

Self-Centered Slavery: IPPF's Declaration on "Sexual Rights"

Prepared by American Life League's STOPP Project, July 2009

Document draws a bleak picture of a heathen world entitled to self-destruction through self-centered sexual pleasure, with no regard for the consequences of that behavior.

Introduction

After two years of preparation, International Planned Parenthood Federation has issued a document intended to create "change," promote and ensure "sexual rights" as human rights, and promote the use of legislative and judicial action to enforce these supposed rights. It is titled [Sexual rights: an IPPF declaration](#).

This 29-page document is divided into three parts. It begins with a preamble, which describes the concept of sexual rights as "a component of human rights, which are an evolving set of entitlements," and then sets forth seven "principles," which are the framework for the declaration. It concludes with a section titled "Sexual rights are human rights related to sexuality," which enumerates 10 "sexual rights" that purportedly flow from the seven "principles."

May your reading of the ungodly radical concepts and philosophies espoused in this document fill you with righteous indignation and inspire you to recommit yourself ever more fully to opposing Planned Parenthood and its agenda at every turn. This is not a battle we can afford to walk away from, but one that everyone who stands for truth and goodness must stand and fight.

The preamble of IPPF's "sexual rights" document

The preamble begins by saying, "sexual rights are a component of human rights, which are an evolving set of entitlements related to sexuality that contribute to the freedom, equality and dignity of all people."

Let's take a closer look at that statement. Webster's dictionary defines "evolve" as "to develop by or as if by evolution: undergo evolutionary change." In this context, evolving rights thus means rights that are subject to change, depending upon who is defining those rights.

The preamble goes on to claim that the Declaration is "grounded in core international human rights treaties." It is important to note that [the United States has not ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child](#), one of the treaties upon which IPPF relies in this Declaration. The treaty would usurp parental rights in contradiction with established laws that protect parents' rights.

Further, the preamble defines "sexual rights" as "norms that emerge when existing human rights are applied to sexuality. These rights include freedom, equality, privacy, autonomy, integrity and dignity of all people; principles recognized in many international instruments that are particularly relevant to sexuality."

Pope John Paul II, in his encyclical [The Gospel of Life](#), says that one of the great advancements of the modern age has been the acceptance of "universal rights." Yet the pope also noted that we have come to believe we have rights to actions that have no basis in truth. IPPF's claiming of rights that have no basis in truth leads to disregard for genuine human rights.

The seven 'general principles'

IPPF enumerates seven principles to promote and fulfill its “sexual rights” propaganda.

“Principle 1 – Sexuality is an integral part of the personhood of every human being. For this reason, a favourable environment in which everyone may enjoy all sexual rights as part of the process of development must be created.”

Principle 1 goes on to say, “Poverty is both a cause and a consequence of sexual ill health and sexuality-based inequalities and exclusions. Programming must address the interconnection of poverty with these issues, recognizing its role in the enjoyment and denial of human rights and, in particular, its effects on sexual rights.”

“Principle 2 – The rights and protections guaranteed to people under age eighteen differ from those of adults, and must take into account the evolving capacities of the individual child to exercise rights on his or her own behalf.”

Here IPPF refers to Article 5 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, saying that “it is stated that the direction and guidance provided by parents or others with responsibility for the child must take into account the capacities of the child to exercise rights on his or her own behalf. The concept of evolving capacity of children requires a balance between recognizing children as active agents in their own lives entitled to be respected as citizens, as people and as rights-bearers with increasing autonomy, while also being entitled to protection in accordance with their vulnerability.”

IPPF’s explanation continues: “Several key principles govern the interrelationship between children’s rights and other interests. Among these are: the view of persons under 18 as rights holders; the best interests of the child; the evolving capacities of the child; non-discrimination; and the responsibility for ensuring conditions for thriving. In the context of sexual rights, these principles require an individualized approach, informed by demonstration of maturity and consideration of particular circumstances, such as the specific child or adolescent’s understanding, activities, physical or mental health status, relationship with parents or other interested parties, the power relations among those involved, and the nature of the issue at hand.”

The key to understanding all this bureaucratic language is the last sentence. Let’s restate that line and add some emphasis in the form of underlining:

"In the context of sexual rights, these principles require an individualized approach, informed by demonstration of maturity and consideration of particular circumstances, such as the specific child or adolescent’s understanding, activities, physical or mental health status, relationship with parents or other interested parties, the power relations among those involved, and the nature of the issue at hand."

What this means is that your child will not be safe from this ideology. For example, if Planned Parenthood can convince a judge that your child is mature and that the child is being stifled because of the Christian morality you are attempting to “impose” on him or her, then the judge can declare your child to be emancipated for purposes of attaining sexual pleasure. It means that once the attainment of sexual pleasure is declared a right, you will be helpless to enforce any rules restricting your minor child’s sexual activity.

“Principle 3- Non-discrimination underlies all human rights protection and promotion.”

This section states, in part, “This framework of non-discrimination prohibits any distinction, exclusion or restriction on the basis of sex; age; gender; gender identity; sexual orientation; marital status; sexual history or behaviour, real or imputed;... religion... which has the purpose or effect of nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others, of all human rights.”

Here we have IPPF claiming, in the name of non-discrimination, the “right” to indulge in any type of sexual behavior, with the underlying threat of enforcement of such “rights” through non-discrimination statutes and legislation.

This section also sets out to prohibit “discrimination in the realm of sexual rights... through unequal access” to “comprehensive sexuality education” (a term that Planned Parenthood juxtaposes with chastity education or “[abstinence-only education, which it opposes.](#)”)

PP, in the meantime, pushes “comprehensive sexuality education” programs to children as young as age five. Today’s sex education programs, such as those promoted by Planned Parenthood, are extremely harmful for children according to experts such as Dr. Melvin Anchell, who discusses the psychological aspects of human sexual development here: <http://www.stopp.org/anchell.htm>.

“Principle 4 – Sexuality, and the pleasure deriving from it, is a central aspect of being human, whether or not a person chooses to reproduce.”

This section promotes an entitlement to the enjoyment of sexuality without reproduction, and the entitlement to reproduction without sex, against the backdrop of the previously mentioned demand for non-discrimination on the basis of age, sexual orientation or identity, sexual history or behavior, religion, etc.

This section also brazenly states, “The entitlement to experience and enjoy sexuality independent of reproduction, and reproduction independent of sexuality should be safeguarded, paying particular attention to those who, historically and in the present, are denied such an entitlement.”

Attempting to divorce society from the natural law, to divorce civilization from its most basic and beneficial institution – sacramental marriage between one man and one woman, and the children who spring forth from and thrive within this marital bond – this document draws a bleak picture of a heathen world entitled to self-destruction through self-centered sexual pleasure with no regard for the consequences of that behavior.

Children become something that interferes with pleasure and thus something to be avoided. When avoidance fails, they are easily destroyed by abortion. They become, on the other hand, property to which adults are entitled, without the need of reproductive sex (i.e., through cloning; in vitro fertilization; adoption by anyone regardless of sexual orientation or sexual behavior, etc.).

Pulling out all the stops, IPPF then claims, “All persons are entitled to the conditions that enable the pursuit of a pleasurable sexuality.” It continues, “Given that pleasure is an intrinsic aspect of sexuality, the right to seek, express and determine when to experience it must not be denied to anyone.”

Having opened the door to all sorts of deviant sexual activity, this document seeks to place a permanent wedge in the door, allowing evil to run at full force.

With an entitlement to seek, express and determine when, where and how to express one’s sexuality, what’s to stop someone from fornicating in the middle of the public square? According to Principle 4, such an activity should not be denied. When a society begins to accept and embrace evil, total chaos will follow.

Principles 5 and 6:

“Principle 5- Ensuring sexual rights for all includes a commitment to freedom and protection from harm.”

“Principle 6- Sexual rights may be subject only to those limitations determined by law for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and the general welfare in a democratic society.”

Once again negating the laws of God, the document states that the only limitations to be placed on sexual freedom are those determined by the laws of man.

In the face of a declaration that basically states, “Do whatever feels good,” it is going to be very difficult to protect people from abuse and harm, since the declaration attempts to eliminate any trace of conscience and guilt from a person and makes no distinction between what is right and what is wrong.

“Principle 7 – The obligations to respect, protect and fulfill apply to all sexual rights and freedoms.”

This section states, “Sexual rights and freedoms include core legal claims as well as access to the means to fulfill those claims.” It would require states to refrain from violating or otherwise interfering with a person’s “sexual rights.” It also places the burden on states to prevent third parties from interfering with these “rights” and would require that states adopt “appropriate legislative, administrative, budgetary, judicial, promotional and other measures towards the full realization of the right.”

It further seeks to hold “other actors in civil society whose actions and omissions have effects on the enjoyment of sexual rights” accountable under the law. It comes as no great surprise that among the groups listed which PP would like to hold legally responsible for interference with sexual rights are “not-for-profit and religious entities.”

There you have it: International Planned Parenthood Federation is attempting to set the stage for requiring churches to support PP’s agenda, by “respecting, protecting and fulfilling” the “sexual rights” of all, in accordance with IPPF’s philosophies.

IPPF and PPFA do not understand the gift of sexuality. As is stated in the Vatican document [*The Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality: Guidelines for Education within the Family*](#), “Sexuality is a fundamental component of personality, one of its modes of being, of manifestation, of communicating with others, of feeling, of expressing and of living human love.”

Is love mentioned at all throughout the entire Declaration? No, not once. The word “love” is never mentioned nor is the word chastity. Perhaps IPPF needs to get a lesson or two about chastity, since “chastity is the joyous affirmation of someone who knows how to live self-giving, free from any form of **self-centered slavery**” (emphasis added).

IPPF’s 10 “sexual rights”

Pope John Paul II, in his encyclical [*The Gospel of Life*](#), says that one of the great advancements of the modern age has been the acceptance of “universal rights.” Yet the pope also noted that we have come to believe we have rights to actions that have no basis in truth.

In this dangerous declaration of “sexual rights,” IPPF lays claim to many so-called rights that simply have

no basis in truth. Thus, the declaration itself becomes a lie and leads to disregard for genuine human rights.

Introduction: Entitlements bolstered by international law

The introduction to this section alleges, “Sexual rights are constituted by a set of entitlements related to sexuality that emanate from the rights to freedom, equality, privacy, autonomy, integrity and dignity of all people.”

The enumeration of “sexual rights” picks up where the “principles” left off, by placing a strong emphasis on the fact that, supposedly, “many international instruments, norms and standards recognize the important principles related to sexuality.”

We might be tempted to overlook this as a mere attempt to bolster the “rights” IPPF is claiming. However, a deeper look into the threat of international law shows that this statement is a most important premise—one upon which IPPF may well be relying to compel nations to comply with these “sexual rights,” whether or not a particular nation has ratified the instruments to which the declaration refers.

Read more on this dangerous premise in an upcoming *Wednesday STOPP Report*.

IPPF enumerates 10 “sexual rights”

In an apparent attempt to mimic the Bill of Rights amending the Constitution of the United States, International Planned Parenthood Federation enumerates what it claims to be 10 “sexual rights,” each listed and expounded upon as a separate article attached to its declaration.

“Article 1 – Right to equality, equal protection of the law and freedom from all forms of discrimination based on sex, sexuality or gender”

The first paragraph references, through footnotes, a whopping **eight** international instruments or statements: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights and must enjoy the equal protection of the law against discrimination based on their sexuality, sex or gender.”

The second paragraph demands that states and civil society take “steps to promote the modification of social and cultural practices based on stereotyped roles of women or men or on the idea of superiority or inferiority of sexes, genders or gender expressions.”

In other words, Planned Parenthood is calling for social engineering to dispel the cultural and social norms regarding male and female roles.

The fourth paragraph says, “All persons shall be accorded legal capacity and the same opportunities to exercise that capacity... and shall be treated equally in all stages of procedure in courts and tribunals, **with due regard for the evolving capacity of the child**” (emphasis added).

Here IPPF continues to play on one of the document’s recurring themes: that these “rights” are evolving or ever changing, that children’s right to attain sexual pleasure is evolving according to their “capacity,” and that children can be emancipated from parental control in areas of sexuality, rendering the parents totally helpless to intervene or control the sexual behavior of the child.

“Article 2 – The right to participation for all persons, regardless of sex, sexuality or gender”

The second paragraph states, “All persons are entitled to participate in the development and implementation of policies that determine their welfare, including their sexual and reproductive health, without formal or informal barriers such as marriage qualifications, conditions related to HIV status, or

discriminatory gender norms, stereotypes and prejudices that exclude or restrict the participation of persons based on ideas of gender and sexual propriety.”

Following on the heels of the statement that children have rights to sexual pleasure according to their evolving capacities, this paragraph says that all persons, obviously including children, are entitled to participate in the development and implementation of policies that determine their sexual and reproductive health (which always includes deadly birth control and abortion, as far as PP is concerned); without the need of marriage, regardless of whether one of the partners is HIV positive; outside of gender norms (i.e., bisexual, homosexual, transgendered); stereotypes and prejudices (i.e., that sexual relations are reserved for a married couple, and that marriage is between one man and one woman); that exclude or restrict the participation of persons based on ideas of gender and sexual propriety (i.e., that Junior cannot be excluded from having sex with anyone of any gender, based on anyone’s ideas of what would be correct or appropriate behavior).

For those who may have doubted the fact that Planned Parenthood wants to pull out all the stops on sexual activity—leaving truth, morality and decency behind as battlefield casualties—this paragraph should dispel any doubt. It spells out, with painful clarity, IPPF’s intention to engineer a world that is guaranteed the right to wallow in the lowest pits of sexual sin, in a moral vacuum, without regard to societal norms.

And just in case you had any doubt that all of the aforesaid applies to young people, the next paragraph removes it: “Young people, who are frequently excluded, shall have the right to be participants and protagonists in processes of change in their societies. They shall have meaningful ways to contribute to and shall share the responsibilities for the development of policies and programmes to protect, promote and fulfil sexual and reproductive health and rights.”

“Article 3 – The rights to life, liberty, security of the person and bodily integrity”

Interestingly, the first paragraph of this article begins with “All persons have the right to life...” The only way IPPF can possibly rectify this statement with its huge abortion and birth control business is to constantly defend its claim, which conflicts with science, that the preborn are not persons. This is an area that cries out to the pro-life community for action—[to press for human personhood amendments](#).

The next paragraph forbids corporal punishment for sexual history or behavior.

It is followed by a paragraph which pits mothers against their preborn babies, stating that “no woman’s life or health shall be put at risk as a consequence of medical treatment being denied to her for any physical or mental condition, or based on others placing a competing value on the foetus she may be carrying.”

Medical care of pregnant women should always take into account the best interest of both patients, mother and child.

The next paragraph is a direct condemnation of the right to life of preborn children: “No woman shall be **condemned** to forced maternity as a result of having exercised her sexuality” (emphasis added).

The 11th paragraph demands that “all migrants and migrant workers, particularly young, female and transgender migrants, must have access... to the means to protect and fulfil their sexual health and rights.”

The 12th paragraph calls for “the right to seek and enjoy asylum from persecution... on the basis of, among other things, sexual history or behavior or sexual orientation or HIV status.” In other words, in the sex-crazed world of IPPF, where anything goes, there will be no consequences for any type of sexual behavior.

The 13th paragraph demands freedom from “removal, extradition or expulsion or threats thereof to any State where they may face a well-founded fear of persecution based on... sexual history or behaviour or sexual orientation or HIV status.” Regardless of a person’s sexual behavior, he or she may not be extradited to a State where he or she will be caused to suffer because of that behavior.

“Article 4 – Right to Privacy”

This article claims the “right to privacy which is essential to the exercise of sexual autonomy” for all persons.

It seeks to give all persons sexual autonomy “to make decisions about their sexuality, sexual behaviour and intimacy without arbitrary interference.”

It seeks to protect all persons from disclosing their HIV status, sexual history, sexual partners and behaviors.

One must wonder how an organization that claims to be working to lower the incidence of HIV/AIDS can allege that those infected with HIV have a “right” to not disclose that deadly infection to past, present and potential sexual partners. Should Planned Parenthood continue to receive funding to combat HIV/AIDS when this is what it advocates?

“Article 5 – Right to personal autonomy and recognition before the law”

In this section, IPPF flashes back to its preoccupation with children’s “rights” to sexual freedom.

The first paragraph says, “All persons have the right to be recognized before the law and to sexual freedom, which encompasses the opportunity for individuals to have control and decide freely on matters related to sexuality, to choose their sexual partners, to seek to experience their full sexual potential and pleasure, within a framework of non-discrimination and with due regard to the rights of others and to the evolving capacity of children.”

Once again, IPPF is off on its never-ending quest for unimpeded sex within a moral vacuum, accompanied by the threat of enforcing discrimination laws against those who refuse to subscribe to its vision of a world lost in lust.

To further that end, the document continues by claiming freedom “to exercise autonomous and relational sexual practices and conduct, within an environment of social, political and economic conditions in which all rights and freedoms can be realized equally by all.”

It further seeks to normalize, by decriminalization, all consensual sexual practices or conduct, calls for the right of all prisoners to have regular conjugal visits, and seeks to require governments to issue identification documents reflecting the person’s “self-defined gender identity, including but not limited to birth certificates, passports and electoral records.”

That is to say, if tomorrow I decide I am no longer female, I could require the government to change all of my identifying documentation so that it states that I am male.

“Article 6. Right to freedom of thought, opinion and expression; right to association”

In this Article, IPPF leaps beyond its usual defiance of social, cultural and moral norms, claiming the “right” to spit in the face of public order, public morality, public health and public security for the sake of expressing ideas about sexuality.

Further, we see IPPF laying claim to our children once again, as it attempts to exclude the influence of parents through demanding the “right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, including the right to hold opinions without interference, within a framework of non-discrimination and respect for the evolving capacity of children.”

In the third paragraph, IPPF attempts to free “all persons” from “fear, shame, guilt, false beliefs and other impediments to the free expression of their desires.” Does this not sound like Satan himself, skulking in the shadows, claiming the ability to take away shame, guilt and, yes, those ridiculous false beliefs that would prevent a person from pursuing whatever he might desire?

IPPF then makes another pathetic attempt at establishing itself as the supreme authority regarding our children, by claiming everyone has the “right” to “receive and impart information and ideas with regard to... sexuality through any legal medium and regardless of frontiers,” and—surprise—relying on its favorite phrase yet again: “within a framework of non-discrimination and taking into consideration the rights of others and the evolving capacity of children.”

This article concludes by claiming the “right” to do all of the above through groups and organizations, “through any medium.”

“Article 7. Right to health and to the benefits of scientific progress”

IPPF attempts to lay waste to the conscience rights of those health-care providers and others who do not wish to participate in its mandate of unbridled sex, immoral reproductive technology, dangerous contraception and abortion, by stating, “All persons shall have access to health care and services *independently of the conscientious objection of health service providers*” (emphasis added).

Here IPPF also attempts to ensure the “right” to “reproductive health technologies, services or medical interventions,” once again invoking the “principle of the evolving capacity of the child.”

“Article 8. Right to education and information”

Among the many descriptive terms that come to mind regarding this declaration, “redundant” looms large. It’s as if IPPF believes that if it repeats something often enough, it will become truth and law.

IPPF claims that all persons have the “right” to “comprehensive sexuality education and information.” As we reported earlier in our analysis, Planned Parenthood pushes for what it calls comprehensive sexuality education, as opposed to abstinence education, which PP opposes.

Article 8 also calls for “empowering [young people] to participate in determining policy regarding sexual health and sexuality education.”

It further claims the “right” to educate children about all sorts of perverse sex, saying, “Young people in particular shall have access to information on sexuality and gender non-conforming lives and sexual relations.”

Next, IPPF seeks to ensure that this education in perversion is available free from parental interference, in school-, health-service- and community-based settings. Included in this section is the assertion that all persons will decide “when, how, and with whom to have sex and when sexual behavior will become reproductive.”

“Article 9. Right to choose whether or not to marry and to found and plan a family, and to decide whether or not, how and when, to have children”

As this document nears its end, it becomes clear that IPPF is attempting to eradicate the most basic building block of our society: the institution of marriage.

The traditional family consisting of one man and one woman joined in marriage and surrounded by the children who are the very expression of the spouses' love for one another, is the model designed by God Himself for the happiness and survival of the human race.

In his 1930 encyclical [Casti Connubii](#) (*On Christian Marriage*), Pope Pius XI grieved that “a great number of men, forgetful of that divine work of redemption, either entirely ignore or shamelessly deny the great sanctity of Christian wedlock, or relying on the false principles of a new and utterly perverse morality, too often trample it under foot.”

He went on to explain that “since these most pernicious errors and depraved morals have begun to spread even amongst the faithful and are gradually gaining ground,” he was duty-bound to raise his voice to keep the flock committed to his care “from poisoned pastures.” By way of this article, IPPF spreads its most lethal poison on the verdant pastures that are intended to support human life.

In the initial paragraph of this article of the IPPF declaration, claim is made to laws and policies that “recognize the diversity of the family forms as including those not defined by descent or marriage.”

Broadcasting the toxic idea of even children entering into these types of relationships, the document claims the “right” for all persons to “enter freely and with full consent into marriage or other partnership arrangements.”

Article 9 then attempts to force you and me to pay for these illicit partnerships, by claiming to grant the “right” to “family-related social welfare” benefits, “independently of the family form they have chosen to found, including those not defined by descent or marriage.”

It then claims the “right” to adopt or create children within these unholy bonds, and to “reproductive technologies, and treatments” deemed necessary for accomplishing those goals. It seeks to ensure the utilization of life-destroying contraception and abortion and, once again, invokes the “evolving capacity of children.”

Then, invoking perhaps the biggest oxymoron ever, it calls for the “right” to “**safe abortion**... accessible, affordable, acceptable and convenient to all users” (emphasis added). Abortion always involves the termination of an innocent human life. Safe abortion? For whom?

“Article 10. Right to accountability and redress”

Ripe and about to burst from its cyclical consumption and regurgitation of sexual excess and giddy from its assertion of rights intended to ensure that depravity runs rampant, IPPF now brandishes its sword of bravado and demands laws to enforce its newly-defined “rights” by any and all means.

“All persons have the right to effective, adequate, accessible and appropriate educative, legislative, judicial and other measures to ensure and demand that those who are duty-bound to uphold sexual rights are fully accountable to them,” it states. “This includes the ability to monitor the implementation of sexual rights and to access remedies for violations of sexual rights, including access to full redress through restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, guarantee of non-repetition and **any other means**” (emphasis added).

It then calls for States to “establish mechanisms of accountability for ensuring that their obligations related to the guarantee of sexual rights are fully upheld,” and specifically calls for “non-state actors whose

actions or omissions impact upon [all persons'] enjoyment of sexual rights" to be held accountable for the lack of such enjoyment.

This rehashes Principle 7, which specifically names not-for-profit and religious entities among those who should be held accountable for actions and omissions that deprive persons of the enjoyment of "sexual rights."

Prophetic proclamations

In his 1930 encyclical *On Christian Marriage*, Pope Pius XI apparently foresaw attacks on the traditional family:

"Some men go so far as to concoct new species of unions, suited, as they say, to the present temper of men and the times... These offer all the indulgence of matrimony and its rights without, however, the indissoluble bond, and without offspring..."

"Indeed there are some who desire and insist that these practices be legitimized by the law or, at least, excused by their general acceptance among the people. They do not seem even to suspect that these proposals partake of nothing of the modern 'culture' in which they glory so much, but are simply hateful abominations which beyond all question reduce our truly cultured nations to the barbarous standards of savage peoples..."

"But no reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good."

He called for a return to the divine plan for marriage.

Rx for unbridled lust: Subject yourself to God

Pope Pius XI said:

"Wherefore, since the chief obstacle to this study is the power of unbridled lust, which indeed is the most potent cause of sinning against the sacred laws of matrimony, and since man cannot hold in check his passions, unless he first subject himself to God, this must be his primary endeavor, in accordance with the plan divinely ordained."

"For it is a sacred ordinance that whoever shall have first subjected himself to God will, by the aid of divine grace, be glad to subject to himself his own passions and concupiscence; while he who is a rebel against God will, to his sorrow, experience within himself the violent rebellion of his worst passions."

If our society is to avoid terminal decay, we must subject our passions to God's will. IPPF's rebellion against God and His plan for chaste marriage is destined to bring those who revel in this rebellion to ruin.

Conclusion

Self-centered slavery. That phrase sums up the content of this entire "sexual rights" document.

Sexuality is part of what makes us human. IPPF's idea of freedom, as set out in this document, is "[a]ll persons have the right to explore their sexuality, to have dreams and fantasies free from fear, shame, guilt, false beliefs and other impediments to the free expression of their desires."

It appears that IPPF is espousing that all people should be free to participate in any type of "evolving" sexual behavior or lifestyle, suffering no consequences, within the confines of the law, and that the law is also subject to change.

IPPF says that all people should be free from guilt. But you must wonder, why is guilt present in the first place? Because we are seeded with truth. "God created man in His image; in the divine image He created him; male and female He created them" (Gen. 1:27). [Guilt](#) is "a feeling of responsibility or remorse for some offense, crime, wrong." IPPF is attempting to assuage guilt by declaring that immoral sexual behavior is acceptable and should be considered a human right.

Pope John Paul II elaborated on the state of a society that suppresses and distorts the truth, in his encyclical [Evangelium Vitae \(1995\)](#). These words go to the heart of IPPF's current efforts to mandate sexual rights that have no basis in truth:

A large part of contemporary society looks sadly like that humanity which Paul describes in his Letter to the Romans. It is composed "of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth" (1:18): having denied God and believing that they can build the earthly city without him, "they became futile in their thinking" so that "their senseless minds were darkened" (1:21); "claiming to be wise, they became fools" (1:22), carrying out works deserving of death, and "they not only do them but approve those who practice them" (1:32). When conscience, this bright lamp of the soul (cf. Mt 6:22-23), calls "evil good and good evil" (Is 5:20), it is already on the path to the most alarming corruption and the darkest moral blindness.

And yet all the conditioning and efforts to enforce silence fail to stifle the voice of the Lord echoing in the conscience of every individual: it is always from this intimate sanctuary of the conscience that a new journey of love, openness and service to human life can begin.

It is up to us to listen to the voice of the Lord "Who tries so hard to get our attention," echoing in our consciences. It is up to us to fight the good fight and to leave no stone unturned in opposing IPPF's evil "sexual rights" agenda, so that our children and our children's children may truly enjoy the knowledge and freedom of living a chaste life of self-giving, rather than perishing in the eternal darkness of a self-centered, self-destructive "freedom" which will steal their souls and condemn them to eternal misery.

To learn more about our proven plan to defeat Planned Parenthood, visit www.stopp.org.