

# Reflections on the 'Jaffe Memo' and why 'Religion' and 'Politics' should Mix- Part 1

[sntjohnny.com/front/reflections-on-the-jaffe-memo-and-why-religion-and-politics-should-mix-part-one/1662.html](http://sntjohnny.com/front/reflections-on-the-jaffe-memo-and-why-religion-and-politics-should-mix-part-one/1662.html)

Anthony

December 5, 2011



[Updated 9/11/2015 with link to original source document]

Former Planned Parenthood clinic director Abby Johnson has set the pro-life blogosphere on fire with her posting of the 'Jaffe Memo,' a memorandum written by Frederick S. Jaffe, former vice-president of Planned Parenthood. Jaffe apparently was in charge of PP's population control agenda. The memo was written in 1969.

~~The memo appears to be legit but I haven't been able to find its original source. Read it: Jaffe Memo (9.2 KiB, 1,110 hits)~~

The original has been found and a corrected copy has been created. Download it: Jaffe Memo -- Horvath.pdf (211.5 KiB, 851 hits)

Access the full memorandum, with the absolute original version of the 'memo', and learn more about Jaffe's intent behind the memo, frederick jaffe memo intent.

This memo has all sorts of blood chilling suggestions- blood chilling if the culture of death does not run through your veins, that is. Ideas on controlling world population include:

- Fertility control agents in the water supply
- Encourage women to work
- Require women to work and provide few child care facilities
- Compulsory abortion of out-of-wedlock pregnancies
- Compulsory sterilization of all who have two children- except for a few who would be allowed three
- Discouragement of private home ownership
- Allow certain contraceptives to be distributed non-medically
- Make contraception truly available to all

Some of my more predictable readers will go through that list and their eyes will simply glaze over for most of it. It'd be like quoting the Nazis to them. I mean, the Nazis were evil, but that was SOOOOOOO long ago! A *whole* **seventy** years ago! And 1969? That was still a

WHOPPING forty-two years ago! That was like forever-ago. No one believes that anymore. Why bring it up at all? None of us were even alive *forty-two* years ago... hey... waitasec...

With their eyes in a fog as they instinctively declare the above as merely an instance of "Godwin's Law", their blood started boiling when they saw on the list "Encourage women to work."

Dear God, who could be against *that*? And who could be against making contraception available to everyone? Clearly, this blogger is a bigot.

I included those two items in order to make a very important point.

There is nothing in the memo that is all that different than what can be found in the writings of the marxists, the communists, the eugenicists... and pretty much every scientist of note, prior to about 1939. But that's not all: people who think this way still exist. They've only changed their approach.

That basic fact is something that I tried to make plain in my foreword to Margaret Sanger's The Pivot of Civilization. I illustrate it by asking my readers to identify who wrote the following:

"Indeed, it has been concluded that compulsory population-control laws, even including laws requiring compulsory abortion, could be sustained under the existing Constitution if the population crisis became sufficiently severe to endanger the society. Few today consider the situation in the United States serious enough to justify compulsion, however."

"As Western society comes to distinguish between those forms of euthanasia that are pernicious and those that are therapeutic- an inevitable consequence of our progress toward liberal humanism- expanded access to neonatal euthanasia appears likely."

"But you can start immediately to eliminate the barely educated, unhealthy and poor segment of our country. No, I'm not advocating some sort of mass extinction of these unfortunate people. ... No, government is also going to have to provide vasectomies, tubal ligations and abortions... "

And which Nazi wrote these words? Was it Himmler? Goebbels? Hitler himself? The case could be made that any Nazi could have comfortably made these statements, but in fact they were uttered by current 'science czar' of the Obama administration, John Holdren (1977), 'bio-ethicist' Jacob Appel (2009), and Ron Weddington, co-counsel in the Roe vs Wade Supreme Court case, in a letter to Bill Clinton in 1992.

These are essentially the same ideas and concepts as embodied in the Jaffe Memo, as well as the sort of reasoning seen in Sanger, the eugenicists, and the Nazis; the words and phraseology are different, for 2 reasons. 1., they are not idiots; they know that it is not 1930 anymore, and if you talk like a Nazi, people are going to object and 2., they don't actually think they are Nazis; true, the ideas may be the same at some points and in some ways, but the Nazis used violence. And therein lies the difference: *they want to achieve many of the same goals*, but without the excessive bloodshed.

Which brings me back to the notion of women and working. My random reader's eyes glazed over at the rest of the list, but my inclusion of the hallmark of women's liberation will set their teeth on edge. But isn't it curious to see such a thing on a list of ideas for controlling the world's population?

I have now arrived at my point: many of the positions accepted in our society are thought to be defensible on one set of arguments but they were originally advanced on an entirely different set of arguments. I don't know about the reader, but I get a little nervous about a particular position that was advocated, sometimes for the first time, by nazis, communists, and eugenicists.

The Jaffe Memo shows what anyone who has ever looked into Planned Parenthood and its roots will see: Planned Parenthood doesn't give a rat's ass about women's liberation and never has. The average person on the street thinks that the crux of the abortion issue centers on whether or not a woman has the 'choice' to do as she pleases with her own body. Wrong!

That's how PP sold abortion to the masses, but that's not their own agenda. Their goal has nothing to do with empowering women. It has everything to do with 'managing' the world's population (both quantity and 'quality'), the 'finite' global resources, lining their own pocketbooks, and positioning themselves as the ones in power so they are the ones pressing the levers of influence, and not others.

You did note in the list the limit of just 2 children per family, did you not? Except for 'some' families that will be allowed *three*. For those who have probed the the true intent of outfits such as Planned Parenthood, etc, there will be no doubt about just which families will be allowed three children. Some people are more equal than others, after all. When you are the ones pressing the aforementioned levers of power, one can easily see how it will pan out.

So, for the last one hundred years we've seen these issues come forward that as a society we've come to accept, even though they were initiated and promoted and pushed by absolutely wicked men and women. Is it possible to take those issues and isolate them from their deceptive and lying promoters?

Planned Parenthood may have promoted getting women in the work place because they were actually trying to implement social conditioning that would reduce the world's population, but couldn't you take the topic on its own merits? Sure, the communists were the ones that made no-fault divorce one of their platform issues, but couldn't one forget that for a moment? The eugenicists of the early 1900s advocated for a minimum wage specifically to try to price uneducated black people out of the labor market- and consequently starve to death and therefore remove themselves from the 'gene pool' (eg, see [the Davis-Bacon Act](#); HT Jonah Goldberg's *Liberal Fascism*, pg 264-265) but cannot we address the topic of a 'fair wage' without the overtly racist purposes of the liberal-progressives of the 1900s?

Of course, buried into that last phrase of that last sentence is the question of whether or not the liberal-progressives of our own era have actually jettisoned the racist agenda of their ancestors two generations ago... but here is the magnificent rub: many of today's liberal-

progressives are not racists and have the sincerest of intentions! Oh, the irony! The progressives of our era are constantly and consistently promoting policies that were originally fashioned to eliminate the 'dysgenic' from our society (usually black people), and generally manage the human herd... all without having any idea that this is what they are doing.

But the question remains: can we take these issues separate from those original purposes?

Short answer: That depends.

Long answer: the fundamental flaw in considering the matter in this way is the presumption that any particular issue can be taken in the abstract and sharply distinguished from all other issues.

Let us return to the Jaffe Memo. "Encourage women to work." Why? Why would they need to be encouraged? And isn't this different than, "Make it legal for women to work"? The latter smacks of genuine 'liberation' much more than the former. Encouraging women to work implies trying to get them to do something that they probably don't want to do, or would approach from a different direction if they did want to. For example, a woman contemplating the question of working probably isn't thinking "I need to have a career because this will make it more difficult to also have a family, but that's ok, because the world is already too crowded." When I listen in on women having this conversation, they often wonder how they can balance both work and family- implying the obvious: they still highly value having a family.

The Jaffe Memo of course recognizes this, which is why it also advocates for the postponement of marriage (check), the alteration of the ideal family size (check), compulsory education (check), increased homosexuality (check), promotion of self-limiting one's family (check), and putting fertility control agents in the water supply... check?

Putting fertility control agents in the water would be necessary because women are women; they are made by God to have certain characteristics and certain desires and certain predilections. The pernicious secular humanist liberal progressives understand this without understanding it, and know that even if they compel everyone to get an 'education' where youngsters can have their notions about the ideal family size and homosexuality stuffed into their heads (while their parents think they are learning mathematics), you're probably not going to be able to get enough women to go along with their schemes in order to 'save the earth.'

Far from being an outlandish idea of a period ages ago- a scant fifty years- Obama's *current* science czar believed forty years ago that such a thing would in fact be necessary if the population gets out of control; no worries, while John Holdren thinks that this could be justified under the Constitution, he does not think we've reached that point...

The fact that humans continue to bear the marks of the imago dei, despite prolonged social engineering in an attempt to stamp it out, has not been lost on advocates of the culture of death. Rather than see this as falsifying their viewpoints, they double down and attempt to seek out other mechanisms to bring about their goals. The goals, however, do not change.

When considering whether or not it is appropriate to 'encourage women to work' we must keep in mind their goals and also bring to bear *our* goals. Their reason for encouraging women to work was that it would decrease the world's population. What might our reason be? If we can generate our own line of reasoning that is wholly independent and separate from their reasons, we might be able to find merit to the idea.

But then we may wonder if we would have ever been thinking about it at all if it weren't for the manipulation of these atheistic social architects. The clue that something is amiss is contained in the phrase itself, '*encourage* women to work.' We may surmise that many women would have been content not working, and raising their families instead, if it were not for being encouraged to choose the work over against the home-making. What would be our basis for encouraging women to work if it is not the leftist's desire to control the population? May I submit first of all that our goal would be to maximize any individual woman's happiness and contentment? If they don't *want* a career, why on earth would we encourage them to pursue one? We know Jaffe's answer, but my point is this: isn't even asking the question tantamount to accepting their premise? Before we come up with our own non-evil answer to the question, we have to first establish that the question itself isn't a sucker punch.

If we fail to examine the issue to that level, we risk rendering ourselves nothing less than one of Lenin's 'useful idiots.'

When I say that, I hope it becomes clear that I am not now arguing against women in the workplace or advocating for any particular position or even rejecting the question out right. I'm not examining the issue at all. I am trying to lay out the situation that we are in in our society, where malicious social engineers- past and present- are pushing issues out for us to consider for reasons they are less than truthful about.

Another example of this that we see in the Jaffe memo (not listed above, but in the memo) was "Encourage increased homosexuality."

Here again if you check the newspaper and talk to the man on the street, homosexuality reduces to whether or not people have the right to 'love' whomever they please, and receive society's stamp of approval in every instance. It is put forward as such a basic human right, that to speak against it is to be regarded as a hate-monger. In fact, it is the case that the world's 'hate crimes' legislation almost exclusively targets those who are opposed to homosexuality and homosexual marriage. Those who stand in the way of people 'loving' each other in whatever manner must be folks of the lowest possible quality- equivalent, of course, to the Nazis. And we all know what to do with such hate-mongers; outlaw their hate-speech and put them in prison, and some would go further- all in the name of tolerance, of course.

I just read this response to a Facebook post detailing the many health problems that is associated with homosexual behavior. This is a cut and paste: "OMFG! You have no idea how much I want to kill people like you. Sorry to be so blunt, but you're what's wrong with the world."

But the Jaffe Memo raises a very distinct possibility: the push to normalize homosexuality was

never about 'equal rights' or 'human rights' or 'free and unrestrained sexual contact between consensual adults' but about controlling the world's population.

That would mean the fact that we're even *discussing* the acceptability of gay marriage in our society is the result of a manipulation on a grand scale. We may wonder: if people are born gay, then should not there have been huge numbers of gay people for thousands of years constantly and consistently, so that there would not be any social mores against them to be overcome? It should have been normal a long time ago. Isn't it interesting that their numbers have increased so rapidly just in the last fifty years?

The Jaffe Memo is just one example of the sort of thing that would lead a reasonable person to ask: perhaps people are not born gay at all, but rather are made gay, by constant and consistent social engineering and normalization of behaviors that were heretofore- for perfectly good reasons- considered abnormal?

In the case of women in the workplace, it would be relatively easy to dismiss objections to (encouraging) it as being, ultimately, arbitrary shackles placed by society; it is only a societal construct. But one can never say the same about homosexuality. There are indisputable biological facts about men and women that suggest that homosexual behavior is wrong- or at minimum, not the sort of thing we should be mainstreaming and condoning as a society.

Unless, of course, it is precisely those biological facts that you are trying to get around. Hello, Jaffe Memo. Hello, adding sterilants to the water supply. Hello, the hard work of manipulating the masses to push your agenda without them knowing the real reasons for it.

It is has never been more important to carefully examine what one believes and why they believe it. If you do not carry out this work, you may end up being nothing more than a useful idiot of the worst sort: directly bringing about the goals and ends of those you specifically repudiate as wicked and evil... condemning the communists, nazis, and eugenicists, while carrying out their work.

I could go on and on about this. Examples abound. I can give illustrations from the past centuries and decades but even recently. The population control agenda still goes forward under the guise of "women's rights" and other such ruses. But this raises another important area of discussion.

In my next post I will show why the work of making sure you are not a useful idiot means that religion and politics must absolutely be mixed. Before you leap to conclusions, you best hear me out. (part two)