devastating impact.

You most likely could easily identify some of these sources as you have seen them at work in your own community, perhaps even in your

⁹ I have represented various pro-family organizations at UN conferences and at other events discussed in this book. For the most part, however, I have represented either Family Watch International (FWI), the organization for which I have served as president since 1999 or United Families International, for which I served as president from 2001 to 2006. Also, at each UN conference, I and others at Family Watch have worked with the pro-family coalition, which consists of a number of small, but effective, nongovernmental organizations working at the UN to protect life and the family. To avoid repetition and bogging down the narratives of my UN experiences, I typically have not identified which organization I was representing for each experience. All of the successes I discuss in this book were supported by a number of dedicated volunteers and staff from the various organizations with whom I have worked.

own family. Yet, like me, you may not fully comprehend how effective the enemies of the family truly are.

As I expose the aspects of what is behind the various assaults on the family, you will see that there are some well-intentioned individuals and groups who are actually being used as pawns, and there also are well-intentioned people who unknowingly promote policies that harm families. And you will learn how your tax dollars are supporting groups and projects that undermine the family.

The Sexual Rights Movement and the Family

As you read about the various groups and individuals who are working to weaken the family, you may notice that most share a common goal: They seek to create a right to sex outside of marriage without having to take responsibility for the consequences. When sex occurs outside of marriage, it doesn't matter if it is heterosexual, homosexual, premarital or extramarital; the evidence shows that any sexual activity outside of a traditional marriage, sooner or later, is damaging to the individual and to society, and especially to the institution of the family.

Sadly, what many are trying to promote as a "right" to sexual activity comes at a cost that is much greater than most realize. Indeed, as the traditional family disintegrates, children are hurt, economies decline, and nations are weakened. (See Chapter 3 for supporting data.)

Yet, almost daily, we see examples of how pervasive this disintegration is. In fact, a UN official publicly revealed his animosity toward the family. Representing the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), he unabashedly declared that the breakdown of the traditional family is a "triumph" for "human rights." He further claimed that high rates of divorce and out-of-wedlock births are not a social crisis, but rather, represent a "triumph" of "human rights" against "patriarchy." UNFPA, receives millions of dollars annually to promote "family planning." Yet it would seem that their true goal is to "plan" the traditional family out of existence.

Sadly, I believe many of those who are attacking the family do so because their families have failed them. You will learn more about this in the chapter titled "Who Could be Against the Family."