

Practical Plan for World Peace:
Unificationism—The Teachings of Sun Myung Moon
by Jon Quinn

You can read the entire text of this book at my Web site:
www.DivinePrinciple.com

CHAPTER FIVE

DYNASTY

The fifth value is for each Unificationist to build a godly dynasty. Father often says we are to honor the commandment to multiply in Genesis 1:28 and create a godly lineage. Father commands us to never use birth control and to have the goal of having big families. In the book *Raising Children in God's Will*, a collection of excerpts from some of Father's speeches, he says:

You must not use birth control. In the satanic world they will have more birth control and in the church we will have lots of children. That also applies to True Mother. We have decided we should have at least twelve children. So we are heading for that goal. Do we have many? We now have eight brothers and sisters, so that is close to twelve. If we quit having daughters and have only sons, we might have fifteen or sixteen. So when I gave mother this task, she was worried. She even said that she wished she could expect the second baby before giving birth to the first one.

Even mother is doing this, so what right do you people have to use birth control?

Sun Myung Moon says he gave his wife a "mandate":

Mother has carried many children and her physical ordeal is great, but my mandate to her was that she must have twelve children. Should Mother pray to God, "My husband is crazy.

How can I have twelve children? Could you somehow convince him to be satisfied with less than that?" Mother is precious because she is grateful to God for her mission. It is an incredible mission but that's why she is even more grateful. That is also why each child is more beautiful and greater than the ones before. Then Mother wants to give more because God is rewarding us in such a fantastic way. God shows His love by blessing this family. (7-8-79)

ONE OF EACH SEX

All the children will extend their arms and embrace one another and, including

their mother, become one big harmonious circle. How wonderful this is. Amen. How about that? Woman's purpose is so precious. Should we have as many children as we can afford, or just a limited amount? (Many.) Many or money? [Laughter] There are some women who want to have only one child. But why did God create two breasts? These two breasts are indicative that you should have at least two children. If you have only boys or only girls, one way or another the human race will end. Father concludes that unless you give birth to a boy and a girl, at least one of each, you cannot say that you are a mother or a father. No matter what, you need at least one boy and one girl.

Should we have as many children as possible, or only a limited number? (Many.) With your twelve children sitting in front of you and your husband sitting behind them, won't you feel really grateful to your husband to see that, in part, the children resemble him? Have you ever thought that your husband is the one who gave you the opportunity to use your breasts and hips most fully for the original purpose? Who is the one who caused the utilization of your breasts and hips most fully? The father of the family. You all experience your monthly period. Why? Does that indicate that you wish to reject your husband or still welcome him? ("Following the Cosmic True Love Way" May 5, 1996)

If you get married and your husband wants to have children but you keep putting it off, what will happen? You only have a certain number of years in which you can give birth to children. ("The Start of the 40-day Witnessing Condition" July 4, 1978)

When I visited Barrytown I asked the seminarians if they would use birth control after they got married. If Jacob and his wife had not wanted too many babies then Joseph, one of the youngest, would never have been born, and if he had not been born there would have been no chance for the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt. I have many older brothers and sisters. If my parents had used birth control and only wanted one or two children, would there have been any chance for me to be born? That would have been great for you because then no one would push you out! In my own family, the farther you look down the line of children, the brighter and more capable the children are.

How do you know what kind of son or daughter you may have in the future? God may want to give a special kind of son or daughter to my family a few years from now who may have the power to govern the world or who may discover some invention to speed the work of God. Who knows! But if Mother and I stop having children then when I go to spirit world God will accuse me of messing up His dispensation. Now you know whether or not birth control is best, right? ("Resurrected Kingdom of God" March 26, 1978)

I talked about birth control in Barrytown. What do you think about birth control? If the people of Jacob's era had practiced birth control, Joseph wouldn't have come into being. If God prepared a man who had the scientific ability to enable people to see God through television, but due to birth control he were not born, that generation would have no excuse in front of the spirit world and humanity. Heavenly sons and daughters should live more happily than anyone else, and should bear more children than people in the satanic realm. Maybe twelve children will be average for you. Continuously give birth to children. Unification Church members cannot practice birth control. You should bear more than ten children. (*Blessing and Ideal Family*)

DOZENS

Then how many dozens would you like to produce? The more the better? The fewer the better? You women, how many dozens are you going to bear? When God sees birth control, He grimaces. Then what are you going to do?

If the factory automates mass production and there comes to be mass production everywhere, the Kingdom of Heaven will be full. That's why women are created to bear many children. (*Earthly Life and Spirit World Part 1*)

What happens if you don't have children, if you just cut off what God wanted to give you? If you apply birth control you cut off children which God planned to send as the sons and daughters that can conquer and rule all of heaven and earth.

Birth Control is Forbidden

I am going to forbid birth control to the women of the Unification Church. I will say, "Go ahead and have many children." In America, even pigs eat barley powder and kidney beans, so go ahead and have many children. As I have said, "Have many children!" After I came to America I had to show a good example, so I have said to mother, "Have many sons and daughters" Now how's that? (*Raising Children In God's Will*)

Birth Expansion

How many children of blessed families are there in Japan? (5,700) Give birth to more. The secular world is practicing birth control, but the Unification Church is practicing birth expansion. The forerunner is Rev. Moon with 14 children. The heaven kingdom needs citizens. ("Unification of My Country" God's Day Midnight Speech December 31, 1990)

Having many children and not doing birth control is a commandment and core value of Sun Myung Moon. He is absolutely clear that Unificationists are called by God to multiply and dominate the earth. He is not interested in any exceptions to this rule. The Second Generation and every generation thereafter are supposed to procreate more than anybody else. He is not into artificial or natural birth control. He commands us to enjoy sex and not do any family planning. Family planning is a core value of those on the Cain side. We are religious people and should never use the Pill, the rhythm method, diaphragms, IUDs, condoms, or natural family planning.

DO THE MATH

If a sister can't or won't physically have many children then that couple should adopt until they bring the number to 12 or more. If those 12 children each had 12 children that would give 144 grandchildren. If each of them had 12 children then there would be 1728 great-grandchildren. These numbers become very exciting. If a woman is 20 years old when she marries and has 12 children by the time she is 60 she will see 144 of her grandchildren and begin having great-grandchildren. When she is 40 years old she is a grandmother; at 60 a great-grandmother, and at 80 a great-great-grandmother with hundreds and hundreds of babies to love. Each one of them needs massive love. Being a mother is a great and demanding career. If a woman does not have many children or even if she never had any she should attach herself to a community of Unificationists and make it her career to care for other's children. This is win-win because she will be taken care of by those children when she goes into her second childhood.

YOUNG MARRIAGE

Mark Gungor wrote the following at his website (www.laughyourway.com) titled “Young Marriage” (3-4-09):

“A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself from within.” – Ariel Durant

There has been quite the uproar over Sarah Palin’s seventeen year old daughter who is pregnant and plans to marry the father. Many have decried this potential marriage as a terrible idea since the couple is “too young”. But it wasn’t long ago that such a marriage would not have been thought of as unusual.

“The traditional markers of manhood — leaving home, getting an education, starting a family and starting work — have moved downfield as the passage from adolescence to adulthood has evolved,” says Michael Kimmel, author of *Guyland*. For instance, in 1960, almost 70 percent of men had reached these milestones by the age of 30; today, less than a third of males can say the same.

Some of the most successful marriages in the world started with two teenagers. Indeed, it is difficult to reach 75 years of marriage if one waits till he is 30 to say “I do” – you’re pretty much dead by then.

Even biology challenges us to rethink delayed marriage. According to U.S. researchers who analyzed census data and information from genealogical records, children born when their mothers were under 25 were almost twice as likely to live to their 100th birthday and beyond and University of Chicago husband and wife team Dr Leonid Gavrilov and Dr Natalia Gavrilova have shown that firstborn children live longer than their younger siblings. It appears the two are linked, with older children living longer because their mothers are younger when they have them.

Studies have also shown that it takes longer for older men to conceive. Starting in their 20s, men face steadily increasing chances of infertility, fathering an unsuccessful pregnancy, and passing on to their children a genetic mutation that causes dwarfism. “We [now] know the probability for certain types of DNA damage goes up with age, and we can give you a mathematical probability,” said Andrew Wyrobek, a researcher at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in Livermore, California.

Not only is it bad to our children’s health to delay marriage and child birth, this delay is also resulting in increasingly lower birth rates which may be bad for the longevity of Western culture. According to Mark Steyn, the low birth rates already at play in Europe are a prescription for the end of Western civilization:

Seventeen European nations are now at what demographers call “lowest-low” fertility – 1.3 births per woman, the point at which you’re so far down the death spiral you can’t pull out. In theory, those countries will find their population halving every 35 years or so. In practice, it will be quicker than that, as the savvier youngsters figure there’s no point sticking around a country that’s turned into an undertaker’s waiting room. So large parts of the western world are literally dying – and, in Europe, the successor population to those aging French and Dutch and Belgians is already in place.

Indeed, those who marry younger and produce more children will be the ones who will dominate the US culture in the not-too-distant future. Dr. Arthur Brooks of Syracuse University writes:

Simply put, liberals have a big baby problem: They're not having enough of them, they haven't for a long time, and their pool of potential new voters is suffering as a result. According to the 2004 General Social Survey, if you picked 100 unrelated politically liberal adults at random, you would find that they had, between them, 147 children. If you picked 100 conservatives, you would find 208 kids. That's a 'fertility gap' of 41%... A state that was split 50-50 between left and right in 2004 will tilt right by 2012, 54% to 46%. By 2020, it will be certifiably right-wing, 59% to 41%. A state that is currently 55-45 in favor of liberals (like California) will be 54-46 in favor of conservatives by 2020—and all for no other reason than babies.

We know that sexual activity before marriage increases the likelihood of a divorce. We also know that couples who live together also have an even higher rate of divorce. But then we tell young people today that they should wait till they are almost 30 to marry – an age that will most likely guarantee they will have been already sexually active or even living with someone.

Even in the Christian community (a group who should know better) we push and encourage delayed marriage. Christian parents even threaten their young people with negative consequences if they marry young. “We won't pay for your education!” “You'll have to pay for your own wedding!” “We'll disown you!” We pull all financial and emotional support from the young couple and then when they fail, we rush back to them with “I told you so...”

Mormons bring an interesting perspective to marriage. Only 6% of those who follow the demands surrounding a temple marriage end up in divorce. Six percent! But it's not just a question of getting married in a certain place. Leaders claim it's that the church requires the candidates for marriage to be people of character—people who stick to their commitments of love and of asking for help, if they need it. What is so striking is that many of these marriages happen between couples still in their teens!

Then there is a threat that almost no one seems to consider: the elimination of grandparents. The culture of divorce that has been ripping and tearing at our national family structure has, so far, failed to destroy us. Though the documentation of the damage divorce does to people and particularly their children is sufficiently solid, American homes (though patched and sown together) have been able to hold together to some degree. This has been in large part due to the presence of grandparents. Those wonderful people who love their grandchildren unconditionally and whose age, wisdom and financial resources have played a key role – in some cases the key role – as stabilizers in those children's lives. Those who delay marriage (and subsequently child rearing) are denying themselves one of the greatest joys men and women have cherished for millennia: to participate in the lives of their grandchildren.

For centuries, men and women became grandparents when they were in their late 40's and early 50's – allowing them plenty of time to enjoy and participate

in their grandchildren's lives. Then in their 70's and 80's they witnessed the arrival of their great-grandchildren. People who delay marriage and family today, however, do not realize how greatly they are cheating themselves by making it virtually impossible to experience their grandchildren. And for what? An extended adolescence? To drink more beer or to experiment with more sexual partners? To focus on their careers and a chance to make money more quickly than their parents did?

If Bobby and Suzie wait till almost 30 to marry and then 35 or greater to have children and their children do the same... well just do the math – they'll be 70 before their first grandchildren are even born. Depending on their health and longevity, they are at risk for not being able to enjoy those children's lives.

There is an even a greater tragedy that will occur than just people not being able to enjoy their grandchildren. As I already stated, grandparents have been the very glue that has helped struggling families stay together or to at least make their grandchildren feel safe should their parent's marriage fail. According to US Census Bureau statistics:

- 6.1 million grandparents have grandchildren younger than 18 living with them
- 2.5 million grandparents are responsible for most of the basic needs of one or more grandchildren
- 918,000 grandparents have been responsible for caring for their grandchildren for at least the past five years
- 477,000 grandparents have an income below the poverty level and are still caring for their grandchildren

But by delaying marriage and children today, we are participating in the foolish and systematic removal of grandparents altogether. When the kids of the next generation are 7, 10, or 12 years of age there won't be many grandparents to speak of. The final blow to the American family will be complete.

Sadly, many pastors and marriage proponents themselves are participating in the destruction of the very institution they seek to save by joining in this foolish call for delayed matrimony.

No matter what the statisticians say, marriages do not fail because of age, money or education – many of the underlying arguments for delaying marriage. Such thinking is utter nonsense. Marriages fail for one reason and one reason only: one or both people become selfish. To imply that young, poor or high-school graduates are incapable of real commitment is an insult. I find it curious that we have young, poor, high-school graduates fighting for our interests overseas with great commitment – some giving the very last measure of commitment by sacrificing their very lives for their fellow soldiers.

Someday historians will write of the end of Western civilization. I am sure that our propensity for selfishness and narcissistic behaviors is what they will point to as the reason for our demise.

Advocating for delayed marriage will be just one more reason we will succeed in destroying ourselves from within.

Interview with Mark Gungor, author of “Laugh Your Way to a Better Marriage”:

Q: Mark, you say that kids should get married a lot younger these days, why do you say that?

A: A big disaster these days in marriage is that people are delaying marriage, especially in the Christian world. Jesus said, “Be in the world but not of it” and that has always been the challenge of Christianity. But we think so much like the pagan culture in which we live and they say “Delay! Delay! Delay!” I know Christian parents who even threaten their kids to wait until they’re almost 30 to get married saying if they get married too early they won’t pay for their college etc...and then we say don’t have sex. How’s that working for us?! That’s pretty much a disaster.

So what happens is that these kids are picking up all kinds of bad habits, anywhere to being sexually active too early, with multiple partners, or a lot of guys are getting heavily involved in pornography and all this other stuff. Then they get married and now these kids have all this baggage.

A lot of people have learned how to get in and out of relationships half a dozen times before they get married. What does that teach them? When the heats on, get out! So now when they get married, thinking they’ve found the magic one and the heats on, they turn to what they’ve always done, which is to pull away. It’s something they’ve learned when they’re 21, 22, 24, 28 and now they’re 32 and they’re married and the heats on and now they pull away.

The idea of waiting to get married is ludicrous and absurd and it is destroying our marriage culture. Better to get it right from the get-go than to do it wrong later!

Q: Some people in the church think maybe people just don’t need sex until we get married. What do you say to that?

A: The whole pressure idea to expect people to be monogamous until they’re 30 years of age is ludicrous. And I would argue, that if you can wait that long, then don’t get married! Good grief what does Paul say that the overwhelming reason to get married is, a sex drive. Now women don’t like to hear that, they want it to be all about romance, but the reality is that, and the New Testament teaches this and this is supposed to be our standard, marriage is fundamentally for the sex drive. Now if you can wait until you’re 30 and you’re happy and you’re not having problems sexually, well become a monk for crying out loud! Just stay single and volunteer in the church and Paul said it’s a better scenario because you can spend more time in the Kingdom of God.

What’s happening is that people are not staying pure. One of the biggest disasters is that our guys are so heavily involved in pornography that when they finally get married, they can’t pull out. I get these guys in my conferences all the time. They come up to me with their lovely wives and the wife says, “He doesn’t want to have sex with me, he just wants to watch porn.” These are Christian people! Who in their right mind would prefer porn over a real

woman?

Only in the United States of America! Why? Because they've gotten so addicted to this behavior in their twenties, mid-twenties, late twenties. Now they're married and they think, "Oh it will fix it now"...it's doesn't fix it. They get married and still actually prefer porn over their very own wives. It creates this disaster in marriage and nobody is talking about it.

Q: Doesn't the fact that a lot of young people don't have a lot of money, doesn't that make a difference?

A: When I got married to my wife, we were incredibly broke, incredibly stupid, but we never struggled...with our marriage. We struggled with life, we struggled to pay the bills sometimes, but what does that got to do with this (between himself and his wife)? Nothing!-unless you start to become selfish and you begin tearing at the relationship, blaming each other.

Or your mom comes in and tells you "I told you you were too young to get married." Yeah, that's real helpful.

Q: Do you think parents should help the young couple out?

A: Absolutely. Why aren't parents still helping their kids when they get married? What is this thinking in our culture that when you get married, complete break from the family, complete break from financial support? We create the very environment that causes these kids to fail.

Man if you were helping them because they were single and twenty in college, why now because they're married you're not helping them? What sense does that make? We helped put our daughter through college, when she was married. What difference does it have? None! This idea that we have to cut our kids off from supporting them financially just because they're married is ridiculous.

Q: Many people when they get married move away from their extended family. Is that a smart idea?

A: Life is hard. Marriage is hard. The Bible says that "He who marries will have trouble in his life". You don't hear that at many weddings, but it's the reality. Marriage is hard, so why not build your marriage around a strong, structured family?

Q: Most families seem to just cut the kids off when they get married, is that a smart thing to do?

A: The biggest factor to successful marriages is the involvement of family. So what do we do, we threaten our kids. "If you get married, I'm going to disown you!" Then when the kids do get married, they pull away from the family, left out there hanging, and then it fails and they come back where everyone says, "I told you so. I knew it would happen." If family would be there in the first place to play that supportive role...

Quite frankly, I think the family should be a huge factor in helping you decide

who to marry in the first place. For thousands of years, men and women got married because their parents got together to help them decide. And it wasn't this black thing where the kids were forced into this marriage and "I couldn't marry the one I love!" That's just a bunch of nonsense! The kids always had veto power. They were never forced to marry anybody. The mom and dad would come in and say, "Hey this would be a good match" and the kids would either say yeah or no! Even in the Bible they came and said to Rebecca, "do you want to marry Isaac?" and she had the power to say no, but she went, "yeah, ok." So, now there's safety because the family is a part of this thing.

Then around the 18th century, it stopped being the parents deciding and the kids started deciding. But then the parents had veto power. That's where you get the whole tradition of the man asking for the father's permission. Well, today it doesn't mean anything, but back in those days if your dad said no, it was over. It wasn't going to happen.

Somebody had veto power, it didn't matter if the parents picked it or the kid picked their spouse, the point is that there was still veto power. Well now, we think we're so much "smarter" today, nobody has veto power and it's our "feelings" that validate us. It's our "feelings" that help us decide the most important relationship of our lives and it's a disaster. And no one has veto power and it's a mess.

Let's face it, we're a bunch of 3rd generation wacos in this country and you wouldn't want your parents to help decide your spouse. Well then, get some mentor, some couple, someone you do trust and run it by them. But if you're just going to trust your "feelings" you're headed for a disaster.

Q: Is it crazy that our culture encourages people to wait and wait and wait before they get married?

A: The maturity question. What they're saying is that you're too immature, you can't commit, and you can't be responsible at that age in life. But stop and think. Right now, there are 18 and 19 year olds out in Iraq who are disproving everything we say in this culture. These young men and women are making the greatest sacrifice that anyone can give.

Jesus said that no one can love greater than to lay down their life for their friend. And these guys are laying down their lives, operating multi-million dollar equipment flawlessly every day. They're 18, 19, 20 years of age! Don't tell me these kids can't do it, because they can.

What has happened is we've created this adolescent culture, which is a bunch of nonsense, ok. Nowhere in the world do they have adolescent culture except in western culture. Do you know we didn't even have adolescent culture until the 50's? The word didn't even exist. You were a young man or a young woman or a child. Then we brought the teen culture in the 50's, 60's, the 70's, and the culture is going to hell in a hand basket.

It's like these kids have permission NOT to grow up. Well, that was fine when it was only 18, but now! Now it's until you're 34! We've created this extended adolescence where these kids are not growing up. They're not maturing and it's

because they don't have to! And the church is allowing this.

Now if the pagans want to live this way, let them knock themselves out and bang themselves against the wall. We have no control over that. But what ticks me off as a minister of the Gospel is the church thinks like this. And we've created this extended adolescence! For those who argue that they're too young to mature, let me ask you, when they're 30, still single, are they still immature? You bet they are! There are kids right now, 32 years old, still living with their mom, boys in particular, who are just as immature, just as irresponsible as the day they turned 16. Why? Because as every culture in the world knows, the thing that turns boys into men is marriage, responsibility and children. That's what jerks the slack out of him.

So what we're saying is "delay, delay, you're still immature" and they stay immature. Ask any girl 30 years of age who is still single looking around for a guy, and she'll tell you they're all still immature. They stay the same. And now, do you know who these women want to hook up with? Married guys, divorced guys! Why? Well, because they're so much more mature. What's wrong with these single guys? What they don't understand is the reason they're so much more mature is because they're married guys!

So this whole argument is ridiculous! They say they're too young, they can't commit. They say, well they have to wait for college. Well, every study shows that married college students fair better than single ones.

Q: What is the advantage of getting married young rather than older like the culture pushes these days?

A: I got married at 18 years old and all the kids in my family get married really early. If you're 21 in my family and you haven't gotten married yet, there's something wrong with you Jack, you know what I'm saying?! And divorce is almost unheard of, we don't have these problems.

As I travel around the country and talk to couples in all these marriage seminars I do, the ones that are consistently the most happy in their marriage are the ones who got married at 18, 19, 20, 21 years of age, without question. All you have to do is take a survey any time.

The ones that aren't doing so well are the ones who have delayed this thing out, or gone in and out of several marriages. The thing that people aren't looking at, the greatest factor is not age, its sexual activity. Heritage Foundation did a study and what they discovered in this study was that women over 30 years of age, of those who have had only one sexual partner, they only had a divorce rate of 20%. Now of those who had just one other partner, and we're not talking lovers here, this is just one other one night stand, the divorce rate jumps to almost 50%, and those who had 3 the rate goes to 60%. I mean, that's the greatest indicator, it's the sexual activity, not the immaturity level, not the money, not the education, none of this nonsense. So what we're creating is the very environment that almost guarantees that these people will become sexually active and almost seal their fate of failure.

Mark Gungor has a television series titled *Love, Marriage and Stinking Thinking*. I believe everyone should watch the two segments on marrying young in his DVD of his first season. You can buy the DVD at this website (www.laughyourway.com).

MYTH OF OVERPOPULATION

Marilyn Boyer is the mother of 14 children. In her book *Parenting from the Heart: Practical Parenting from a Mom of 14 Children* she gives excerpts from *How to Understand the Purpose Behind Humanism* (an Institute in Basic Life Principles publication www.iblp.org):

The Myth of Overpopulation

The world is comparatively empty. There are 52.5 million square miles of land are in the world, not including Antarctica.

If all the people in the world were brought together into one place, they could stand, without touching anyone else, in less than 200 square miles ...

If all the people in the world came together in one place and stood shoulder to shoulder, they would all fit within one-half of the city limits of Jacksonville, Florida with plenty of room to spare!

The world population is four and a half billion people. By allowing an average of 2.6 square feet for each person from babies to adults, every person in the world could stand shoulder to shoulder in just one-half of the city.

A further fallacy in the population explosion myth is the assumption that the greater the population, the lower the standard of living. This is not true. Japan has a population density of 798 people per square mile, yet they have a higher per capita gross national product (\$4,450) than India, which has 511 people per square mile (\$140).

Projections of running out of energy or food sources are totally misleading. God gave to man the command and ability to fill up the world with people and to subdue the earth for their own needs.

India does not have a hunger problem because of lack of food. It has a hunger problem because of religious beliefs which are contrary to the Word of God. The Hindu religion teaches that people who die are reincarnated in the form of animals; thus it is against their laws and religion to kill rats, mice, cows, or other animals.

Every cow eats enough food to feed seven people, and there are two hundred million "sacred cows" in India. If the people of India would just stop feeding these cows, they would have enough food to feed one billion, four hundred million people. That is more than one-fourth of the entire world's population!

God promises adequate provision for those who serve Him and obey His laws. On the other hand, He warns that those who reject His Word will experience destructive hunger and famine.

THE EMPTIED QUIVER: THE PROTESTANT EMBRACE OF CONTRACEPTION

Allan Carlson wrote an article (www.profam.org) on the history of contraception titled “The Emptied Quiver: the Protestant Embrace of Contraception” (9-22-2006). He writes:

It is a reckless speaker who reopens Sixteenth Century disputes between Roman Catholics and the Protestant reformers. All the same, I have agreed to do so tonight, in the interest of a greater good. I want to underscore that in accepting this talk, my purpose is not to say who was right or who was wrong, then or now. I am here as an historian, not an advocate. (Although, on a personal note, I will say at the outset that I come to you as a “cradle Lutheran” and also that I believe Martin Luther was wrong about what he called the impossibility of lifelong celibacy; I have come to know too many faithful Catholic priests to accept that.)

However, back to the main point: in order to understand why the Protestant churches maintained unity with the Catholic church on the birth control question for four centuries, only to abandon this unity during the first half of the 20th Century, we also need to understand the Protestant vision of family and fertility, how it differed from the Catholic vision, and how this difference played out over the last 100 years. So, I ask the Catholics here tonight—and I am told that there are some Catholics here—to bear with me for a while, for I am going to delve into some Protestant theology: both the positive ideals and the dilemma that eventually emerged.

Early Sixteenth Century Europe was an era very different from ours. The late Medieval Church claimed about one of every four adults in celibate orders, serving as priests, sisters, monks, or in celibate military and trading groups such as the Teutonic Knights. Over the centuries, the religious orders had accumulated through bequests vast landed estates, and gathered in the wealth that came through this ownership of productive land. The trading orders held remarkable assets in land, goods, and gold.

Many orders were nonetheless faithful to their purposes and vows and used this wealth to tend the sick, help the poor, and lift prayers to Heaven.

However, in others, spiritual discipline had grown lax. Indeed, sexual scandals of a sort rocked the church of that era. To support these latter two statements, I draw strictly on Catholic witnesses. For example, the great Dutch theologian Desiderius Erasmus, while always loyal to Rome, complained: “Let them prate as they will of the status of monks and virgins. Those who under the pretext of celibacy live in [sexual] license might better be castrated....[T]here is a horde of priests among whom chastity is rare.” Philip of Burgundy, the Catholic Bishop of Utrecht and great uncle of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, admitted that chastity was nearly impossible among clerics and monks who were “pampered with high living and tempted by indolence.” This problem festered until the reform-minded Council of Trent convened in 1545.

The key figure in developing a Protestant family ethic was Martin Luther. Himself an Augustinian monk and priest, Luther also served as Professor of Theology at the University of Wittenberg. In theological terms, Luther's opposition to contraception was closely tied to his rejection of celibacy.

Luther's critics have seen him as a failed celibate, a man unable to control his lusts. Luther blamed the doctrine of celibacy itself. For Luther, writing in his 1521 treatise on *The Estate of Marriage*, God's words in Genesis 1:28, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth," represented more than a blessing; even more than a command; they were rather "a divine ordinance which it is not our prerogative to hinder or ignore." Addressing the celibate Teutonic Knights, the Reformer also emphasized Genesis 2:18: "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper who shall be with him." Setting himself squarely against the Papacy and the Church Councils here, Luther declared: "whoever would be a true Christian must grant that this saying of God is true, and believe that God was not drunk when he spoke these words and instituted marriage." Except among those rare persons—"not more than one in a thousand" Luther said at one point—who received true celibacy as a special gift from God, marriage and procreation were divinely ordained. As he wrote: "For it is not a matter of free choice or decision but a natural and necessary thing, that whatever is a man must have a woman and whatever is a woman must have a man."

The Geneva-based reformer John Calvin put even greater emphasis on Genesis 1:28. He argued that these words—"Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth"—represented the only command of God made before The Fall that was still active after God drove Adam and Eve out of Eden. This gave these phrases a unique power and importance.

While occasionally acknowledging in unenthusiastic fashion St. Paul's defense of the single life, the Reformers were far more comfortable with the social order described in Luther's *Exhortation to the Knights of the Teutonic Order*. "We were all created to do as our parents have done, to beget and rear children. This is a duty which God has laid upon us, commanded, and implanted in us, as is proved by our bodily members, our daily emotions, and the example of all mankind." Marriage with the expectation of children, in this view, represented the natural, normal, and necessary form of worldly existence.

Marital fertility was also a spiritual expression. Luther saw procreation as the very essence of the human life in Eden before the Fall. As he wrote in his commentary on *Genesis*:

[T]ruly in all nature there was no activity more excellent and more admirable than procreation. After the proclamation of the name of God it is the most important activity Adam and Eve in the State of innocence could carry on—as free from sin in doing this as they were in praising God.

The fall of Adam and Eve into sin interrupted this pure, exuberant potential fertility. Even so, the German reformer praised each conception of a new child

as an act of “wonderment...wholly beyond our understanding,” a miracle bearing the “lovely music of nature,” a faint reminder of life before the Fall:

This living together of husband and wife—that they occupy the same home, that they take care of the household, that together they produce and bring up children—is a kind of faint image and a remnant, as it were, of that blessed living together [in Eden].

Elsewhere, Luther called procreation “a most outstanding gift” and “the greatest work of God.”

Accordingly, as his theology mandated, Luther sharply condemned the contraceptive mentality that was alive and well in his own time. He noted that this “inhuman attitude, which is worse than barbarous,” was found chiefly among the well born, “the nobility and princes.” Elsewhere, he linked contraception and abortion to selfishness:

How great, therefore, the wickedness of [fallen] human nature is! How many girls there are who prevent conception and kill and expel tender fetuses, although procreation is the work of God! Indeed, some spouses who marry and live together...have various ends in mind, but rarely children.

Regarding the sin of Onan, as recorded in Genesis and involving the form of contraception now known as “withdrawal,” Luther wrote: “Onan must have been a most malicious and incorrigible scoundrel. This is a most disgraceful sin. It is far more atrocious than incest and adultery. We call it unchastity, yes, a Sodomitic sin...that worthless fellow refused to exercise love.”

On this matter, Luther was again joined by Calvin who, in the strongest possible terms, equated the sin of Onan with abortion, adding: “The voluntary spilling of semen outside of intercourse between man and woman is a monstrous thing. Deliberately to withdraw from coitus in order that semen may fall on the ground is doubly monstrous. For this is to extinguish the hope of the [human] race and to kill before he is born the hoped-for offspring.”

A second element in Luther’s Protestant family ethic was his concept of a divine call to the vocations of husbandry and housewifery. Emphasizing human frailty, Luther argued that a successful marriage was exceedingly difficult to attain if ungrounded in religious faith. In such cases, the delights of marriage—“that husband and wife cherish one another, become one, serve one another”—would be commonly overshadowed by the responsibilities, duties, and attendant loss of freedom which the married state entailed.

Luther believed that happiness in marriage depended on recognition that the married estate, with its attendant responsibilities, was “pleasing to God and precious in his sight.” Indeed, he argued that God called women—all women—to be Christian wives and mothers. Similarly, God called men—all men—home to serve as Christian “housefathers.” In one passage, Luther describes the father who confesses to God: “I am not worthy to rock the little babe or wash its

diapers, or to be entrusted with the care of the child and its mother.” Luther assures him that “when a father goes ahead and washes diapers...for his child, God, with all his angels and creatures, is smiling, because he is doing so in Christian faith.” Luther says that in the Commandment, “Honor Thy Father and Mother,” we see that “God has done marriage the honor of putting it...immediately after the honor due to himself.” The Reformer concludes that “...there is no higher office, estate, condition, or work...than the estate of marriage.”

The third element of the Protestant family ethic involved praise for parenting as a task and responsibility. In so doing, Luther energized the Christian home as an autonomous social sphere. “There is no power on earth that is nobler or greater than that of parents,” stated the Reformer. He added: “Most certainly father and mother are apostles, bishops, and priests to their children, for it is they who make them acquainted with the gospel.” One of Luther’s colleagues, Justus Menius, explained the task of parenting in more detail:

The diligent rearing of children is the greatest service to the world, both in spiritual and temporal affairs, both for the present life and for posterity. Just as one turns young calves into strong cows and oxen, rears young colts to be brave stallions, and nurtures small tender shoots into great fruit-bearing trees, so must we bring up children to be knowing and courageous adults, who serve both land and people and help both to prosper.

According to Harvard University historian Steven Ozment, in his book *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe*: “Never has the art of parenting been more highly praised and parental authority more wholeheartedly supported than in Reformation Europe.” Child rearing, in this view, was not just “woman’s work.” In the Protestant home, father and mother would share the duties of child rearing to an unusual degree. Luther saw the years from birth to age six as a time when a child’s reason was “asleep.” During these years, the mother took the dominant role in child care. But at age seven, fathers should take the lead, with special responsibility for the moral and practical education of children. Inspired by Luther’s message and example, publishers turned out dozens of so-called “Housefather” books, 16th century “self-help” volumes for dads.

How might we judge the success of the Protestant family ethic? For nearly four centuries it worked reasonably well. Relative to contraception, the Protestant opposition remained firm. Writing in the late 18th Century, for example, John Wesley—the founder of Methodism—also condemned the sin of Onan, adding: “[o]bserve, the thing which he did displeased the Lord—and it is to be feared, thousands, especially of single persons, by this very thing, still displease the Lord, and destroy their own souls.” The 19th Century Reformed Pastor Johann Peter Lange described contraception as “a most unnatural wickedness, and a grievous wrong. This sin...is [as] destructive as a pestilence that walketh in darkness, destroying directly the body and the soul of the young.” At their 1908 Lambeth Conference, the Anglican Bishops recorded “with alarm the growing practice of artificial restriction of the family and earnestly call upon all Christian people to discountenance the use of all artificial means of restriction as

demoralizing to character and hostile to national welfare.” As late as 1923, the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod’s official magazine *The Witness* accused The Birth Control Federation of America of spattering “this country with slime” and labeled birth-control advocate Margaret Sanger a “she devil.” Pastor Walter Maier, founding preacher in the 1930’s of the long-running *Lutheran Hour* radio program, called contraceptives “the most repugnant of modern aberrations, representing a twentieth century renewal of pagan bankruptcy.”

On doctrine, then, Protestant leaders held firm. The Achilles heel, the weakness of the Protestant position, actually lay elsewhere: namely, in the informal institution of the Pastor’s Family. In rejecting lifelong celibacy, in casting marriage as the highest order and calling on earth, in elevating motherhood and homemaking, in emphasizing the spiritual authority and practical tasks of fatherhood, in refocusing adult lives around the tasks of childrearing, in celebrating procreation and large families, and in condemning contraception, Luther implicitly laid a great burden on Protestant clerics. They must serve as examples for their congregations; specifically, they must marry and bear large families themselves. Where the Catholic priest or the cloistered sister faced the challenge of lifelong celibacy, the Protestant cleric faced the lifelong challenge of building a model and fruitful home.

Luther again supplied the prototype, in his marriage to Katharine von Bora. By the standards of the time, they married late. Still, they brought six children into the world and their busy home served as the inspiration to generations of Protestant clerics. This special role of Pastor’s Family was rarely codified in church doctrine; however, the Protestant rejection of both celibacy and contraception created a visible expectation. Barring infertility, a faithful Protestant Pastor and his wife would be parents to a brood of children.

And again, for nearly four centuries, so it was. The Protestant family ethic, where it held sway, worked to reshape the culture in family-affirming, child rich ways. Indeed, the large families of Anglican, Lutheran, and Calvinist clergy become something of a problem for relatively poor rural parishes, and something of a comic image for novelists. For example, in Oliver Goldsmith’s 1766 book *The Vicar of Wakefield*, we find a country pastor with six children: a naive but charitable fellow who ends up (with his brood of children) in debtors prison, only to be rescued from his misfortunes by Sir Thornhill. And, as late as 1874, the average Anglican clergyman still had 5.2 living children. In 1890, the average Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod pastor had 6.5 children.

The great break in this tradition came in 1911. In that year, the new Census of England showed that the average family size of Anglican clergy had fallen to only 2.3 children, a stunning decline of 55 percent. The British Malthusian League—a strong advocate of birth control—had a field day exposing what it called the hypocrisy of the priests. As the League explained, the Church of England continued to view contraception as a sin, and yet its clerics and bishops were obviously engaging in the practice. Apparently only the poor and the ignorant had to obey the Church. And in practice, there was not much that Anglican leaders could say in response. This propaganda continued for another two decades. Perhaps as a convenient way out of their dilemma, some Anglican theologians bought into the argument that Britain’s poverty problems required

the birth of fewer children. Pressures culminated at the Anglican Church's 1930 Lambeth Conference, where Bishops heard an address by birth-control advocate Helena Wrighton, on the advantages of contraception for the poor. On a vote of 193 to 67, the Anglican bishops approved a resolution stating that:

In those cases where there is such a clearly felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, and where there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence, other methods may be used, provided that this is done in the light of the same Christian principles.

So was Christian unity on the contraception question broken.

The same stress line emerged in America. For example, in the very conservative Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, the family size of clerical families also fell, reaching 3.7 children in 1920, 42 percent below the 1890 number. Here, too, the Protestant clergy had ceased to be models of a fruitful home for their congregations and the broader culture. Instead, a culture infected by neo-Malthusian ideas was reshaping the clerical family. During the 1930's, the Missouri Synod quietly dropped its campaign against the Birth Control League of America. In the 1940's, one of the Church's leading theologians, Albert Rehwinkel, concluded that Luther had simply been wrong. God's words in Genesis 1:28—"be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth"—were not a command; they were merely a blessing, and an optional one at that. Please note: As in England, so in America, the change in clerical family behavior came before the change in doctrine.

Meanwhile, among the more mainstream American Protestants, the embrace of contraception occurred in direct fashion. In 1931, the Committee on Home and Marriage of the old Federal Council of Churches—following the Anglican lead—issued a statement defending family limitation and arguing for the repeal of laws prohibiting contraceptive education and sales. Some member churches—notably the Southern Methodists and the Northern Baptists—protested the action; the Southern Presbyterians even withdrew their membership from the Federal Council for a decade because of this statement.

All the same, by the early 1960's, the successor National Council of Churches (NCC) was fully part of the sexual revolution. At the NCC's astonishing and deeply disturbing 1961 North American Conference on Church and Family, population control advocate Lester Kirkendall argued that America had "entered a sexual economy of abundance," where contraception would allow unrestrained sexual experimentation. Wardell Pomeroy of the Kinsey Institute for Sex Research also addressed the NCC meeting, explaining how the new science of sexology required the abandonment of all old moral categories. Psychologist Evelyn Hooker celebrated the sterile lives of homosexuals. Planned Parenthood's Mary Calderone made the case for universal contraceptive use, while colleague Alan Guttmacher urged the reform of America's so-called "mean-spirited" anti-abortion laws. Not a single voice in the spirit of Luther or Calvin could be heard at this 1961 "Christian conference;" indeed, the conferees saw the traditional Protestant family ethic focused on exuberant marital fertility as the problem.

All of this logically followed the Protestant acceptance of contraception. As I have argued, the potential Protestant weakness on birth control lay within its formal leadership, its clergy. Rejecting both lifelong celibacy and contraception, classic Protestant theology required family-centered and child rich pastors. When those clerical leaders, in the privacy of their bedrooms, broke faith with their tradition, when pastors and their wives consciously limited their families, the Protestant opposition to contraception faced a crisis.

The ordination of women by a number of Protestant groups, commonly initiated in the late 1960's and 1970's, represented another surrender to the broader culture, now under heavy feminist influence. It also struck a nearly fatal blow to the informal Protestant institution of Pastor's Wife. By upending and confusing gender roles, by granting to women the same religious functions long held exclusively by men, the ordination of women marginalized the special works and responsibilities of clerical wives, including their task of being model mothers with full quivers of children. Even more than before, contraception became their answer.

When the U.S. Supreme Court, in its 1973 *Roe* and *Doe* decisions, overturned the anti-abortion laws of all fifty states, relatively few Protestants voiced opposition. Indeed, some denominations had already endorsed liberalized abortion. The prominent Southern Baptist Pastor W.A. Criswell openly welcomed the decision, claiming: "I have always felt that it was only after the child was born and had life separate from its mother that it became an individual person."

All the same, it would be the eventual turn by evangelical Protestants to the pro-life position that would also reopen the contraception question. An early sign of this shift occurred in 1975 when a young editor at *Christianity Today*—Harold O.J. Brown—authored a short anti-abortion editorial. From his home in L'Abri, Switzerland, the neo-Calvinist Frances Schaeffer weighed in with books such as *How Should We Then Live?*, which mobilized evangelicals against abortion. This campaign grew through the founding of new evangelical organizations with pro-life orientations, including Focus on the Family, Family Research Council, and Concerned Women for America.

At first, this pro-life evangelicalism either avoided the issue of contraception or accepted the practice as being different than abortion. However, over time, it has become ever more difficult to draw a line between birth control and abortion; the "contraceptive mentality" embraces both; some forms of "contraception" are in practice abortifacients. In his last years, Frances Schaeffer seemed to be moving toward the historic Christian view of contraception. Since 1980, several Resolutions adopted by the Southern Baptists have criticized contraception. By the close of the twentieth century, the Family Research Council—to choose another example—featured special reports on "The Empty Promise of Contraception" and "The Bipartisan Blunder of Title X," the latter referring to Uncle Sam's domestic birth control program.

In addition, more attention has turned to those Protestant groups that have never abandoned opposition to contraception: the Hutterites; the Old Order Amish; and other Mennonite and Anabaptist sects. While long on the margins of

American life, they are in the early 21st century among the fastest growing religious groups in the country.

There have been other signs of Protestant rethinking on this question, including individual pastors and their wives who have opened their lives to bringing a full quiver of children into the world. For example, Pastor Matt Trehwella of Mercy Seat Christian Church in Milwaukee concluded that “we have no God-given right to manipulate God’s design for marriage by using birth control;” after a vasectomy reversal, he and wife Clara have had seven more children.

While surely in the minority, the Trehwellas are not alone. In so acting, they rediscover their distinctive theology and their heritage; and they accept their special responsibility to serve as witnesses to the original Protestant understanding of Divine intent. Importantly, they are also rebuilding a common Christian front on the issue of contraception, one lost in the dark days of the first half of the 20th Century.

BIRTH RATES

Allan Carlson gives the following insights on birth rates in an article titled *Lessons from History About the Future of Marriage & Family in the United States*” (www.profam.org) Here is an excerpt that shows religious people have more children and public education decreases the birth rate and therefore public schools are anti-family:

Lesson Five: Fertility reflects belief, and religious belief benefits society by raising it. One book disorienting American families during the late 1960s was *The Population Bomb*, Paul Ehrlich’s notorious case for radical measures aimed at population control. It proved mistaken, but not until it had helped convince millions of Americans to limit the size of their families and provide contraceptive devices to all who wanted them.

While the American Baby Boom and falling mortality rates in the Developing World could then be used to project frightening scenarios of a globe swarming with over 50 billion people, it is now clear that falling human fertility has been the real long-term story, and poses the real danger. In 2004, 80 nations recorded below-replacement, or negative-growth, fertility. The global population, it appears, should peak in 2050 at a little over 8 billion souls, and decline thereafter as nation after nation falls into the “age trap” described in Phillip Longman’s recent book, *Empty Cradle: too few children to sustain the elderly*. (And this is only one of the negative effects of declining, and therefore aging, population.)

In other words, far from being a danger to the planet, human fertility preserves the future. (And this is not its only benefit.) What caused this radical shift? There actually appear to be two distinct fertility transitions. The first one accounts for a shift from a “natural” level of fertility, seven to nine children born per couple, down to the replacement level of two.

The best explanation for the first transition, I believe, comes from the Australian demographic historian, John Caldwell, in his book *Theory of Fertility Decline*. Looking at the Western world, Caldwell attributes part of the decline to a “spectacular growth in capitalist” production and gadgets that overwhelmed

residual home production, and part to Europe's egalitarian streak, a legacy of the French Revolution. Yet the real spoiler, he insists, was mass state education, which indoctrinated new generations against the old family morality rooted in Christian faith.

The new government schools, introduced in the nineteenth century, did not only reduce the potential for child labor around the house and raise the cost of items such as children's clothing, making children less useful and more expensive. They also became, for the children involved, the new focus of loyalty and advocate for the future, displacing the family. As Caldwell shows, the schools "made citizens of those whose horizons had been largely confined to the family, and taught the immorality of putting family first." State schools so "destroy[ed] the corporate identity of the family," attacking parental authority in particular, that fertility tumbled.

What was true for Europe and America soon became true for the whole world. As Caldwell concludes: "It seems improbable—and has yet to be demonstrated—that any society can sustain stable high fertility beyond two generations of mass schooling."

Testing this theory in the United States, researchers found the spread of state schooling to be closely related to fertility decline in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, even in rural school districts, each additional *month* of a public school year resulted in an average fertility decline of .23 children: The state schools consumed children.

The Natural Floor

The second fertility transition is from a replacement level of two children per couple down to .85 of a child, which one European analyst considers the natural "floor" of fertility. What might be the cause here?

A Belgian demographer has shown that only 20 percent of all citizens of the European Community above age 18 have some link to organized religion. Among young adults alone (the people most likely to have children), the figure is closer to 10 percent. Recent changes in family formation and marital fertility, he argues, merely continue the "long-term shift in the Western ideational system" away from the values affirmed by Christian teaching (specifically "responsibility, sacrifice, altruism, and sanctity of long-term commitments") and toward a militant "secular individualism" focused on the self.

Low fertility is a sign of what an American scholar, Ronald Inglehart, has called "the silent revolution" in European values starting in 1964. Scholars have noted that remaining pockets of high fertility in Europe—such as in the rural regions of Switzerland and the pockets of higher "Catholic fertility" still to be found in Spain and Portugal—all disappeared after 1964. In contrast, 97 percent of 21-year-old Danish women now report having had pre-marital sex, essentially marking the full collapse there of the old sexual ethic.

Can the Europeans turn their situation around? It is highly unlikely. To begin with, the "momentum" of demographic change in Europe shifted to the negative side in the year 2000. The very age structure of the population now makes

fertility decline much more likely than during the prior four decades, when it was already sharp and sustained.

Moreover, most European policymakers are simply clueless regarding the driving roles of statism and secularism in the changes they now confront. They commonly embrace materialistic explanations of cause, welcome the disappearance of motherhood as a vocation, dismiss the Christian religion as a superstition of the past, and place all their hopes in the Swedish model. Specifically, they call for full sexual equality and the priority of the work life over the family, and, to support the family thus created, call for generous day care, paid parental leave, child allowances, and other welfare benefits. However, such reforms actually lock post-family, anti-child values into place.

Growing Americans

Lesson Six: American exceptionalism is real and social creativity remains possible here. Europe is dying. So is Japan, also being done in by a broad rejection of children. However, unlike forty years ago, when America was leading the global retreat from marriage and children, something different is now happening here. The United States is the only developed nation in the world that recorded an increase in its total fertility rate between 1981 and 2000: from 1.81 in 1981 to 2.13 in 2000, an increase of 18 percent, to a point slightly above the replacement or zero-growth level.

This was not, as some suggest, only a function of a rising number of births out-of-wedlock. Between 1995 and 2000, even marital fertility rose by 11 percent, the first sustained increase in that number since the mid-1950s. Nor was this a function of America's greater ethnic diversity. Fertility among Americans of European descent actually climbed by 21 percent after 1981, to a total fertility rate of 2.114 in 2000.

As *The Economist* magazine summarized, "Demographic forces are pulling America and Europe apart. . . . America's fertility rate is rising; Europe's is falling. America's immigration outstrips Europe's. . . . America's population will soon be getting younger. Europe's is aging." The magazine predicts a US population of up to 500 million by 2050, compared to a Europe in demographic freefall, with barely half as many people.

The best explanation for America's greater fecundity—this openness to children—is the higher degree of religious identification and behavior shown by Americans. Forty-five percent of Americans in the year 2000 reported attending religious services during the previous week; in Europe, only about ten percent did. And believers usually do have more babies. Alas, outside of recent Hispanic immigrants, overall Catholic numbers today are not impressive, but "white fundamentalist Protestants" who attend church weekly show a fertility rate 27 percent above the national average, and the fertility rate of active American Latter-Day Saints, or Mormons, is about double the national average.

America's resilience can also be seen in that most unexpected, but successful, American folk movement of the last thirty years: homeschooling. Probably numbering fewer than 20,000 children in 1975, there are about two million home-educated children in America today: a hundred-fold increase. The last

fifteen years have witnessed a surge in the number of Catholic families so engaged. And fertility is affected as well.

As John Caldwell argued, state-run mass schooling drives fertility down. As would be predicted, homeschooling families drive it up. Sixty-two percent of home-educated children come from families with three or more children, compared to 20 percent of non-homeschoolers. Over 33 percent of homeschooling families have four or more children, compared to but 6 percent of those in state and private schools.

There are a number of good books on how childish people have become in our feminist culture such as *Washington Times* columnist Diana West's, *The Death of the Grown-Up: How America's Arrested Development Is Bringing Down Western Civilization*, *Nanny State: How Food Fascists, Teetotaling Do-Gooders, Priggish Moralists, and other Boneheaded Bureaucrats are Turning America into a Nation of Children* by David Harsanyi and David Alan Black's *The Myth of Adolescence: Raising Responsible Children in an Irresponsible Society*. Robert Epstein's book *The Case Against Adolescence: Rediscovering the Adult in Every Teen* gives a powerful argument that there should be no such time as adolescence. People should go directly from childhood to adulthood around the age of thirteen. Jesus' mother, Mary, was that age and true mother was 17 when she had her first child. Father matched his first son to a 15 year old. I write more of this in my book *12 Before 40*.

If Unificationists have true united big families of say 10 or more children their descendants would, in only a few generations, become the leaders of the world. If 200,000 Unificationist families had an average of 10 children, there would be one million children. If all these blessed (2nd Generation) children married between themselves, that would make 500,000 couples. If they, in turn, had an average of 10 children, they would have 5 million children. If we do the math, then in the next generation there would be 25 million children. The next generation would have 125 million. The generation after that would be 600 million and using the multiple of 5 the next would be 3 billion. Because Unificationists would have more children than any other group, in only a few generations their numbers would be so great they would dominate the earth.

If a couple had 12 children who each had 12 they would have 144 grandchildren. If they had 15 and each had 15 they would have 225 children. Let's push ourselves to have huge families.

One of the most dramatic videos I have ever seen is when the TV show *Nightline* went to Ken Carpenter's home and did a 10 minute show on the Quiverfull Movement of which Ken and his wife are members. They explain how they believe no one should do birth control and it is God's will to have as many children as He gives. Please order this DVD from *Nightline* at ABC News and show it to everyone. The product number at *Nightline* is N07103051 and it aired on 01/03/07. "Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord: and the fruit of the womb is his reward. As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of one's youth. Happy is the man who has a quiver full of them." (Psalms 127:3-5)

Nancy Campbell is interviewed briefly on this show. Please go to her website www.AboveRubies.com and order her wonderful book *Be Fruitful and Multiply*. Vision Forum also sells her book. Check out the website www.QuiverFull.com and read their articles and the books they recommend against birth control and for big families. Mrs. Campbell talks about having many children on her DVD titled *Interview with Nancy Campbell* (order at www.aboverubies.org). Mrs. Campbell addresses the question everyone asks whether they live in America or Kenya: How can the average person afford to have big families? The question should be how can you not afford to? Who is going to take care of you when your 90 years old? Nancy explains that first you have babies and then God will provide. Fallen man does things the other

way around. To the question “How can you raise a family on just one income?” she says, “I see God providing.” She says when we take a “step of faith then we will see God’s provision.” On one income she says, “God always does something. He never provides for that child before the child arrives but when that baby arrives. God will show His provision. Trust God.”

In Nancy Campbell’s DVD series you can watch this amazing woman explain how her daughter Serene Allison at the age of 29 has 11 children. She and her husband adopted some from Africa and they may very well eventually end up with more than 20 children. At the time of the printing of this book she has 13 children. The First Generation Unificationists were often married late by Father but Father is now encouraging the Second Gen to marry young and have many children. Unificationists—Let’s give up the tradition of gift children and adopt some of the millions of outside children many of which are orphans and street kids. If Serene can do it so can most Unificationists. By the way you can see Serene in her DVD on the raw food diet titled *Rejuvenate with Serene* that you can buy at AboveRubies.com.

In Mrs. Campbell’s must-read book *Be Fruitful and Multiply* she writes:

Many young mothers stop having children after two or three because they are so overwhelmed with the busyness of caring for little ones. It is true that is the busiest time of motherhood. Your children are all little and are not yet at an age where they can help and pull their weight. But look to the future. These little ones will grow older and as they do they become wonderful helpers. There is a mother in our community of Hickman County who are blessed with nineteen children. Nine of her children are now grown and have left home but there are still ten children at home. She trained them well and confesses that she now lives “like a Queen.” By the way, before you start imagining a worn-out lady after having 19 children, this mother is fit, in-shape, vibrant and beautiful. It’s hard to believe she has had even two children!

Recently I received a letter from a mother of seven children. This family of nine lived in a two-bedroom, 784 square foot trailer home. Did she write with grumbling and complaints? No, her letter was full of the blessings and joys of their family life. She says, “We are blessed, and are managing, because we are grateful for what God has provided. We often laugh when we think of the family we brought our trailer from. They had one small boy and felt they needed more space! I guess it is all in how one looks at it! We heat totally with wood and appreciate the warmth and coziness. I must add, it is also practical on a day like today. We are experiencing a blizzard. Many inches of thick, white snow keep us closed in. The telephone quit and electricity is still out. We are having a ball—melting snow, simmering soup, playing board games, writing letters, and cleaning cupboards. Perhaps tonight it will be a lamplight eve. The children love that...” This family doesn’t sound as though they are deprived, do they?

For nearly a year our daughter Evangeline lived in a one-room cabin with no running water, no bathroom, and no inside kitchen. She had five children and was pregnant with her sixth. They now have a bathroom, a kitchen, running water, another room added on—and their seventy baby! But they still don’t have bedrooms or even beds for the children. There’s no room for beds. Each night the children take their blankets from the big pile in the corner and make their cozy spot on the floor in the all-purpose room. Is Evangeline a grumbling mess? No! She is the most joyful mother in this nation. The children are happy and live adventure-filled lives. Some time ago, some young people gathered together and

began to discuss who were the richest people they knew. They all came to the conclusion that Evangeline and Howard were the richest! It had nothing to do with their material possessions. It had all to do with their joy of the Lord and their attitude for life.

We are called to create powerful and wealthy dynasties. The Bible says we are to be “mighty in the land.” Praise the LORD. Blessed is the man who fears the LORD, who greatly delights in his commandments! His descendants will be mighty in the land; the generation of the upright will be blessed. Wealth and riches are in his house; and his righteousness endures forever.” (Ps.112:1-3)

The back cover of *Be Fruitful and Multiply* says, “Nancy Campbell serves her husband as a helpmeet but also through a special “Titus 2” ministry to ladies.” I encourage every Unificationists sister to listen to her message against birth control and for having many children, even it that requires adopting them. In her book she writes: “The children of Israel did not obey God’s commandment ‘to be fruitful and multiply’ just when it suited them, or only in good economic times. No, they obeyed, no matter what the circumstances.” Unificationist couples need to tell each other, “I will never divorce. No matter what.” And say to each other, “I will have a large family. No matter what.” She goes on to write:

They obeyed when they were in slavery in Egypt. They multiplied in the face of persecution. Exodus 1:11-12 tells the story, “They put slave drivers over the Israelites to wear them down under heavy loads... But the more they were crushed, the more they increased and spread...” Our mentality is that if we are going through persecution, difficult times, or money is tight, that we cannot have children. The Israelites proved that God was able to keep them and provide for them, even in the most difficult times. None of us have to face the persecution and trials that they faced at that time, but they still kept multiplying.

The greatest building program we can invest in is that of building godly generations. Philip Lancaster says: “Each man should aim to be the founder of a dynasty of God.”

God wants us to have a vision for family, not just when we start a family, but also even before we are married. We should train our sons to be fathers and therefore the providers, the protectors, and the priests of their homes. We should train and give our daughters a vision for motherhood, preparing them to be the nurturers, the nourishers, and the nest builders of future families.

“How can I afford to have more children?” you ask. This is certainly a valid question if we trust in our own resources. But if we trust in God, we need to have no fears. The idea that having children is a function of one’s personal economics is contrary to the patterns and principles which Scriptures do reveal. If anything, the Bible teaches that those who are economically poor should desire more children, because with such children come all sorts of blessings including economic blessings. But to understand these truths we must come to the Lord in faith believing He is a God who cares for His own.”

I would add to this that women should trust God will work through their husband if he wants to have a large family. If a Unificationist sister is not moved by Father’s words and Mother’s example to not do birth control then she should at least read Nancy Campbell’s powerful arguments to be godly and mature enough to go through the pain of many childbirths and years of raising many small children in her book *Be Fruitful and Multiply*. I feel sorry for brothers and sisters who have mates who do not understand the commandment from the Messiah to have many children. I believe Unificationists should have more children than any group has had in history.

True Parents had 14 children. Why can't we have more? Because I am limited in space in this book I have written a whole book on this subject titled *12 Before 40: The Case for Large Families in the Unification Movement*. You can read the text for free at my website www.divineprinciple.com.

I challenge Unificationists to not use birth control and have the same goal True Parents had of having at least 12 children even if they have to adopt.