

## **Supporting the Perceived Victim**

**by Fred DeRuvo – Study-Grow-Know Ministries**

We have discussed the fact that the *oversimplification* of issues by those within the arena of political correctness (PC) causes them to divide everyone into two categories; either a person is a “victim” or they are the “aggressor.” The “victim” is seen as being “right” (and *supported*) while the “aggressor” is understood to be “wrong” (and consequently *vilified*). It is as basic and as simplistic as that.

A person is determined to be a victim if he/she is up against someone or something that *appears* to be stronger. Strength represents aggression, regardless of whether or not it is that. It is *seen* as lording it over others and creating victims because of it. All “good” people then must fight against the aggressor. Those who defend “aggressors” become just as vilified.

For instance, the president of Planned Parenthood, Cecile Richards, can publicly announce that declaring a fetus a *human being* is an “extremist” position<sup>1</sup> and women’s groups and supporters will agree with her. She is referring to the recent North Dakota *Personhood Amendment*. Richards notes, “*These politicians don’t care about women or whether these matters are on the minds of the American people.*”<sup>2</sup>

This is exactly how the PC see issues in life and react to them. The absurdity of her words masks a political subterfuge. Richards and others like her must always bring it back to a focus on women and women’s rights and do everything in their power to *eradicate* the fact that women who have abortions *are* carrying a human life within them. The focus cannot be on the unborn human being but on women’s “health” issues, and it should stay there.

Richards claims that politicians do not care about women. She also denies that a fetus is a human being. As the representative for Planned Parenthood, she cannot admit that the unborn child *is* a human being because if she does, she immediately becomes a hypocrite *and* guilty of supporting murder. She *has* to deny that a fetus is a human being so that those who attack Planned Parenthood then are seen as solely attacking *women*.

For the politically correct minions (including Planned Parenthood), a woman carries an unborn baby to term and delivers a baby. At *that point (after the birth)*, it magically

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://weaselzipper.us/2013/03/24/planned-parenthood-ceo-declaring-a-fetus-a-human-being-is-extremism/> (03/26/2013)

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*

*becomes* a human being. A woman who is pregnant with an unborn baby, but opts to *abort* (even as late as the third trimester through the partial-birth abortion method), kills something that is *never* seen as a human being. This is how political correctness works.

Remember, Richards *must* emphasize that women are the “victims” here by focusing on women’s “health” issues. She does this by making a sweeping generalization that politicians do not “care” about women or their “health” issues. It’s an untenable position, but it is done so that she forces the focal point of the discussion to remain on women as “victims” (without using the term), and this focus disregards the fact that an unborn child is in the mix. The people at Planned Parenthood can never waver from this position at all.

This is why a person who, for instance, shoots a pregnant woman during a robbery or carjacking is often charged with two *murders* (if both mother and unborn child die). The accepted assumption is that the mother had *every* intention of carrying the unborn child to full term and giving birth. In that case, the law sees the perpetrator as being a murderer of the unborn child as well as of the mother.

However, if the same woman had gone to an abortion clinic and *paid* to literally have the child *murdered*, this action is *acceptable* by law because the *woman* made the decision to end her unborn baby’s life and abortion is not seen as murder. In that case, the unborn child is *never* recognized as a human being.

In both cases, the *murder* of an unborn baby *occurred*. Yet because one method (abortion) is socially acceptable (another term for *political correctness*), it is *not* considered murder. It is considered a legal “choice” by the mother and the doctor is merely paid to perform a “health” service that removes *fetal tissue* from the womb, regardless of the age or development of the “fetal tissue.”

Those who claim to be *Christians* and see life through the lens of political correctness must look seriously at *how* they make their decisions. In nearly all situations, these individuals base their decisions *not* on *biblical truth* but on the ever-changing tapestry of *societal relativism*. If they would stop to consider the fact that they are actually aligning themselves with atheists, agnostics, and in general, people who are in complete *rebellion* toward God and His *absolute truth*, they might realize the problem.

God considers societal relativism (or political correctness) to be *compromising* with the world, regardless of how well-intentioned individuals may be who call themselves Christian. Far from standing on *His* truth, they are firmly in line with the *world’s* relativism or “virtue.”

So, even though God says “*thou shalt not kill*,” for instance, those who claim to be Christian yet use political correctness to define their position do so by setting God’s immutable law aside, replacing it with human-made moral relativism. How is that Christian? We understand that when God issued that command, He was speaking of premeditated *murder* since He also made provision for those who accidentally killed someone or killed someone in self-defense (cf. Exodus 22:2-3; see also Nehemiah 4:17-18).

In the case of abortion, these individuals claiming to be Christian *choose* to believe that women are “victims,” so their decision is made clear. It is to fight those whom they see as *oppressing* women (keeping them from having an abortion, in this case). This is in spite of the fact that the “aggressors” they fight against are also fighting *for* the rights of thousands of *unborn* babies every day: true innocents, who have no one to speak for them and whose innocent blood is spilled, something that God abhors (as the Scripture points out in places like Deuteronomy 19: 10; Proverbs 6:17; cf. 2 Kings 8:12; 15:16; Hosea 13:16; Amos 1:13).

To the politically correct “Christian,” their truth is clearly (and only) seen in who is the “victim.” Having arrived at that conclusion (in spite of God’s absolute truth, which judges not based on victim/aggressor, but on the act of a person), that the unborn child is *not* the victim, but the woman *is*, they find ways to make God’s Word fit into their preconceived idea of truth.

In all issues that face society, it is *imperative* for those within the politically correct camp to determine *victim* and *aggressor*. That is the starting point for them in determining “truth.” Once this is accomplished, it is merely a matter of “aggressively” supporting the “victim” while also viscerally castigating those who are seen as standing against that “victim” (aka, the aggressors).

This is why – according to the politically correct – the Tea Party is evil. The Tea Party is seen as the *aggressor* because it supports capitalism, as well as the Constitution and Bill of Rights as the rule of law in America. Ultimately, the Tea Party believes in biblical values as outlined by the founders. This stance is anathema to the politically correct. This is one reason why people were and are so desperate to paint the Tea Party as *racist* and *sexist*, in spite of not one shred of evidence to prove the charges.

It is also why the Occupy Movement, which leaves tons of garbage and destruction in its wake, is seen as the *victim* because it is opposed to corporate America, or *capitalism*, which is seen as the aggressor. The Occupy Movement – the perceived *victim* – is given a wide berth to do what it needs to do by the politically correct (including the media) and among politicians. The Tea Party – the stated *aggressor* – is the enemy of “freedom” and “equality” and should, in every respect, be verbally abused by the media and virtually everyone else.

Another example of how political correctness works is seen in a recent discussion that occurred on Al Sharpton's show. In it, he and two others focused on Mayor Bloomberg of New York City and his continued efforts to abrogate the Second Amendment. Right out of the chute, the race card was played – anti-Semitism – because of Bloomberg's Jewish ethnicity.

*"MIKE BARNICLE: Let's get down to it: Mike Bloomberg, Mayor of New York City. I mean, there's a level of anti-Semitism in this thing, directed toward Bloomberg –*

*"AL SHARPTON: No doubt about it.*

*"BARNICLE: I mean, it's out there.*

*"DAN SENOR: I don't think it's anti-Semitism. I think it's the perception of big-city urban elites, wealthy elites, telling the rest of the little people how to live their lives.*

*"SHARPTON: But if he were not a big-city Jewish man, in some parts I think it would be different."<sup>3</sup>*

The only one who sort of got it right was Dan Senior, though I believe he was off the mark as well. It is not so much "*big-city urban elites*" telling the rest of us how to live. It is the fact that Bloomberg believes the Second Amendment is outmoded and needs to be seriously curtailed or eradicated.

That's our show for today. Until we meet again, I pray that the Lord will open your eyes to show you how blessed you are in Him!

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/mark-finkelstein/2013/03/25/sharpton-barnicle-agree-anti-semitism-explains-opposition-bloomber#ixzz2OYzGu3iL> (03/26/2013)