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INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS THE ABDERTION WAR all about, anyway? This journal has been wrestling with that question for quite a while (this issue begins our 18th year of continuous publication). We've put forward a few thousand answers, but none more succinct than a single paragraph we spied in a recent column by Thomas Sowell, writing about the kind of “political buzzwords” that “have made rational discussion virtually impossible” for Americans.

For example, wrote the acid-tongued Mr. Sowell, “reproductive rights” mean that “we cannot debate abortion laws. A woman’s ‘right to do what she wants with her own body’ means that the issue is not open for discussion. But the issue arises precisely because it is not her own body that gets left in a garbage can at the abortion clinic. It is someone else’s body.”

In our lead article, Mr. Andrew Puzder, Esq., argues that anti-abortionists are failing to win the Abortion War precisely because they have failed to make that withering distinction: they are indeed perceived as attacking the rights of women rather than defending the rights of unborn human beings. Puzder has had considerable experience in the matter: back in 1984, while practicing law in St. Louis, he conceived of and co-authored a proposal for a law that was enacted by the Missouri legislature two years later; everybody knows it now as the Webster law which the U.S. Supreme Court upheld in its famous 1989 decision.

The statute begins with a declaration of fact: “The life of each human being begins at conception” and therefore “unborn children have protectable interests in life, health and well being.” The point is, the demonstrable rights of the unborn can and should be protected in every area where Roe v. Wade does not override such rights: the High Court in effect baptized that position by not striking down the opening declaration. Needless to add—if Mr. Puzder’s advice is followed—those rights will be “in place” should Roe actually be reversed.

We couldn’t agree more. Indeed, Puzder was, well, inspired by an article we ran over a decade ago (Winter, 1981) by Mr. Stephen Galebach, who proposed a Human Life Statute which began: “The Congress finds that present day scientific evidence indicates a significant likelihood that actual human life exists
from conception”—therefore the Congress can declare “the obligation of the States under the Fourteenth Amendment not to deprive [unborn persons] of life without due process of law.” Galebach’s proposal was translated into the Human Life Bill which, in the event, failed by a single vote in the U.S. Senate— the closest Congress has ever come to rejecting Roe. So we are delighted to have Mr. Puzder re-state the argument in what might be called “new and improved” terms here—may it sell nationwide.

Another advertising campaign is attempting to sell Americans the notion that there is such a thing as “safe sex”—a cure-all that will, among many other beneficial results, handle the AIDS plague—that is the “message” sent us by the sad plight of Mr. Magic Johnson. But our friend Joseph Sobran—stealing the politically-correct “liberal” approach—argues that sex itself is a lot more “complex” than that, and now that the liberals have demolished traditional sexual restraints, they “simply can’t cope with sexual irresponsibility.” But there are ways to cope—age-old remedies applied throughout history by what Sobran calls “the Tribe,” that extended family in which all of us really live (as distinguished from the “state” we reside in). The question is, can our Tribe regain its moral traditions, or is it already too late?

As always, Sobran manages to handle such daunting questions—which are complex—not only with lucidity but also wit. Or, as one admirer puts it, “like the Good Humor Man selling you the complete Oxford”—despite the heavy going, you should enjoy this one.

Next an old Canadian friend, Professor Donald DeMarco, takes on a related problem: we’ve managed to politicize not only sex but also motherhood itself, which is no longer a “hallowed vocation” but rather just another “choice”—you know, like abortion. But, says DeMarco (like a good philosophy teacher should), motherhood has an objective reality which “modern technology” can only obscure, leaving women anything but happy about “their new opportunities to choose motherhood in the manner that suits their lifestyle.” There is a great deal in this one that we knew nothing about, including some amazing case histories of “surrogate” mothers, not to mention the amusing fact that that great pro-abortion flagship, the New York Times, calls a child “residing in a rented womb” a baby—not a “fetus” suitable for abortion.

Then you get a chapter from the new book Blessed Are the Barren, by Messrs. Robert Marshall and Charles Donovan, two veteran laborers in the anti-abortion vineyard, who have bottled vintage stuff on the “social policy” of Planned Parenthood. Here again, there is an awful lot we never knew about that “charitable” organization, not least the fact that, long before Roe, its “experts” knew that “increased availability of contraceptive services” was increasing the abortion rate. But then that makes sense: the real goal is non-parenthood; viewed that way, Planned Parenthood is a real success story, and a lucrative one as well.

Fact is, it’s becoming a world-wide “success” story, especially in what we’re
used to calling the "Western World" (now including Japan), in which birth rates are now generally well below "replacement level"—and still dropping fast. Who would have believed even a generation ago that Italy, that fabled land of "over-extended" families, would achieve Europe's lowest birth rate? Heaven may forgive, but Nature never does: the resulting vacuum will be filled by the fertile, as our next two articles remind us.

First Herr Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, who knows more about the subject (and most others) than the next score of experts, describes the "menaced continent"—Europe is suffering an "underpopulation" that seems certain to transform it into unrecognizable shape in short order. The reason is obvious: a "practical materialism" makes people simply not want children, who after all "interfere with one's comforts" and "demand sacrifices in time and money" that members of a "competitive society" aren't willing to pay. Herr Erik says the "dwindling of religious influence" is the root of the problem: marriage—once a "sacred rite almost everywhere, not only in Christianity"—has lost its "hallowed character" (DeMarco's point), and thus its attraction.

Then Thomas Molnar describes the geopolitical realities: while of course "good-liberal" governments won't openly discuss it—that would be "racist"—Europeans know that they face waves of "mass-migration" both from the disintegrated Evil Empire to the East and, even worse, from the over-populated South, which is spawning hordes of Moslem invaders the "West" cannot hope to assimilate. As Molnar makes clear, such invasions are by no means new to Europe's history—he even holds out the hope of resistance—but it remains a grim prospect.

But do we have any right to resist? Teeming Asia invokes a different perspective. Our frequent contributor Jo McGowan writes: "I live in India where, as everyone knows, there are too many people." She was born in Massachusetts, where "People who have experienced only the American way of life often believe they have everything to teach and nothing to learn" but, she asks, "What's so great about us?" Do we deserve "special status" above "the wrong sort of people" threatening to overwhelm us?

Taken together, these three articles may leave you as limp as they leave us: the proliferating problems are all too real, with "moral" answers all too elusive—"complex" is a mild word for the dilemma we face—our cop-out is "You decide"!

Or perhaps, on the unsound principle that "All's well that ends later," you'll prefer to read on into our traditional antidote for all such heavy stuff—an abrupt change of pace. This time we have another Canadian friend, Professor Ian Hunter, who knew the late great Malcolm Muggeridge well enough that they swapped houses for a year: "St. Mugg" taught classes at an Ontario university while Hunter plumbed the Park Cottage, Robertsbridge (Sussex) archives for his book Malcolm Muggeridge: A Life.
Hunter’s point is that, while the obituaries more or less adequately described Muggeridge’s famous career as a writer and TV personality, “little was made of his role as a Christian apologist—rather as though a first century obituary of St. Paul should have praised his travel writing while ignoring his missionary accomplishments,” vivid among them his “most eloquent voice in the international pro-life movement.” Amen: long-time readers of this journal will of course know how true that is, but unless you have also delved deeply into Muggland you will find much in Hunter’s memoir that is both fresh and fascinating, just like the “Vendor of Words” himself remained, to the end of his long, remarkable life.

But while you read the sonorous prose, and contemplate the man’s insights, keep in mind that Hunter has no means to convey the ineffable laughter that confirmed Malcolm’s love of life: like Caruso’s voice, he took that with him, no recording can do it justice.

* * * * *

As is our custom, we have added some appendices—only four this time, but each of them adds more depth to what our articles provide. In Appendix A, Columnist Suzanne Fields writes (like Joe Sobran) about Mr. Magic Johnson, the famous basketball star who is now, sadly, much more famous as an “unsafe-sex” symbol. In fact, as Sobran notes, Magic now counsels “safe sex, which means no sex”—but the Media have paid no attention to that little change. Nor, as Miss Fields notes, did they ballyhoo Vice President Dan Quayle’s quaint notion that sex should wait for marriage. But it is interesting that Fields is by no means the only commentator to wonder whether Americans might not be ready—or getting there—for such “square” messages; many once-ardent advocates of the Sexual Revolution are admitting that it has got out of hand, and that Condom-mania promotes more of what ails us. Miss Field’s point is that women, the chief victims, should know better.

Columnist Pat Buchanan (Appendix B) also has plenty to say, in his accustomed style, about Magic—for instance, that “Johnson’s stunner unleashed a torrent of nonsense” about AIDS, and the myth that “we are all at risk”—everybody knows the “primary way AIDS is transmitted” and “the need for compassion must not lead to a denial of truth.”

Next, Buchanan wades into “the dark underside of euthansia” (Appendix C) and the sad suicide of Ann Humphry, ex-wife of Derek, with whom she co-founded the Hemlock Society. Regular readers will find this one an up-date on Mrs. Rita Marker’s lead article in our last (Fall, 1991) issue—if you missed it, we’ll be glad to supply a copy. And you will note that Buchanan wrote just before last November’s euthansia referendum in the State of Washington, which was supposed to produce the Death Industry’s “greatest victory ever”—as we now know, the “Initiative” was soundly defeated.
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We should add that both pieces were obviously written before Buchanan announced his challenge to President Bush, following which he suspended both his columns and TV shows. While we cannot claim to share all of his political positions, we wish him well. More to the point, it should be interesting to see how Pugnacious Pat’s strongly-expressed opinions on the issues we share—the columns here are good examples—will “play” with voters. On that score, we wish our old friend all possible success.

We close with another columnist friend, Ray Kerrison (Appendix D), who never fails to shoot straight at any issue. Here, he gives you a white-hot commentary on New York City’s infamous “Butcher of Avenue A” scandal. Again, faithful readers will find much that is familiar; those who don’t might enjoy the excellent summary in a recent Lifeletter (which even the Washington Post calls “the nation’s leading anti-abortion newsletter”); we will be glad to supply copies on request. But what we’d most like to supply you with is a big book full of Kerrison’s columns: nobody else covers “our” issues with more power or passion—it’s a joy to find a True Believer who can write, and a pity that jaded New Yorkers are his primary audience—we promise more from Kerrison in coming issues, which we trust you eagerly await.

J. P. McFadden
Editor
The question remains open: Will either side win decisive public support in the Great Abortion War?

The most difficult tasks for any social or political movement are maintaining focus and gaining public attention and sympathy. Whether the issue is ending a war or advancing civil rights, success often depends more on the public perception of the cause than on the "merits" of the case. In the abortion debate, the "pro-choice" side has effectively focused public attention on the issue of women's rights, garnering significant public support for the argument that abortion is a "privacy" right entitled to at least some constitutional protection.

In fact, the pro-choice movement has been so successful in focusing the debate on women's rights that its opposition is often perceived as determined to limit or restrict a woman's purported right to abortion, rather than focusing on the far more "saleable" and legitimate issue of protecting an unborn child's life. The unfortunate result has been not only broad public misperception with respect to the goals and motives of the "pro-lifers" but also 18 years of legal abortion on demand.

The pro-abortion side has, of course, been greatly aided by a biased, patently pro-abortion media. Even such notable newspapers as the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Post have been appropriately self-critical of their biased coverage of the issue. Such criticism has done little to affect the neutrality of the coverage, but it has given substance to criticism of the journalistic ethics involved.

However, the media is not totally to blame for the pro-life movement's failure to focus public attention on its true motives and objectives; pro-lifers themselves must accept much of the responsibility. For years they have pursued political and legislative strategies that do indeed address the issue in terms of restricting or regulating "women's rights"—they have often ignored the legitimate interests pregnant women may have, while failing to emphasize the fundamental interests of the unborn child.

Andrew F. Puzder is now practicing law in southern California; while in St. Louis in 1984 he proposed a law which Missouri enacted and which the U.S. Supreme Court upheld in its landmark Webster decision.
ANDREW F. PUZDER

Such strategies only enhance the disingenuous media-created image of pro-lifers as a group of anti-woman religious conservatives more concerned with oppressing women than protecting unborn life. While this image persists, the pro-lifers will be unable to achieve the broad social changes they must achieve—even if they win the abortion battle in the Supreme Court, they will lose the war in the court of public opinion.

A winning strategy must therefore focus on the rights, value, and humanity of the unborn child without ignoring the interests and concerns of the pregnant woman. The general public must be made to understand that pro-lifers are fighting to protect the most fundamental right which Western Civilization recognizes, the right to life, and that protecting this right does not mean oppressing women. They must convey the message that one can be pro-life and pro-woman, that sympathy and compassion for unborn children is not tantamount to disdain and disrespect for their mothers.

The problem has its origins in the pre-\textit{Roe v. Wade} abortion-regulation statutes which were on the books in most states in 1973. These statutes (such as the Texas statute the Court struck down in \textit{Roe}) generally criminalized abortion under virtually all circumstances without giving any consideration to the serious and unique concerns of pregnant women or directly stating that the purpose of criminalizing abortion was to protect unborn children.

Since 1973, both sides have debated the issue of whether the states involved intended such pre-\textit{Roe} statutes to protect unborn children or to protect pregnant women. As with many statutes, the motivation of the legislatures involved is difficult to discern. However, it is clear that such statutes failed to clearly convey the message that their intention was to recognize and protect the rights or value of unborn children. This left the pro-abortion movement in the desirable position of arguing that such statutes were intended solely to oppress women and were inappropriate in our supposedly “enlightened” era of women’s rights.

For the next 16 years, the pro-lifers had an extremely difficult time redirecting the thrust of the legal arguments from women’s rights to unborn children’s rights. Having held in \textit{Roe} that the unborn were constitutional non-persons, the Supreme Court simply elevated a pregnant woman’s privacy right to control her own body and destiny into a fundamental constitutional right superior to any rights of her child. The lack of any constitutional basis for this purported
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privacy right failed to inhibit in any way the social-policy-minded Justices who sat on the Court in its early post-Warren years.

Given a newly-created privacy right to abortion and the lack of any constitutional rights for the unborn, pro-lifers were in the undesirable position of having to attack \textit{Roe} by enacting state laws which tested the reach of this privacy right. The purpose of such “chipping away” legislation was to force the Court to reconsider \textit{Roe}, or limit it, rather than making a frontal attack on \textit{Roe}’s lack of valid social, political or constitutional reasoning. For example, such statutes might attempt to 1) require parental consent for an abortion on a minor, 2) require that pregnant women receive certain information prior to receiving an abortion to assure informed consent, 3) require that doctors perform late abortions in a hospital, or 4) prohibit abortions based on race or sex. There have been many other attempts to chip away, but these examples are sufficient to make the point.

The point is that each of these legislative approaches fails to focus the argument with respect to abortion on protecting the rights of unborn children. For example, laws requiring parental consent are based on the belief that minors lack the maturity or experience to make certain decisions, not on a belief that the unborn children of minors have greater rights than the unborn children of adults. Race and sex-selective abortions were singled out for legislation because the woman’s motive in obtaining an abortion was impermissible, not because unborn children who are the subject of race or sex discrimination have any greater right to life than other children. Informed-consent statutes (or statutes requiring that doctors perform late abortions in hospitals) were designed to protect the interests of pregnant women, not unborn children.

But each time the Supreme Court upheld a chipping-away statute, it limited the purported abortion right and made legal abortion appear less heinous, thereby creating broader public acceptance. Thus, while pro-lifers enacted these “popular”—to them—positions into law they in fact eliminated very few abortions while making it appear all the more reasonable to leave the “remaining” abortions legal—if “bad” abortions are illegal, the public perceives that we must be left with only “good” abortions. Such statutes were, of course, important to pro-lifers because many believed they really had no other way to attack \textit{Roe}. They thought \textit{Roe} placed them in a straitjacket, limiting the kinds of laws state legislators could enact. Nonetheless, chipping-
away legislation lent support to the pro-choice arguments that the real issue was women’s rights and seriously diverted the focus of the movement from protecting the rights of unborn children to limiting the rights of women. In short, pro-lifers were playing right into the hands of pro-choicers.

The Webster Case

The situation changed in 1989, when the Supreme Court decided *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, which gave pro-lifers a new opportunity to redirect the focus of the debate to the unborn child’s life. The *Webster* case involved a 1986 Missouri statute designed to attack *Roe’s* disingenuous rationale *without* making abortion illegal. This statute begins by declaring that “The life of each human being begins at conception” and that “unborn children have protectable interests in life, health and well being.” It goes on to state that in all circumstances *other than abortion*—where the Supreme Court had prohibited the states from acting—Missouri’s laws “shall be interpreted and construed to acknowledge on behalf of the unborn child at every stage of biological development, all the rights, privileges, and immunities available to other persons, citizens and residents of this State...” Thus, by statute, Missouri had declared and recognized that unborn children had significant rights and value in areas such as tort, property and criminal law, wholly *apart* from the abortion issue. The focus of this statute was unquestionably the protection of unborn children’s rights.

Along with this statute, the Supreme Court in *Webster* considered two Missouri laws which did attempt to regulate abortion. One prohibited state funding of certain abortion-related activities; the other imposed certain requirements as to when doctors had to conduct tests to determine if an unborn child was viable.

In sum, the Court was faced with a series of laws which started from the premise that under Missouri law generally (*not* just its abortion law) unborn children had significant rights and value, and that Missouri was attempting to protect the lives of such unborn children. The Court—whose composition had materially changed since 1973—upheld each provision of Missouri’s law stating that Missouri had an “interest in protecting potential human life.”

However, the Court’s opinion also recognized certain interests of the pregnant woman. Chief Justice William Rehnquist, one of
the two original dissenters in Roe, specifically recognized that women have a "liberty interest" in abortion protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and stated that the Court's decision was not an invitation for states to return to the "dark ages" of abortion legislation (the dark ages being apparently the pre-1973 period when most states had criminal abortion statutes similar to the Texas statute, which the Supreme Court held unconstitutional in Roe). Webster's message is that the states have legitimate interests in protecting unborn children's rights, but cannot ignore the concerns of pregnant women.

Thus, after Webster, the pro-life movement had—and still has—the opportunity to regain its focus and to raise public consciousness concerning the rights and value of unborn children. The Court having permitted Missouri's law recognizing the humanity and rights of unborn children to stand, pro-lifers can now use the law to "educate" public opinion, as their opponents have so effectively done for the past eighteen years. By focusing on the rights of unborn children and raising public awareness of the real—not the media-created—pro-life perspective, pro-lifers could well turn the abortion debate around.

Webster's Disappointing Aftermath

Statutes passed since Webster have attempted to direct attention to the unborn child in limited ways. For example, in March, 1990, Guam's legislature passed a law prohibiting abortion except for ectopic pregnancies and pregnancies which would endanger the mother's life or gravely impair her health. This statute begins with legislative findings which basically parrot Missouri's law stating that the "life of every human being begins at conception, and that unborn children have protectable interests in life, health and well being." It goes on to state that "The purpose of this act is to protect the unborn children of Guam." However, the law deals only with abortion, and fails to recognize the rights or value of unborn children in any other context.

In 1991, Utah passed a bill which declares that "unborn children have inherent and inalienable rights that are entitled to protection by the State of Utah" and that "It is the intent of the legislature to protect and guarantee to unborn children their inherent and inalienable right to life and liberty..." Utah's law then prohibits abortion, while recognizing the woman's liberty interest, permitting abortions 1) which are necessary to save the life of the mother or to prevent
grave damage to her health (which includes physical and mental health), 2) when the pregnancy is the result of reported rape or incest, and 3) when the child would be born with grave defects. But this law provides only limited protection for unborn children and, again, attaches value to them solely in the context of abortion.

Also in 1991, Louisiana passed a bill which states that “Life begins at conception” and that the State of Louisiana “has a legitimate compelling interest in protecting, to the greatest extent possible, the life of the unborn from the time of conception until birth.” The law prohibits abortion except to save the life of the mother, and in certain cases of reported rape and incest. As with Guam and Utah, this law deals solely with abortion.

Each of these three laws state their intention to protect and actually do provide very substantive protection for unborn children (Utah to a lesser extent than Louisiana or Guam). The problem is that they do so only in the context of abortion and through slightly-modified versions of the strict-prohibition statutes which were on the books prior to Roe. Thus pro-choicers can disingenuously attack these laws as thinly-veiled attempts to oppress women under the subterfuge of protecting the rights of unborn children—that they are anti-abortion rather than “pro-life.”

Despite the flawed manner in which these laws address unborn children’s rights, the real question is how the Supreme Court, Congress and the public will react. Will the Court regard these laws as returning the abortion controversy to the “dark ages” or as legitimately protecting the lives and rights of unborn children? Will our society come to accept state-by-state solutions to this problem as a just and practical means for resolving the issue or—if the Supreme Court overturns Roe and upholds any of these laws—will one or both sides seek a national solution through federal legislation? In each of these scenarios, the key to ultimate success for the pro-life movement lies in focusing the debate on the rights and value of unborn children. Statutes which simply make abortion illegal improperly (albeit unintentionally) focus the issue on women’s rights, which means that the pro-lifers should rationally and realistically re-evaluate their strategies.

For example, many naively assume that Supreme Court Justices who favor overturning Roe are also opposed to abortion as a matter of social policy, and will thus uphold whatever pro-life statutes come before them. However, the split on the Court is not between pro-life and
pro-choice Justices. While certain Justices who would vote to overturn *Roe* may also hold pro-life sentiments, the real split on the Court over *Roe* is between Justices who favor a strict-constructionist approach to constitutional interpretation and those who favor a social-policy orientation. Speaking very generally, strict-constructionist Justices consider themselves bound by the Constitution's language and intent to a greater degree than social-policy Justices who see the Constitution as a more general guide to decision making, leaving them free to apply their own views on good social policy as constitutional law.

The Court's strict-constructionist faction generally votes in favor of state pro-life legislation because there is little, if any, ambiguity with respect to whether the Constitution itself actually prohibits states from regulating abortion. The Constitution contains no such prohibition.

Thus, a strict-constructionist Justice could consistently believe that women have no constitutionally-protected right to abortion while believing that abortion on demand is good social policy. Such a Justice would have to vote to overturn *Roe* to remain consistent despite his or her personal views on abortion.

Nonetheless, the Justices are as capable as anyone of bias, prejudice or intellectual dishonesty. The worst strategic mistake the pro-life movement could make is to assume that the Court is simply going to accept whatever abortion legislation the states put before it because strict constructionists now dominate the court. Unfortunately, this may be the unstated assumption underlying the Guam and Louisiana laws. Utah's law attempts to address this problem and present the Court with a law it can uphold, but does so by reservedly *limiting* a woman's right to abortion rather than focusing on the unborn child's rights; it does recognize the burdens a crisis pregnancy places on the pregnant woman, but in so doing all but *ignores* the unborn child's rights in such situations, simply permitting an abortion if the doctor involved deems it appropriate under the statute.

The Court in *Webster* was faced with a law which began by extending substantial rights to unborn children in the areas of tort, property and criminal law, well beyond the area of abortion. Arguments that Missouri intended this law to oppress women rather than to protect unborn children were *prima facie* baseless and properly fell upon deaf ears.

But the laws enacted by Guam, Utah and Louisiana failed to follow Missouri's lead, and limited their scope solely to protecting the unborn
from abortion. In Webster, Justice Rehnquist confirmed that states have an “interest in protecting potential human life” prior to viability. Whether the Court will find the Guam, Utah and Louisiana laws constitutionally sound legislative action designed to protect that interest (as this author believes should be the case) is an open question. It is clear, however, that pro-lifers can greatly enhance the odds of the Court upholding a pro-life law if the attorneys involved can convince the Court that the true intent of the law is to protect unborn children rather than to oppress women. Unfortunately, while this was certainly their intent, the strict-prohibition statutes from Guam, Utah and Louisiana give the attorneys involved very little with which to work.

The Court Has Changed

Even so, the composition of the Court has changed since Webster in ways which may result in a complete reversal of Roe based upon the Guam, Utah or Louisiana laws (or a chipping-away statute from Pennsylvania which may be the first to come before the Court). This is hardly a proposition worth betting on, but it is a distinct possibility. Of course, if the Guam, Utah, Louisiana or Pennsylvania laws are stricken by the Court as currently constituted, pro-lifers are in deep trouble and will be forced to redirect their efforts.

The more interesting question is: What happens if the Court reverses Roe? Would this be a victory pro-lifers could hold?

It is a victory they can hold only if they convince “the people” that it is a victory for unborn children more than it is a defeat for women’s rights. Otherwise, Roe’s reversal may well be nothing more than the precursor to defeat in Congress or in the voting booth. The recent pro-life “victory” in Rust v. Sullivan well demonstrates how a victory misperceived can sow the seeds of an adverse public reaction.

In Rust, the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutionality of federal regulations (under Title X of the Public Health Service Act) which prohibited the use of federal funds to counsel or refer for abortions at family-planning clinics which received federal funds. The Act itself specifically states that “none of the funds appropriated under this sub-chapter shall be used in programs where abortion is a method of family planning.” One would think this language made it fairly clear that Congress intended to fund family-planning programs— not programs dealing with an existing pregnancy—and that it did
not intend to fund programs that advocated abortion as a means of family planning. This is precisely what the Court found.

The Court quoted a General Accounting Office Report which stated that “Most of the clients of Title X-sponsored clinics are not pregnant and generally receive only physical examinations, education on contraceptive methods, and services related to birth control” [emphasis added]. In fact, as the Court stated, it was “undisputed that Title X was intended to provide primarily pregnancy preventative services.” The program simply does not provide “post conception medical care.” This is hardly what one would perceive as fertile ground for a meaningful battle over abortion.

Yet, the Secretary of Health and Human Services promulgated these regulations based, in part, upon “a shift in attitude against ‘the elimination of unborn children by abortion.’ ” To knowledgeable pro-choicers, any recognition of the humanity or value of unborn children signals a desperate battle which they well know they cannot afford to lose: if abortion is an inappropriate method of family planning, people might actually begin to question whether there is something inherently wrong with abortion. The pro-choicers simply could not let these regulations stand unchallenged.

The principal challenge was that these regulations violated Title X clinic employees’ First Amendment “freedom of expression.” The Court rejected this argument, noting that to avoid the force of these regulations, a clinic could simply “decline the subsidy” it received under Title X. The government in no way compelled anyone to accept the federal subsidy or operate a Title X project. If a clinic accepted the subsidy, its employees nonetheless remained free “to pursue abortion-related activities when they [were] not acting under the auspices of the Title X project. The regulations . . . do not in any way restrict the activities of those persons acting as private individuals.” Again, this is hardly fertile ground for a major First Amendment battle.

Nonetheless, the pro-abortion media buried or ignored the legitimate issues in this case and immediately characterized the decision to uphold the regulations as a “gag rule,” generating fairly broad-based support for congressional action to overturn these regulations.

In fact, both the House and Senate passed a bill which would have eliminated these regulations. President Bush vetoed the bill, but faced the closest override effort of his presidency: the pro-choice lobby came within twelve votes of overriding his veto. This was
an ominous sign for pro-lifers looking towards a Supreme Court reversal of *Roe*—the vote was *all too close*.

Perhaps even more ominous was the introduction in Congress this year of the so-called “Freedom of Choice Act.” This bill, which press accounts claim will “codify *Roe v. Wade*” if enacted, is actually more oppressive than *Roe* and would invalidate many laws which the Court has upheld under *Roe*. Rep. Don Edwards, the bill’s prime sponsor, described it as “A classic one-sentence statute that says a state may not restrict the right of a woman to terminate a pregnancy and that is for any reason.”

Could such a bill actually pass Congress? In the wake of a reversal of *Roe* based on strict-prohibition statutes which give the *impression* of being intended solely to limit a woman’s purported rights (such as the Guam or Louisiana statutes and perhaps even the Utah statute), it would be very difficult to prevent passage of the bill. Assuming the President (presumably President Bush) vetoed such a bill, would Congress override his veto? As matters currently stand, this is an open question. More, if this “Freedom of Choice Act” became law, it would certainly be challenged, and end up before the Supreme Court. As strict constructionists, the same Justices who voted to overturn *Roe* could feel ideologically compelled to uphold this Bill as a legitimate exercise of legislative power under the Constitution.

Of course, no one knows whether the Supreme Court will reverse *Roe*, or what the political implications would be if it did. Even if pro-choicers are unable to successfully defend *Roe* or to pass comprehensive federal legislation prohibiting state regulation of abortion, many states will continue to allow abortion on demand. Thus the deprivation of unborn human lives will continue under any reasonable scenario until pro-lifers are able to bring about societal awareness of the rights, value and humanity of unborn children.

For the pro-life movement, the issue is not what can be done, but rather what must be done. It must face the fact that it is not to be a simple struggle which the movement can win by bringing about *Roe’s reversal*—reversal is a necessary first step, but that is *all* it is. If and when *Roe* is overturned, the battleground will shift, but the battle will continue. If pro-lifers are to prevail in any forum, they must enhance the credibility of the position that they are fighting to protect the rights of unborn children.

In sum, pro-lifers must *succeed* in refocusing the debate on the rights of the unborn. They can no longer afford to pass legislation
which makes abortion less offensive, or which adopts approaches readily characterized as oppressive of women. They can no longer afford to concentrate solely on the evils of abortion and flaws in the feminist agenda—so long as they are perceived as anti-women, their movement is doomed to failure.

As with most political movements, the pro-life movement’s fate rests in its own hands. It is faced with profound issues of civil and human rights which test the strength and character of our nation’s most cherished beliefs and trusted institutions. It must ask: Why should anyone accept as legal the termination of a single human life without due process of law? Why should this society accept laws which deprive an entire class of human beings of the most essential human rights, including our most hallowed “inalienable right to life”?

Pro-lifers can no longer hold these questions in reserve, or continue to enact laws which test Roe’s limits by making abortion appear less heinous. They must win the hearts and minds of the American people by emphasizing at every opportunity (even self-manufactured opportunities) that their sole objective is to protect the human rights of unborn children. There is no stronger position, nor any justification for pursuing a weaker one.
AIDS and the Tribe

Joseph Sobran

When Magic Johnson announced that he was HIV-positive, the public reaction followed a familiar pattern. First the basketball star was lachrymosely embraced as a “hero.” He had “heightened public awareness” of the AIDS problem, much as Anita Hill was said to have “raised the nation’s consciousness” about the problem of sexual harassment merely by accusing Judge Clarence Thomas of having committed it.

But the second phase of the reaction discerned something excessive, mawkish, and simplistic in the first. A few sportswriters (a more conservative breed than most journalists) observed that sexual promiscuity had become the norm among professional basketball players, pro athletes in general—and Magic Johnson in particular. Some were surprised that the AIDS virus hadn’t shown up among athletes more often than it already had. Groupies are a regular postgame sight outside athletes’ dressing rooms, and some players have been known to end a working day by taking two or three of them back to their homes or hotels.

Johnson himself remorsefully confirmed this. In a long article in Sports Illustrated the week after his announcement, he confessed that, besieged by eager women from the beginning of his career, he had always “done my best to accomodate them.” From now on, he pledged, he would urge young people to practice “safe sex.” This new mission was welcomed with a long, satisfied purr from the media. There was a third phase, hardly noticed. Barely a month after his sensational revelation, Johnson had formed a partnership with the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. He added an important codicil to his earlier promise: he would exhort young people to practice “safe sex, which means no sex.”

Perhaps coincidentally, it was at this point that the media’s interest in Magic Johnson faded to near zero.

To his credit, Johnson took full responsibility for his own fate.
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He blamed only himself, and tried movingly to maintain a facade of good cheer. But his endorsement of abstinence was not the message the media were eager to carry for him.

Even so, there was an unmistakable feeling in the air: the romance had gone out of the sexual revolution, and Johnson's contraction of the AIDS virus was a sort of baleful milestone. When an older basketball great, Wilt Chamberlain, boasted in his autobiography that he had bedded an estimated 20,000 women, even liberal pundits (especially feminists) wrote harshly of his reckless macho attitude. Few went all the way and condemned fornication out of hand, but there was a definite sense that 20,000 was a bit much.

Other questions emerged. How many women had Johnson infected after getting the virus himself? What about his wife and the child (to call it a "fetus" in this case seemed inappropriate) she was carrying? Anyone who remembers the heyday of the sexual revolution in the Sixties and Seventies can only marvel at the change in tone. Sex was no longer purely a private, inconsequential act; it was now recognized as bearing the most urgent public and private consequences. A whole society was exemplifying Ben Franklin's adage: "Experience keeps a dear school, but a fool will learn in no other."

But how much was really learned? The media continued to plump for "safe sex," which definitely didn't mean no sex. It meant condoms. Somehow, the essence of the sexual revolution had to be salvaged, though hedged by prudent precautions. New York City's public schools began handing out free condoms to students, regardless of parents' wishes or disapproval. *Newsweek* ran a major article on "Safe Sex," complete with a packaged condom on the cover.

Yet even *Newsweek* had to concede that ignorance was no longer the problem, and that education is therefore no sure solution. There are fewer and fewer things of which we can safely say that "every schoolboy knows," but by now the condom is surely one of them. The real problem is that schoolboys don't like to wear them.

Another problem is that sex is mostly a girl's problem. The boy is much more likely to initiate sex, but the girl is much more likely to get the AIDS virus from intercourse, and she is the only one who is going to get pregnant. Boys who are all that considerate of girls don't usually press them to have sex anyway. As a rule, of course, boys can only get the virus from other boys, or from sharing a dirty hypodermic needle.
So the cry for “safe sex” is disingenuous. After all, we got legal abortion and the birth control pill largely because 1) many men won’t use condoms, and 2) condoms often fail. And the same liberal voices (Newsweek, for instance) that used to decry the condom’s unreliability are now inviting the young to bet their lives on its effectiveness. If any other product had a similar failure rate, consumersists would be calling for a government crackdown on the whole industry, not hailing the product as the answer to our ills.

There is something profoundly absurd about this bland pedagogical approach to a medical, social, and moral epidemic. What liberals call sex “education” might better be called diseducation, by analogy with “disinformation”: it can only disorient those who are subjected to it, because it evades what is central. It is explicit without being truthful.

The “joy of sex” has been replaced by a great sadness. Our society is learning, but not yet saying, what Shakespeare was candid about:

The expense of spirit in a waste of shame
Is lust in action; and till action, lust
Is perjured, murderous, bloody, full of blame,
Savage, extreme, rude, cruel, not to trust;
Enjoyed no sooner, but despised straight;
Past reason hunted; and no sooner had,
Past reason hated, as a swallowed bait,
On purpose laid to make the taker mad:
Mad in pursuit, and in possession so;
Had, having, and in quest to have, extreme;
A bliss in proof, and proved, a very woe;
Before, a joy proposed; behind, a dream.
All this the world well knows; yet none knows well
To shun the heaven that leads men to this hell.

“Before, a joy proposed; behind a dream.” All this the world knows, all right, but nobody seems to want to say it in the context of sex education, though our society is littered with broken hearts, disease, abortion, divorce, and a general anxiety and depression about the very thing that was once known as the “joy” of sex; a joy proposed indeed.

One thing sexual freedom clearly means is the freedom to desert. We speak hopefully and vaguely about “commitment” now; but then, we speak hopefully and vaguely about so many things. We no longer speak firmly of “setting a good example”; this has been replaced by “role models.” Chastity is merely negative “abstinence,”
with overtones of deprivation rather than of consecration to a destiny awaited. To fornicate is to be “sexually active.” Husbands and wives, boyfriends and girlfriends, lechers, tramps, and one-nighters are all indistinguishable “sexual partners.” If you have the same partner for more than a week, it becomes a “relationship.” If the relationship should have an accident, the result is a “fetus,” a term that suggests waste matter rather than a human being. (Is there some nebulous association between the fetal and the fecal?) When that happens, the pregnancy can of course be “terminated.” The filthiest practices are now “alternative lifestyles,” and to disapprove of them—to be “judgmental”—is “homophobia.”

Here is where the safe-sexers are at their most dishonest. Homosexuality usually involves anal intercourse (“A homosexual,” a friend quips, “is a guy who’s interested in the one part of your body you’re not interested in”), which is less a matter of sex than of sanitation. Most people’s sense of hygiene wouldn’t permit them to share an ice-cream cone or a soup spoon with a stranger. The mind boggles at the idea of letting a succession of casual acquaintances and strangers penetrate one’s backside. And it seems a little bizarre to blame Ronald Reagan or George Bush, as the AIDS lobby does, for any diseases thereby contracted. The question is not so much why this sexual pastime is a sin, as why it is even a temptation. But it has become taboo to suggest in public that homosexuality indicates any sort of constitutional disorder.

This taboo is one more sign of the unbelievable moral crassness that has taken over America. The very slogan “safe sex” equates the most intimate human activity with such handy pleasures as fast food. If it feels good, do it, but wear a rubber. How deeply smart kids must despise adults who give advice like that. Everyone is smart these days, but few are wise. The safe-sexers wouldn’t presume to give moral advice—not in our “pluralistic society,” in which it is taken for granted that kids “are going to do it anyway.”

The liberal society has clearly reached its limit, in sex as in so many other things. Liberals may not be prudish about sex, but they are extremely prudish about sexual morals. They persist in stipulating, in the face of all experience, that moral problems are really cognitive, and can be solved by telling people things, with numbing iteration, that everyone already knows. “Education” ceases to mean instructing or guiding, and becomes mere ritual; liberalism’s last rites.

Liberals are also prudish about fertility, the mystery that fascinates
nearly every other society. The very word "sex" has come to mean the pursuit of intercourse minus any intention to conceive. "Be fruitful and multiply" has become an embarrassing injunction.

In liberal rhetoric, sexual morality is always "religious," stemming from the outdated theological notions of old celibate males, when in fact—what could be clearer?—it's a practical necessity of everyday life, for which the old celibate males merely happened to coin the term "natural law." If anyone "made it up," as liberal ideology implies, it was worried parents. We shouldn't require a cultural anthropologist to explain why.

The great beneficiaries of the sexual revolution are reckless males and abortionists. Everyone else picks up the tab, but women especially. One waits for some feminist to draw a deep breath and pronounce the sexual revolution a dud; the term "male-dominated" would, for once, be totally appropriate. Nothing is more comical than the safe-sexers' exhortation that we learn the "sexual histories" of our prospective sexual partners before going to bed with them. Could any advice possibly be more useless? Folk wisdom as well as Shakespeare ("I do know, when the blood burns, how prodigal the soul lends the tongue vows") testifies that it is rather pointless to expect an aroused male to be a reliable witness against himself. You might as well ask him if he has ever lied. A girl who is ready to engage in casual sex has already left safety far behind.

Today more than ever, to fornicate is to swim in polluted waters. The risk is incalculable. The safe-sexers are in essence recommending that we play Russian roulette with rubber bullets. They fail on their own narrow terms. More important, they are blind to the real problem. But even conservatives may not be seeing the problem whole.

Laments that family morality has broken down are true enough, but they are only part of the story. It is also true that well-meaning liberals' programs have contributed to the breakdown. But our whole society is becoming thoroughly politicized, and the conservative instinct to call for more police and sterner laws can also be a bogus cure for an extra-political malady.

A deeper insight was recently offered by the columnist William Raspberry, who noted the quiet disappearance from modern society of "the tribe." By this he meant the extended network of kinship, friendship, and hard-to-define "relatedness" that used to back up the nuclear family. Sociologists have called it Gemeinschaft, the society one constantly experiences as "mine."
There was a time when a boy from a broken home would be effectively raised by avuncular other males in the community. These could be informal relationships, but they helped prevent a boy from feeling utterly fatherless. When he didn't belong to a whole family, at least he belonged to a tribe.

This is far less true now than it used to be. A fatherless boy is apt to get little if any guidance from older men. He is more likely to be influenced by peers who are as unwise and impulsive as he is. When you see a young killer on the 11 o'clock news, you nearly always sense that he isn’t particularly related to anyone, except perhaps a mother on welfare who can’t control him. You needn’t be a bleeding-heart liberal to feel that this youth is as much a victim as his own victim, that he was doomed long before his more-or-less random fatal act—that a pointless death was the result of a pointless life.

The word “tribe” conjures up images of primitive societies in which men dance in loincloths and warpaint with upraised spears. It shouldn’t. A tribe is a kinship system, and it may be highly sophisticated. Elizabethan England was highly tribal in this sense; who you were depended on whom you were related to, not on things like a Social Security number.

In fact, all societies are more or less tribal. Ours is becoming less so. And there is plenty of reason to believe that this is not progress, but gradual disaster.

The tribe is not a local custom but a dimension of all human life. Being highly political—that is, state-dominated—we have become oblivious to it. Jews are sometimes humorously or derisively referred to as “the Tribe.” This implies, correctly, that they have anomalously preserved an extrapoltical kinship system. But it should not imply that there is something wrong with this. It’s a sign of health in a sick world.

The state makes statutes and formal laws, but the tribe is the matrix of morals and manners, which are the real stuff of social order. Modern society has lost something vital by becoming more political and less tribal, because the state is no substitute for the tribe. The state can only use force or propaganda, of which “safe sex” is a fair specimen. But the tribe has innumerable subtler pressures and incentives that are far more efficacious.

Your tribe consists of those you feel related to in ways you may not even be able to express. The fear of immediate disgrace before
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your "people"—the people you refer to as "we" without specifying the antecedent of the pronoun—or the loss of their affection, loyalty, and esteem is one of the most powerful controls on misbehavior, and it operates far more constantly and swiftly than the remote prospect of a prison sentence. In fact it usually operates without our thinking about it: it decides what forms of behavior are, for "us," unthinkable.

The family without a tribe to support it is fragile. Most criminals come from broken homes, yes, but also from tribes that have dissolved. This is probably why there are so many black criminals: unlike voluntary immigrants, who often came here in tribal waves, blacks were forcibly uprooted from their kinship systems when brought here as slaves. After emancipation, they began building families and kinship-based communities; but by now the welfare state has destroyed them again. It's ironic that when we picture a tribe, we are likely to imagine a black African tribe, when African-Americans have suffered from systematic detribalization at the hands of benevolent as well as malicious whites.

The modern state is suspicious of and even hostile to the family, which it associates with "privilege" and "accidents of birth" that prevent the kind of bureaucratized equality it seeks to promote. Insofar as it is even aware of the tribe, the state is even more hostile to it. It sees only the negative side of tribal enmities and prejudices, and has no regard for tribal loyalties. Instead of merely supplementing family and tribe, the state has worked actively to supplant them.

But like nature, society has a delicate ecology, and the state, along with the many well-educated state-minded people who drive it, has been indifferent to the "environmental impact" of ostensibly benign social programs. The state's rationalism is at odds with the informality, traditionalism, and fluidity of tribal ways, which are destroyed by the state's coercion and bureaucratic controls. Increasingly, the tribal is a mere residue within politicized society.

The reason this is so serious, for our present purpose, is that the tribe is ideal for policing the very kind of problematic conduct the state is finding itself impotent to affect: above all, the sexual. The state knows nothing of morals or manners; they are not its province, and it can only act stiffly and irrelevantly when it tries to address them. In the eyes of the state, we are isolated individuals, and sex can only be regarded as an affair between individuals. But sex is a supremely social concern, and the tribe has always recognized it as such.
It’s only natural that sexual freedom should grow along with the state. To the state’s social planners, it is a matter of indifference whether a sexual act occurs within marriage, or even whether it is heterosexual. It’s also natural that militant homosexuals should be as political as they are: they want to enlist the state against the tribe’s morals, which they condemn as “bigotry.”

In most societies marriage is a tribal affair, not just a private mutual contract between the two spouses. The presence, witness, and festivities of the tribe are felt to be essential to the wedding ceremony. Sexual unions are a tribal concern for the most basic of reasons: they determine who will be related to whom. And marriage defines these relations firmly. Tribal societies usually frown on sex outside marriage precisely because its natural result is to produce people without real relations or responsibilities, a fact our society hasn’t yet noticed. The whole idiom of kinship sounds quaint among us: kin, folks, misbegotten, bastard—such terms in their literal senses have an archaic or exotic ring now. They used to mean something.

Outright coercion, the state’s modus operandi, is inappropriate for policing sexual behavior. To that extent the liberals are right. The trouble is that they are rapidly abolishing the only level of society that has always policed sex with fair success. Of course a certain amount of fornication and adultery has always happened “anyway.” So has burglary. But the present epidemic is only possible in a society where kinship pressures have been gradually weakened. Tribal societies can shame people into sexually-responsible conduct without stationing a policeman in every bedroom, but we have made this kind of sanction almost impossible, and there is no alternative way.

The civil or political dimension of society is necessary. Some rules need to be formalized, precisely where there is no informal consensus or where such a consensus needs to be armed against the downright violent or fraudulent. The state should therefore be a federation of tribes; it should not seek to take their place and do away with their role. It merely expresses the reality that our relations with some people can never be more than legalistic.

But when a whole society becomes excessively politicized, as ours is, the individual is likely to lose both family and tribe and to be left with no relation but the state itself. The state-minded among us see nothing wrong with this. They don’t appreciate that the state
can never supply the warmth, intimacy, and immediate moral authority of the tribe. It’s hard for us to feel real loyalty to the state, and states that fuse the tribal with the political (Hitler’s Germany being the flagrant example) can become monstrous. The morals of the tribe are much easier to internalize than the shifting laws of the state. In fact the state would do well to legislate much less, and to imitate the stability and economy of traditional tribal moralities. The liberal ambition to “remake” society is part of the general crassness of the age.

As the uproar over AIDS shows, the state simply can’t cope with sexual irresponsibility. In fact it has promoted it. For the state to demand chastity of us would be hugely presumptuous, even tyrannical, and in any case impracticable. But the family can expect it of us, and the tribe can uphold it as a standard of honor, using ties of affection and loyalty more potent than force or violence because they engage our self-respect as no merely external penalties can.

The state is useful for dealing with egregious criminals who are at war with society. But it can’t and shouldn’t attempt to police our common faults, which include most sexual vices (in the old sense of sins of weakness). The modern statist mentality can’t grasp this. It feels that whatever is immoral should be made illegal, and that whatever is legal, or whatever can’t be effectively proscribed by law, should be regarded as moral.

This mentality is by no means confined to liberals. Even some libertarians and anarchists hold their own version of it: they seem unaware of the familial and tribal dimension of society (if they aren’t in actual rebellion against it) and they don’t recognize the category of vice. They seem to be as politicized as any Marxist, in an inverted way. Often they seem almost to endorse the things they don’t want banned: abortion, drugs, sodomy, pornography, and so forth, almost as if the vice squad could redeem itself by promoting vice.

The English philosopher Michael Oakeshott distinguished carefully between laws and commands, which are often confused in modern political discourse. Laws are impersonal rules that bind everyone; they are usually negative, taking the form “Thou shalt not.” Commands express personal will, and tend to be ad hoc and positive. “And the king said, Bring me a sword”—that is a command, not a law. As Oakeshott put it, we “observe” laws, but we “obey” commands. Laws typically bind everyone. Commands are addressed to particular
people who are in a special relation to the authority whose will they must obey.

Because laws are more general and more universal than commands, they should be economical; that is, there should not be too many of them. They should be relatively few, and as Aristotle says, they should change as little as possible, in order to keep the character of necessary rules as distinct from legislative whims. People lose reverence for law when it appears as mutable, arbitrary, needless, or excessive.

This seems like the most obvious common sense, once it is said, but the statist mentality has forgotten it. The modern state is, as C.S. Lewis remarked, incessantly legislating, and its enactments become ever more intrusive and entangling. A Congress that doesn’t issue a respectable number of ambitious new laws is said to be “unproductive,” as if it were a factory that had failed to meet a quota.

And one of the baneful features of the modern state is that, forgetting the difference between laws and commands, it recognizes no limit on our obedience. It assumes that we will forever do whatever it asks of us, in spite of the historical lessons of statist experiments as different as Prohibition and Communism. The state’s enactments are not required to respect the human and social material of the citizenry.

Tribal rules, on the other hand, are mostly unwritten, formed by tradition rather than statutory enactment. For this reason there can’t be too many more of them than a reasonable person can carry around in him and accept as morally compelling. And for all their fluidity and adaptability, they are more or less permanent. This is so because they tend to approximate natural law.

To say all this is not to idealize family and tribal life, which have their own tyrannies and tragedies. Anyone who hasn’t been exposed to their imperfections can get the idea by reading King Lear or The Way of All Flesh. But a thing can be both flawed and indispensable. Only the utopian will find this a paradox.

What happened earlier to black America is now befalling white America too: our tribal ties are being steadily weakened. The state, which has done so much to undermine them, is now demonstrating its utter inability to do their job. The public school, pushing condoms, becomes a gauche step-parent, stupidly well-meaning but unable
to clear its throat and make a genuinely moral appeal to those it would help, partly because it senses that this is not really its natural role. And the mass media, knowing no idiom but that of statism, become our equally-inane reference group, spouting hollow homilies about “safe sex,” as if only appeals to our basest self-interest could be counted on to move us. Neither the state nor the media, of course, would presume to mention God.

The spread of AIDS is only one by-product of a system that has become too “modern” for its own good, in which people have been encouraged to seek intimacy without even establishing real relationships first. In our society, sex is the “relationship.” Far from being “outdated,” the old rules turn out to have had more practical pertinence than anyone could have realized while they were still generally respected. That they are not the kind of rules the state can enforce doesn’t mean that the state should disregard them, as the state-minded have done. No wonder those sexual energies only the tribe can police effectively are now running amok, and bringing death rather than life. And a society that has refused to feel shame is finding itself troubled with an unexpected burden of guilt.

Can anything be done? Well, yes. It’s too glib to say simply that we can return to the old rules, though they are pretty much the only rules we can ever have in matters of sex. Even the most sensible rules can’t stand up to “the fire in the blood” if they are supported by nothing more than long-range calculation. They require, for one thing, an image of virtue to make them cohere and to give them urgency when calculation takes the night off.

The decay of the tribe, moreover, is like any other environmental disaster. It takes time to recover, like a forest after a fire. Those who demand a “cure” for AIDS instantly if not yesterday are displaying the same quick-fix attitude they bring to sex. But the social recovery will be like a reforestation program, if it happens at all. And it won’t even begin until we all understand what we have done to the human infrastructure that carries moral traditions.
SOCIOLOGIST KRISTIN LUKER makes an important observation in her book *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood* when she points out that “the abortion debate is so passionate and hard-fought because it is a referendum on the place and meaning of motherhood.”¹ The widespread acceptance of contraception and sterilization, as well as abortion, has done a great deal to compromise the mystique of motherhood, if not dethrone it entirely. The more society accords respectability to using these technologies in making reproductive choices, the more motherhood loses its status as a hallowed vocation and becomes merely another choice. Motherhood has become “politicized,” according to Luker, because “feminists” and “housewives” are competing against each other for the right to assign the social place and moral meaning of motherhood that reflect their political viewpoints. The choices that reproductive technology has given women have thus turned motherhood into a political battleground.

The essential weakness in Luker’s position is that in seeing all too clearly the politicization of motherhood, she has lost sight of the apolitical, objective reality of motherhood. She is correct in stating that “women come to be pro-life and pro-choice activists as the end result of lives that center around different definitions of motherhood.”² But she is less than correct when she implies that all contemporary views of motherhood are political and none are realistic.

It may seem presumptuous, in a society that is as committed to relativism as ours is, to suggest that one definition may be right and another wrong, that one view is realistic and another illusory. Yet the pejorative connotation of the word “politicized,” in speaking of motherhood being “politicized,” suggests the distortion of a reality, its appropriation to popular taste. There is the reality, pure and objective, and there is the “politicization” of that reality. Politics has a way of subjectivizing reality, turning it into something that
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better accords with people’s wishes. Women as well as motherhood have been and continue to be “politicized.” What we need is a process of “depoliticization” in order to restore our understanding of women and motherhood to what they are in themselves rather than what rival factions would prefer them to be.

Margaret Atwood’s novel *The Handmaid’s Tale* offers a clear illustration of the politicization of both women and motherhood. In the novel, a regime of fundamentalist Christians overtakes the government, suspends the Constitution, and establishes a highly structured and restrictive society in which only the fertile women are valuable, and then only for their ability to be surrogate mothers, to bear children for an aging upper echelon of “Commanders” and their wives. As one handmaid describes her station: “We are two-legged wombs, that’s all; sacred vessels, ambulatory chalices.”

Atwood’s satire could not be appreciated if it were not for the fact that her readers had some understanding of women in their undistorted, unpoliticized reality. Radical Feminism complains vociferously about how women have been “politicized.” Yet their remedy—more unfettered choice—is the very factor, enlarged by reproductive technology, that has intensified the politicization of women and motherhood. For if it is mere choice that determines the place and value of motherhood, then motherhood is caught in the web of subjective preference and loses its objective meaning. Once choice is severed from truth, the processes of “politicization” take over. Ironically, the real remedy for the politicization of women that feminists claim they are seeking is the very last thing they would be able to recognize. Freedom apart from truth inevitably leads to chaos.

Reproductive technology now makes it possible for a woman who lacks a uterus to have her own baby. This represents a “choice” on a level of reproductive freedom that was formerly reserved to the imagination of science fiction writers. By a combination of in vitro fertilization and embryo transfer to a surrogate gestator, the “infertile” woman can become the mother of her own genetically related child. But what about the host mother? According to Harriet Blankfeld, who directs a surrogacy program, “The host mother is truly, in every respect, an incubator.”

This extraordinary remark, a paradigm of extremism, would qualify Harriet Blankfeld for the role of a high-level Commander in *The Handmaid’s Tale*. Yet, in her own mind, she sees it as heralding a new
breakthrough for women's freedom. Have Ms. Blankfield and the host mother both become “politicized” without their even suspecting it?

Dr. Robert Edwards, who teamed with Patrick Steptoe in supervising the world's first IVF baby, spoke these tender words after the birth of Louise Brown: “The last time I saw her, she was just eight cells in a test tube. She was beautiful then, and she’s beautiful now.”

These are the words of the same man who would have directed the abortion of Louise Brown if there was but a “suspicion” that something might be wrong during the pregnancy, who stated that “fertilization is only incidental to the beginning of life,” and who proposed that human embryos be implanted in such animals as sheep, rabbits, and pigs. His encomium to Louise Brown was more a political statement than a reflection of his inner convictions.

The recognition that women and motherhood have been politicized has led to an overreaction on the part of archfeminists who conclude that even personal activities, especially those of a sexual nature, including marriage, lovemaking, and orgasm are intensely political. “The personal is political” has become a shibboleth for their movement. As political scientist Jean Bethke Elshtain points out, “Nothing ‘personal’ is exempt, then, from political definition, direction, and manipulation—neither sexual intimacy, nor love, nor parenting.”

The word “political,” according to the feminist script, describes activities that exert power over individuals in an oppressive way that deprives them of opportunities for self-fulfillment. Impregnation, then, would be an evident political act since it is viewed as oppressing women. “Even if a woman wants to have children,” writes Simone de Beauvoir, the intellectual matriarch of radical Feminism, “she must think very hard about the conditions in which she will have to bring them up, because child-bearing, at the moment, is real slavery.”

According to Shulamith Firestone, whose books have been required reading in programs of Women’s Studies, “The heart of woman’s oppression is her childbearing and childrearing roles,” functions that provide the ground for all the other inequities against women. Monique Wittig speaks of liberation from “the sexual economy imposed on us by the dominant heterosexuality.” And to the eternal question, “Where do children come from,” Jeffner Allen, who sees motherhood as the “annihilation” of women, states: “Children come from patriarchal [male] sexuality’s use of woman’s body as a resource to reproduce
men and the world of men.”13 Her escape from male tyranny is through evacuation: “I am endangered by motherhood. In evacuation from motherhood, I claim my life, body, world, as an end in itself.”14

Radical feminists reduce the complexus of society to a pair of simple equations: 1) the personal is political, and 2) politics is power. All human actions, then, revolve around the paradigm case of Oppressor and the Oppressed. “There is nothing we do,” writes Nancy Henley, “no matter how individual and personal it seems—that does not reflect our participation in a power system.”15 The only options people seem to have, according to Henley, are either dominance or submission.

This utterly cynical viewpoint can hardly serve the cause of liberation. Defining the person in purely political terms and casting him in the dual role of oppressor and oppressed rule out the possibility of cultivating a society in which values such as freedom, equality, and self-fulfillment could be realized. The identification of the person with power politics leads directly to the disappearance of the person and, therefore, to the disappearance of any hope of establishing a society where personal values reign. It also leads to the cognitive disappearance of reality, that is, of the human ability to see things as they are in themselves, undistorted by political ideologies and partisan viewpoints.

Politics is a system of social interactions that is devised by persons. The person is prior to politics. The person also transcends politics, as evidenced by the fact that throughout history man has constantly been changing his various political systems. This is not to say that political structures do not influence people. They do. But the person and the political structure are distinguishable entities. They are dialectically related to each other, capable of mutual adjustment and correction. At times, when politics does not serve its primary purpose, it can be oppressive; at other times, when it does serve that purpose, it can be liberating. To say that the personal is political is to understand neither. It is to identify man with his political structures and to deny him his capacities for personal authenticity. Hegel identified the real with the rational. The folly of this position was amply demonstrated when he tried to explain the real solely from the perspective of the rational. The folly of the feminist dictum that what is personal is political carries a similar methodological danger since it implies that the personal can be adequately understood solely from the point
of view of the political. This, of course, represents the dissolution of the personal.

The source of sexuality's politicization is not the fact of pregnancy, but the failure to honor and protect pregnancy with personal values. In the absence of personal values, pregnancy becomes a battleground for a host of impersonal concerns that include the political as well as the commercial, experimental, egoistical, carnal, and even diabolical. In order to avoid the first step toward the politicization of pregnancy, it is necessary to practice those personal values marriage embodies, namely, love, unity, and fidelity, together with all the other personal values that spousal and parental responsibility entails. Marriage is essentially and profoundly personal. It becomes vulnerable to politicization only when the personal values that protect it are compromised or withdrawn.

Reproductive technologies such as in vitro fertilization, embryo transfer, and surrogate motherhood represent threats to marriage and parenthood. In IVF, conception takes place apart from the woman's body and independent of the marital embrace. Embryo transfer may involve a third party, such as a donor or a surrogate gestator. Surrogate motherhood also involves third (and sometimes additional) parties; it also bifurcates maternity by separating the genetic mother from the gestational mother. These technologies compromise the personal values of love, unity, and fidelity that are needed to protect marriage from the impersonal processes of politicization. By exteriorizing human procreation and involving outsiders such as surrogates, brokers, businessmen, etc., several dangers arise. Among these are that power replaces love and that fundamental realities—especially the unborn child and the gestating woman—are no longer perceived as they are but are reinterpreted according to arbitrary and fluctuating demands.

Radical feminists need not look anywhere else than to their own rationalizations for abortion in order to find a model example of politicizing pregnancy. First, the unborn child is depersonalized; it is presumed to be only a part of the woman's body. Then the abortion procedure itself, which is an act of power that deprives another of his potential for self-fulfillment, is politically reinterpreted as merely a "choice." Hence, one is not pro-abortion, just pro-choice. Neither the victim nor the nature of the act are recognized or acknowledged for what they are. Personal values are extinguished, reality is distorted. Radical feminists are right about one thing, that
the processes of depersonalization and power politics can go undetected by their own practitioners.

Technologized parenthood has its own built-in dangers. Against a social backdrop of abortionism, feminism, commercialism, capitalism, hedonism, and egoism, these dangers become greatly magnified. In Robert Cole's review of *Birth Mother: The Story of America's First Legal Surrogate Mother*, we find a candid and decidedly unflattering portrait of some of the professionals who were involved:

... a self-centered, arrogant, callous physician, eager as can be to show himself off, pose for cameras, rake in cash while he became known nationally as someone who arranges surrogate pregnancies; a lawyer all too pushy and demanding; and worst of all, a minister who not only was eager to be photographed, to appear on television—nothing special these days—but was willing to betray confidences, curry favor with reporters, strut and pose endlessly at the expense of a vulnerable woman who had turned to him for advice, if not consolation.16

Given the vicissitudes of power politics, surrogate motherhood, from the standpoint of valuating the unborn and its gestating mother, is the opposite of abortion. In abortion, the child is depersonalized while the mother is praised for her courage to choose. By contrast, in surrogacy, the child is elevated to the status of a “tenant” while its mother depreciates to the status of an “incubator.”

A few years ago a woman became a mother despite the fact that she lacked a uterus. This incident offers a good example of how human values rise and fall in accordance with the latest technology. This woman’s genetic offspring was transferred from its origin in a petri dish to the body of the gestational mother who gave birth to it.17 The Court awarded custody to the genetic mother, reasoning that the gestational mother (who served as a surrogate gestator) functioned merely as a “human incubator.”18 There was never any dispute over the humanness of the offspring, either when it was in a petri dish or when it resided in the womb of a surrogate incubator.

The arbitrary quality of the judge’s decision in this case, the fact that the adopting parents paid $40,000 to get the child they wanted, and certain other actions of a disingenuous nature, have prompted George Annas of Boston University’s School of Medicine to make the following comment: “If we really believe money and contracts should rule, then the identity of the child’s mother will depend upon contract and payment only, and both genetics and gestation (and therefore all biological ties) will be irrelevant.”19
Annas is sensitive to the objective reality of motherhood and is less than eager to see it redefined according to terms established by the contracting parties. A well-known surrogate clinic on the East Coast illustrates how arbitrary surrogate contracts can be in valuating the mother and the child. This particular clinic has drawn up a contract stating that the surrogate gets $10,000 for the delivery of a healthy child and nothing for a “defective” child; further, she must pay the father $25,000 if she decides to keep the child. Is it reasonable, one might well ask, that the cost of the child leaps to $25,000 if the birth mother keeps it? Or is this higher fee to be construed as a way of punishing the mother for deciding to keep the child?20

When the New York Times wants to justify abortion, it has no difficulty valuating the unborn as less than human. But when it wants to advance the cause of surrogacy, that same pre-human is suddenly transvaluated into a person with a name. A Times editorial speaks about an unborn surrogate child named “Baby Thrane” who is “residing in a rented womb.”21 In this case, the unborn is humanized while the surrogate becomes a “rented womb.” The rhetoric is most effective. Psychologists attest that surrogates identify themselves not as mothers but as incubators.22 A surrogate is often indoctrinated into thinking that although she is carrying a precious little baby, she is not the real mother because she is carrying it for someone else. This devaluation of the woman, which radically subordinates her to the child she carries, makes surrogacy highly susceptible to exploitation. A teenage Mexican surrogate, for example, testified that she was confined against her will in the house of a California sperm donor for the duration of her pregnancy.23 The surrogate and the couple who hired her were granted joint custody of the child eight months after the baby was born. They were also ordered not to make disparaging remarks about one another in front of the child.24

In surrogacy agreements, the baby is paramount. But if the infertile parties who contracted for the child divorce or change their minds, or if the baby is not normal either before or after birth, they may direct the abortion of the child or reject it. The baby’s value rests precariously on the couple’s stability as well as on its own degree of normalcy. The baby that an infertile couple so desperately needs can easily become the “mistake” that nobody wants.

Another reproductive technique, known as “surrogate embryo
transfer,” introduces a slightly different set of values. In this procedure, a volunteer agrees to be impregnated through artificial insemination and then undergoes, a few days later, a treatment called lavage to wash the embryo out of her uterus. The embryo is then transferred to a second woman. This second woman is the one who wants to rear the child and be recognized as its legal mother. She is unable to produce fertilizable eggs and therefore is reliant on the volunteer’s role. This method is safer for the volunteer than achieving conception through IVF because it avoids the very real hazards of egg retrieval through laparoscopic surgery.

In surrogate embryo transfer (SET), which is also termed "prenatal adoption,” the baby and the gestating woman are highly valued, whereas the volunteer, who is the genetic mother, is regarded as a mere “donor.” In terms of valuating motherhood, the SET procedure stands in sharp contrast with surrogate gestation. In surrogate gestation, it is the genetic contributor and not the gestator who assumes the mantle of importance.

Researchers at the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center in Torrance, California, were the first to devise the SET procedure. In advertising for volunteers, they requested “egg donors” for their “ovum transfer” project. This conscious bit of deception lured 380 volunteers to the program. These young women were not, of course, simply requested to “donate an egg.” Each was asked to endure repeated artificial insemination attempts in the interest of achieving conception, to undergo lavage to flush out the embryonic child, to submit to an abortion in the event the lavage procedure failed, to risk pelvic infection, venereal disease, and ectopic pregnancy, and to abstain from sexual intercourse in order to provide assurance that the child conceived was the client’s.

The Center reported to the Press on February 3, 1984, that 10 volunteer “donors” were inseminated 46 times with sperm from the husbands of 13 wives who were prospective recipients. In 42 attempts at uterine lavage, 18 embryos were flushed out. Two recipient women had apparently normal pregnancies. Two women were impaired in the process. One suffered an ectopic pregnancy that led to the surgical removal of her right tube. The other woman, a donor, was left with an embryo inside her when it could not be flushed out. She spontaneously aborted nine days after her expected period.

The contrast between the status of the volunteer donor—who was deliberately deceived and duped into assuming unreasonable risks
to her health and reproductive future—and the baby she was trying to conceive for an infertile couple is another striking example of the inverse evaluation of that which is found in the abortion picture. Pioneers of the SET project hired a California public relations firm to help them with their advertising. The firm came up with the idea of using the letters B-A-B-Y as the last four digits for the program's telephone number. The "donor," it will be remembered, allegedly donated an egg. But the egg became a "baby," not when it was fertilized, but when it was transferred to the infertile mother who would gestate it.

Richard Seed, one of SET's pioneers, envisioned opening up a string of twenty to thirty embryo transfer clinics across the country. Expecting to win international acclaim for this work in this area, he stated in a 1980 interview: "I don't mind telling you that I expect to get a Nobel Prize." He believed that he would earn the coveted Prize if he could accomplish two things: 1) produce the first human pregnancy through embryo transfer (which he accomplished in 1983); 2) achieve pregnancy in a postmenopausal woman (which he is apparently still working on).27

Politics and pride have been an integral part of UCLA's SET project. In a March 1984 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), the author writes favorably about SET and makes the remark that we should worry less about the rights of SET children than about the desires of infertile couples. The article creates the impression that it is a non-partisan, scientific evaluation of SET. In truth, as George Annas points out, Marie Bustillo, who wrote the article, had been paid by the research team at UCLA to write a document, under contract, that helped them get their initial SET protocol through Harbor-UCLA's Institutional Review Board in 1981. Her JAMA article was based on that work. Thus, what was prepared for the JAMA readership was not an evaluation of SET by a neutral observer. It is no doubt true that the quest for promotion, tenure, and prizes is as much a deterrent to disclosing all the possible harmful effects of a particular reproductive technology as is the profit motive.

The politics of power have a decisive effect on the various and fluctuating evaluations of pregnancy, motherhood, fatherhood, and the child in the womb. Through the prism of self-interest, everything is distorted. It is only through the window of love that the values associated with human procreation are recognized for what they
are, objectively and in accordance with their being. Love is often dismissed as a subjective experience. It is subjective, however, only in the sense that what the lover sees, he grasps in his subjectivity, that is, in himself as a subject. But what he sees is objectively discerned. As Chesterton has said, “Love is not blind; that is the last thing that it is. Love is bound; and the more it is bound the less it is blind.” Power, however, is blind because the subject is more interested in his own subjectivity, in his own advantage, than in the good of the object. In this regard, love is more realistic than power.

Power is often said to be more realistic than love because, unlike the latter, it is willing to use deception, exploitation, pressure, and force in order to accomplish its aims. This Machiavellian sense of realism, however, is unrealistic in that it remains blind to the real, objective values of what it is trying to manipulate. Moreover, it is unrealistic in a more practical sense insofar as it incites other people to operate in a similar fashion, thereby bringing about a conflict or power that inevitably must be resolved either through force or through the force of law. The clash of divergent lines of power cannot be endured for very long.

Reproductive technologies—from contraception to surrogate embryo transfer—have greatly enlarged the horizon of reproductive choice. Feminists, in general, have welcomed these innovations insofar as they have contributed to reproductive freedom and have given women greater control of their bodies. Nonetheless, this freedom is more an illusion than a reality. As motherhood becomes more and more dissociated from marriage, intercourse, conception, and gestation, its place in society and its moral significance grows increasingly arbitrary. Motherhood is now merely one of a number of choices a woman can make, and the particular way in which she becomes a mother is also a mere matter of choice. A woman no longer conforms to motherhood, she reinvents it.

Today, a woman can avoid marriage, intercourse, conception, and gestation and still have a child to whom she is genetically related. IVF in combination with surrogate gestation makes that possible. Or she can be married, conceive, gestate, and deliver a child and not be considered a mother. Surrogacy makes that possible.

Technology has freed motherhood from its traditional identity. But women are not enjoying their new opportunities to choose motherhood in the manner that suits their lifestyle. Rather, they are engaged in fierce and deeply emotional struggles both in and
out of court over which mother is the real mother and who should have legal custody of which children. Dissolving the integral identity of motherhood has left it unprotected and vulnerable to new meanings and definitions. The struggle to project new meanings onto traditional motherhood is essentially a political activity, involving law, medicine, business, the Media, and public opinion. In this way motherhood has become politicized.

Chesterton once said that you can free a tiger of its bars, but if you free it of its stripes, you’ll find that you no longer have a tiger. Reproductive technologies have created the illusion that you can free motherhood of its essence and still have motherhood, that you can politicize motherhood by assigning it a host of arbitrary redefinitions and somehow preserve its moral meaning.

Freedom that is not an illusion maintains its realism because it is anchored to what is true. The only freedom of choice that serves motherhood expresses itself in the form of recognizing what motherhood is and honoring and protecting its dignity, its nature, and its enduring moral significance.

NOTES
2. Ibid., p. 214.
14. Ibid.
18. Ibid., slip op. at 9.
DONALD DeMARCO

26. Ibid., pp. 86-87.
27. Ibid., p. 95.

"Colin, Trish, Lucy, the Devil you know, Amanda, Brian . . . ."  
THE SPECTATOR 30 March 1991
Repeated to the point of mind-numbing boredom is the Planned Parenthood dogma that birth control will prevent the so-called “need” for abortion. But with more than seventy years of clinical evidence and experience, much of it from Planned Parenthood, what is consistently shown is that those who most frequently use “preventive” measures also most frequently resort to induced abortion.

In addition to the research of Pearl and Stix and Koop cited earlier, we have the acknowledgement of this linkage by attendees at a 1955 Planned Parenthood-sponsored conference on abortion. At one point in the proceedings, famed sex researcher Alfred C. Kinsey said, “At the risk of being repetitious, I would remind the group that we have found the highest frequency of induced abortion in the group which, in general, most frequently used contraceptives.”

Later, the concluding statement of the conference, signed by Dr. Alan Guttmacher, Dr. Christopher Tietze, Dr. Louis M. Hellman (later HEW deputy assistant secretary for population affairs in charge of Title X), Dr. John Rock (co-inventor of the birth control pill), and other Planned Parenthood notables, acknowledged: “It was recognized by Conference participants that no scientific evidence has been developed to support the claim that increased availability of contraceptive services will clearly result in a decreased illegal abortion rate.”

In practical terms, all of the indications for illegal abortions in 1955 were indications for legal abortions after 1973.

In 1981 Dr. Malcolm Potts, former medical director of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, recognized the still-current validity of the contraception/abortion link in commenting upon two South American studies (1965, 1969). Potts wrote: “Requena showed in Santiago, Chile, that the poorest members of the community do not have a very widespread use of contraceptives, and the incidence...
of abortion is low. The middle classes attempt to control their fertility, and both the use of contraception and the incidence of abortion rise."³

Kristin Luker noted that of fifty white, middle-class, single women interviewed who aborted a first-trimester pregnancy, nearly "three-quarters had been using effective means of contraception before embarking on 'contraceptive risk taking' that resulted in pregnancy."⁴

In 1968, before the nationwide legalization of elective abortion, Planned Parenthood's Dr. Guttmacher said:

> We find that when an abortion is easily obtainable, contraception is neither actively nor diligently used. . . . Therefore, if we had abortion on demand, there would be no reward for the woman who practices effective contraception. Secondly, abortion on demand relieves the husband of all possible responsibility; he simply becomes a coital animal.⁵

Guttmacher's view is not isolated. Writing in 1971, Sandburg and Jacobs stated that "during the past three years [1969 to 1971], as legal abortion has become increasingly available, it has become evident that some women are now intentionally using abortion as a substitute for contraception." They concluded that this "single-episode" approach to fertility regulation appealed to women who desire pregnancy but not reproduction, those who receive welfare abortions, who have erratic coitus, feminists who believe abortion to be a "right," and young "nonconforming social dissenters who declare, Why sweat? So it happens. So we'll take care of it.

"It seems certain that for some time to come there will be an increasing number of women who will reject contraception purely on the basis of the availability of legal abortion."⁶

Abortion proponents regularly link abortion to other forms of birth control by calling it a backup for "failed" contraception. Why are the Pill, etc. given out in abortion clinics? Or, alternatively, consider that postfertilization, abortion-causing antifertility drugs and devices are euphemistically designated as "contraceptives," "birth control," or even "family planning." One abortion doctor wrote that "attaching suction to a comparable cannula . . . promises to be one of the most exciting advances in birth control imaginable, a procedure done before woman or physician is sure that pregnancy is present."⁷

Then there is the practical aspect of using abortion as a primary method of birth control. The Pill must be taken every day. Other methods must be used consciously and effectively at every intercourse. Abortion, in contrast, takes only one antifertility intervention. Coupled
with the claim that abortion is “safer than childbirth,” this advantage in convenience leads one to reasonably ask: Why not use abortion as a primary means of birth control? And if abortion is a moral right, what objection, other than emotional or possibly aesthetic can anyone have to repeat abortion? None. If abortion is a woman’s right, why should anyone deplore or regret its exercise or seek to minimize its enjoyment or self-expression? Defenders of legal abortion are in the curious position, at least when they are seeking tax handouts from legislators for birth control, of wanting to minimize the exercise of the abortion right.

Planned Parenthood’s premier researcher, Dr. Christopher Tietze, has acknowledged that

a high correlation between abortion experience and contraceptive experience can be expected in populations to which both contraception and abortion are available and where some couples have attempted to regulate the number and spacing of their children. In such populations, women who have practiced contraception are more likely to have had abortions than those who have not practiced contraception, and women who have had abortions are more likely to have been contraceptors than women without a history of abortion. 8

Denmark is a case in point. “During the fifteen months following the 1973 Danish abortion [liberalization] legislation, the mean annual rate of induced abortion was 23 per 1,000 women aged 15-44 compared with a mean annual rate of 14.3 during the preceding months.” 9 Also Pill sales to drug distribution intermediaries decreased during this period. “Thus, whereas 15.9 more women per 1,000 aged 15-44 were using pills during each of the three and three-quarters years before the introduction of the 1973 abortion law, these women seemed to be abandoning use of oral contraceptives at an annual rate of 77.2 women per 1,000 after the law went into effect.” 10 IUD sales increased, but as these act to cause early abortion, this intervention cannot be said to have decreased abortion. Second, some of these could have been used by women replacing an expelled IUD. Even if all the new IUD purchasers were new users (most unlikely), there still were not enough to compensate for the decline in Pill users.

Other researchers also suggest that the Pill played a part in increasing the social acceptance of abortion:

Mariano Requena has found that in Latin America the introduction of more effective contraception led to an increase in the abortion rate. He argues that after couples have made a commitment to lower fertility, they are less willing to tolerate mistakes when they occur. In the United States, therefore, one could assume that the availability of the Pill—a virtually 100 percent
effective contraceptive—would have created a population of people who had made important life commitments that depend on a very high level of fertility control.11

Viewed in this fashion, Pill users who abort unexpected pregnancies are simply disgruntled consumers who naively believed manufacturing claims and cannot tolerate disappointment. They were told that they could have 100% birth control effectiveness, and they will have it, even at the price of child homicide. The high expectation of near 100% birth control efficiency claimed for the oral contraceptive may predispose some women on the Pill to choose abortion when they do become pregnant. A survey of 320 predominantly white, middle-class women (mean age 24.6 years) undergoing abortion found that of the Pill "failures," 6% occurred in women who used the method correctly, and 94% occurred from Pill discontinuance because of undesirable side effects.12

The survey's authors suggest that women who choose birth control be given not only the technical or ideal "failure rates," but "also the number of human error failures among users" because the true effectiveness of a birth control method "is a function of both its technical efficiency and the user's propensity to use it correctly and consistently."13

Second, the ready availability of legalized abortion may lower the level of motivation necessary to use the Pill successfully.14 And former Pill users may have an especially high rate of induced abortion even when compared to women currently using other forms of birth control. In the British Royal College of General Practitioners Pill Study, 20.98% of ex-Pill users reported at least one subsequent induced abortion, whereas in the control group, 55.18% of whom used another form of birth control, 12.28% reported at least one abortion during the course of the study.15 That former contraceptive users had higher abortion rates than nonusers was also shown in a Taiwan survey (1967) of women aged twenty to forty-four. Of these, 2,921 women had never used birth control, and their induced abortion rate was 3.5%; among users of birth control, 24.8% had an induced abortion.16 The increase for induced abortion among former contraception users was consistently higher than nonusers, regardless of the number of pregnancies experienced.17

Potts et al. report that a survey by the Korean Ministry of Health and Social Affairs in 1968 suggested "that the number of Korean women in the 20-44 age group reporting that they have ever experienced
one or more induced abortions doubled between 1964 and 1968, exactly paralleling the use of contraception.”

Moreover, the Pill itself is used as a postcoital menses inducer, or early abortion method. Birth control pills and other estrogens are routinely given to adolescents after “unprotected intercourse” to prevent the continued development of the preborn child after mid-menstrual cycle ovulation and conception but before or around the time of implantation. This is acknowledged to be an intended early abortion, and it has also been suggested that clinicians not include this information on the patient's medical records and also not tell the patient of the abortifacient nature of the process.

The regimen, not approved by the FDA, consists of giving two Orval birth control pills (Wyeth Pharmaceuticals) within seventy-two hours of “unprotected intercourse,” followed by two more pills within twelve hours.

A report of an experimental program designed to influence aborting women subsequently to “contracept,” presented at an American Public Health Association meeting, noted that none of the women were still on the Pill at fifteen months postabortion. The project's author, abortionist Dr. Michael Burnhill, tried to console his antifertility co-workers by noting that this failure to contracept was not their fault and that “altering fertility behavior is little-understood and difficult to accomplish.” One of Burnhill's co-presenters at the APHA public health conference stated that though the women undergoing repeat abortions usually denied using abortion as birth control, “you just know that's what they were doing.”

In another study of 101 adolescent patients who started taking the Pill at age thirteen to nineteen, similar results were obtained in the course of trying to discover factors associated with contraceptive compliance and nonuse: “Becoming pregnant and having an abortion before beginning oral contraceptives did not improve compliance in comparison to the never pregnant group.”

Adolf Hitler wrote in his infamous tract Mein Kampf, “The great masses of the people . . . will more easily fall victims to a great lie than to a small one.” Another practitioner of falsehood, a character in American writer Ring Lardner’s “Ex Parte,” noted: “I never lied save to shield a woman or myself.”

While neither of these social opportunists were consulted by abortionists as they prepared to assault America’s antiabortion laws.
in the 1960's, they honor, in common with abortionists, the use of language as a tool of deception. Because the physician is called upon to use his techniques and instruments as tools to implement the abortion decision, abortion has been mistakenly thought by some to be simply a medical matter, with the issue of the woman's "safety" surfacing as the central point of inquiry.

Abortion proponents, such as Planned Parenthood and other groups, usually adhere to the claim that "the early termination of pregnancy is a medical matter between the patient and the physician. . . . Abortion is a medical procedure and should be performed only by a duly licensed physician in conformance with good medical practice. . . ."25

But to conclude that abortion is purely a "medical matter" is like saying that war is purely a military matter and that therefore only the generals should decide such issues; or that capital punishment is simply a concern of electrical engineers. Medicine, in effect, seeks to become a metaphysics of morals and ethics by answering profound and broad human questions with answers derived from a real or supposed technical competence in procuring an induced abortion. This is specious reasoning. For example, it could undoubtedly be demonstrated that a mother who stayed on a sidewalk, rather than pull her toddler from the path of a runaway car, would be less likely to be injured by a runaway car. But who would applaud this?

As human beings, we are called to seek not merely the "healthy" life, passing for the moment whether abortion is really "healthier" than childbirth, but rather the good and the just life. Were this not so, all social and legal decisions should be referred for resolution to the medical profession. This, manifestly, is not what most successful societies have chosen to do.

Planned Parenthood's tack is to identify mistakenly those who implement a decision with those who are "authorities" on whether such a decision should be made at all. In large part, American medicine is content with this misunderstanding. The authors of this book are not.

First, a doctor who performs elective abortions is not acting as a healer. In short, he is not practicing medicine; he is merely a biological technician who seeks to bring about the death of the human fetus (a Latin term for "offspring"). American medicine used to understand this fact. The American Medical Association, while not founded solely as an antiabortion organization during the mid-nineteenth century, nevertheless strongly defended the "pro-life" position. An
1859 AMA committee on criminal abortion, which was also concerned with a woman’s health, stated that abortion was “the wanton and murderous destruction of her child.”

Second, it would be a gross distortion . . . to believe that all or even most nineteenth-century laws were mainly attempts to protect a woman’s health. An examination of the statements of those who most loudly urged the passage of restrictive laws during the latter two-thirds of the nineteenth century indicates that, in the minds of many, safeguarding the mother’s health was held to be secondary to the protection of the foetus as a rationale for antiabortion laws. . . .

One can infer from an analysis of nineteenth-century laws that the status of the foetus was a major concern of many State legislatures. A law which has maternal health as its sole or main consideration is not likely to be worded in such a way that the human status of the foetus is recognized, since such recognition would also require that the foetus be given human rights protected by law. In a law where the concern is with the woman’s health, a woman is likely to be labelled as “pregnant” rather than as “being with child” or some other phrase which gives a human status to the foetus.

But by 1981 the AMA would slough off its past and call elective induced abortion a “recognized medical procedure” and a “necessary medical procedure”; moreover, the AMA held that a constitutional amendment prohibiting or even allowing for restrictions on abortion would constitute an unacceptable “invasion of privacy.” Using this rationale, bank robbers could take a similar invasion-of-privacy view of television cameras monitoring their “financial transactions.”

But what has happened is that the mere techniques of the physician, exercised here not for medical but for dubious social goals, have taken hold of his mission. His goal becomes to graft the goals of public health onto his techniques for establishing a “new” culture with individual autonomy as its major premise and which can be efficiently hedonist with minimal adverse consequences. Under this system, techniques and those who wield them become the measure of the new “morality”—really the old immorality. A 1970 editorial from California Medicine presaged the now partially completed slide away from the traditional sanctity of life ethic:

This is seen most clearly in changing attitudes toward human abortion. . . . Since the old ethic has not been fully displaced it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing, which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins at conception and is continuous whether intra- or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth.
under socially impeccable auspices. It is suggested that this schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary because while a new ethic is being accepted the old one has not yet been rejected. 29

Abortionists seek to replace the paramount question of the intentional homicide of the child in utero with the lesser question being addressed, namely, the partial “good” of a woman surviving an abortion with her “health” still relatively intact. These destructive labors are all the more appalling, taking place, as they so often do, half a corridor away from the wondrous interventions of perinatal specialists who see in both mother and child the focus of their healing and saving arts.

NOTES
2. Ibid., 182.
10. Ibid., 218-19.
11. Potts, “Abortion and Contraception.”
13. Ibid.
15. The Royal College of General Practitioners Pill Study, chap. 11 (23.67% used no birth control, almost 1% were sterilized, and 26.42% were pregnant or recently pregnant, as were 18.39% at recruitment).
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., 458.
23. Personal communication, RGM.
24. P. W. Scher et al., “Factors Associated with Compliance to Oral Contraceptive Use in an Adolescent Population,” *Journal of Adolescent Health Care*, vol. 3 (1982): 120-23; only adolescents who chose the Pill at least three months before the study began were eligible. Compliance meant using the Pill without interruption after it was prescribed, or discontinuing use because not sexually active, or using another form of birth control. Noncompliance meant having “unprotected intercourse.” Side effect occurred in seventy-seven patients after one month; 66% quit the Pill, and 42% of the noncompliers had an “unplanned” pregnancy after quitting the Pill.
Editorial cartoon by Wayne Stayskal (Tampa Tribune, 1989; reprinted with permission).
Europe without Vitality

Erik v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

The menaced continent is Europe and the name of the menace is "underpopulation." Reading this might surprise some people who know that the density of population is greater in Europe than in any other region on this globe, but under- and overpopulation are very relative terms. The grim fact Europeans have to face is the weak population increase in some countries, the stagnation in others and the marked decrease in a great many. Europe's share in the world's population is falling ceaselessly.

The main reason for this state of affairs is, broadly speaking, "practical materialism" in all its aspects. And the birthrate is declining not only because the means to prevent conception have been perfected and abortion—i.e., the murder of the growing child prior to birth—has been legalized in nearly all countries, but because people are less desirous to have children, or a sufficient number of children, since they tend to restrict one's freedom and to interfere with one's comforts, and they demand sacrifices in time and money—both precious in a competitive society.

A normal human being, male or female, has a normal and healthy desire for perpetuation in union with another beloved being. Hippolyte Taine called procreation "the only remedy against death." To this must be added the urge for more objects of love, combined with the joy in raising (nurturing, educating, loving) small but growing human beings. Man has been created in the image of God and thus he is also potentially a creator, not only as homo faber, as cultivator, as artist, but also as creator of other human beings. As a result of parental procreation and education, children become truly "embodiments" of marital love. And, besides all this, children generally spread joy.

Yet the attitude that will prepare, encourage and animate people to have, to create children is a certain pride in themselves. Animals have sexual drives subject to certain automatic rules. With humans the situation is entirely different. They have a free will and can
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decide if and when to procreate. And they can also thwart the live result of cohabitation. But to will a child one must have esteem for oneself as well as for one’s partner, a certain pride and affection for oneself which is anyhow necessary for a healthy psyche. (The Command says: Love thy neighbor as thyself!) A self-hating, despondent, pessimistic melancholic might be ready for sexual intercourse, but not for procreation. Looking at our modern culture and our increasingly urbanized civilization, one must admit that it is collectivistic rather than personalistic.

Modernity means uniformity, living in crowds, buying identical products of industrial origin, all generating a feeling of being mere numbers, numbered in ever so many ways. In democratic elections numbers alone count. The fact that every human being is truly unique is obscured and obfuscated by all forms of modern life. The Middle Ages were different in this respect. There was serfdom in some regions (by no means everywhere), but the material fate of the serf was not worse than that of a middle-class European.

The serf was glaebae adstructus, tied to the soil, he had to work one or two days a week for his overlord and was restricted in his movements. (Travelling having been extremely onerous, nobody travelled for pleasure.) Modern man, if he does not own his home, works for his landlord at least one or two days a week and again as much for a mythological figure called (in America) “Uncle Sam.” The serf could lead a life in dignity; he was by no means a slave whose family could be sold away from him. If he found his living conditions too hard, he could run away and, after living in a city for one year and one day, he acquired “freedom” and became a “citizen.”

Needless to say, for the raising of large families, agrarian regions were at all times more propitious than cities, small towns more so than big. Certainly a major reason for the population decline is the exodus from rural areas. (In the Austrian Tyrol only 11% of the population is still purely agrarian, whereas the agrarian output is twice or thrice the pre-war quantity.) The farmers always used to be the main source of a healthy population increase. Pride not only in oneself, but also in one’s family and ancestors, is an incitement for procreation.

Tacitus said that it is vile to ignore one’s ancestors and Burke wrote that he who has no respect for his forebears will not endeavor to have progeny. (Of Hitler it was said in Germany that, like a mule, he had neither pride of ancestry nor hope of progeny.) Hence the nobility in Europe was traditionally prolific and not to want many children was considered rather low-class. Royal families, especially the Catholic
ones, often had a very large number; the late Empress Zita of Austria (and Queen of Hungary) had 15 brothers and sisters, half-brothers and half-sisters; the Empress Maria Theresa had 16 children and, at the same time, handled vigorously and effectively the administration and the defense of Europe's heartlands. Admittedly, she had domestic help, but she also conducted assiduously an enormous correspondence with her children and others. If one had told her that "only illiterates have litters" she would have been highly amused.

The end of so many monarchies put an end to "nobility," which was a powerful element of social mobility and social "rise." The modern social structure is determined by money, and children are becoming more and more expensive, partly because they are spoiled. But here is the point: it used to be honor rather than money people sought; they contemplated enterprises that brought them distinctions, decorations, prizes and civic titles, or titles of nobility which, on the Continent, were almost always hereditary. The purpose of bestowing nobility was twofold: to reward persons in a non-material way and to create an elite with a tendency to intermarry. Thus a constant influx of new blood into the nobility took place on the Continent (and also in Britain).

Quite naturally, these people, proud of their name and its new "embellishment" wanted to hand it on—a more secure bequest than even a lot of money. The notion that nobility automatically means money is completely erroneous. But here I have to admit that among the European nobility, too, the number of progeny today is decreasing.

The Jewish birthrate was also high, at least as long as Jews stuck to their faith. Since they were the Chosen People (as all Christians will admit), to bring forth new life meant to enlarge God's Own People.

The situation changes when, instead of honor, wealth becomes decisive and with it—even worse!—the display of wealth. For a long time Europeans used to smile at the American tendency "to keep up with the Joneses." The efforts to outshine one's acquaintances, friends and neighbors have now spread in Europe, especially in northern Europe, for many reasons, including the disappearance of monarchies which could give titles and honors to their subjects, the tendency of the remaining monarchies to discontinue this custom and of course the general increase in wealth. West of the former Iron Curtain, Europe is well to do, and it will not take many years until Europe will be rich up to the former Soviet border.

The first step in this direction was, needless to say, the loss of
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the colonies, which cost enormous sums. Now that they are free and detached from their motherlands, these former colonies form the big slum called the Third World.

In the effort to keep up with the Joneses, children are a big handicap. It belongs to the nature of man (and woman) to want to compete, to excel. The (un-Biblical) belief in human equality always remains a mere ideological lip service. Yet, while competition as such is legitimate, the mere desire for economic superiority (as against excellence, the old measure) is not. Hence the number of children must be kept low. And with but a minimum, or a complete lack of children, the family vanishes. A childless couple easily degenerates into mere dual egotism. In the old order children, contrary to nowadays, were an economic asset, an old-age insurance. The French Canadians used to say un enfant vaut mille piastres—a child is worth a thousand dollars.

Today the state has taken the place of the children, social security takes care of our old age. With the maturity of the children, the family falls apart, the older generation is sent to the tombs for the living, the homes for “senior citizens,” although the possibility that the state might go bankrupt does not seem to enter anybody’s mind. Viewed from a frog’s perspective, this system solves the problem; from a bird’s-eye view it does not, because it does not answer the question what happens if the age pyramid is reversed and the old ones, the retired ones, totally outnumber the younger working ones.

Will they then be enslaved to the “seniors” or will they be induced to follow Dr. Francis B. Crick’s advice to exterminate these “useless mouths”? With the dwindling number of children the Provider State (wrongly called the Welfare State) assumes the role of the family father, the classic provider. However, we must beware identifying the Provider State with socialism. The truth is that all Socialist or Communist States (the dividing line is very thin!) are automatically Provider States. But a free market economy is possible within a Provider State, the classic example being Sweden, where the means of production are overwhelmingly in private hands. (If this were not so, Sweden would have been bankrupt long ago.) The Provider State tends automatically to become totalitarian and to take upon itself the sheltering of the family—and this is one of its chief demoralizing aspects. Children are no longer an old-age insurance and, when grown up, no longer need the support of parents or siblings.

In other words, children become superfluous and—due to the
dwindling of religious influence—marriage, the family’s focal point, loses its hallowed character as well as its societal importance and, consequently, its attraction. (Marriage has been a sacred rite almost everywhere, not only in Christianity.) The single woman has not the same motives for having progeny as the married one, whether or not the state comes to her aid (materially, not morally). Nevertheless, what we see in Europe should make us apprehensive for the future: in spite of the widespread knowledge concerning the methods of artificial contraception and the legalization of abortion, the number of illegitimate births is rising steadily. In Sweden and Denmark they amount to nearly half the total number of births. (In Norway and Finland the situation is only somewhat better.) It is not unreasonable to see this evolution in the light of dwindling religious convictions.

Interesting is the case of Germany, because there the birthrate is truly catastrophic. Like France, the country can continue only with the help of foreign immigrants, mostly from southern and eastern Europe, but also more and more from Asia and North Africa. For religious and cultural rather than for racial reasons, the latter cannot be integrated. Spaniards, Italians and Croats intermarry; Moslems do not, even if they are blond and blue-eyed.

To what extent “practical materialism” is responsible for this state of affairs is demonstrated by the fact that, in spite of abortion on demand in the former East German republic and its vastly inferior living standards, the birthrate in West Germany was even lower. There the native population actually decreased. Western Germany has gone utterly Epicurean (just look at the omnipresent sex-shops). And the differing birthrates in the two Germanies existed (and probably still exist) in spite of the fact that East Germany had a Communist government quite effective in its anti-religious propaganda.

In last year’s free elections one eighth of the population voted the Communist ticket, which is really amazing. The hungry East Germans produced relatively more children than the opulent West Germans. (According to a curious theory, hungry people are more fertile than well-fed ones.)

Unfortunately we do not have fertility data for the various denominations because the very complex questionnaires of the last German census have still not been evaluated and published. In the old days Catholics certainly had the higher birthrates. Today the situation is more complex because many people, especially
in the liberated East, have no longer any denominational ties. In Switzerland in 1930, for instance, only one percent of the population was “non-denominational”; in reunited Germany there are probably 25 percent, a good deal more than in West Germany before 1989. Today the German population is, as we said, recessive and can be replenished only by immigration of partly-unassimilable elements which foster the rise of a new wave of racism.

Americans are used to an influx of immigrants, but the only comparable European country is France which, as a colonial power, had very little racial prejudice (contrary to Great Britain, where the psychological problem is grave in this respect). Yet even in France, with its pitiful birthrate, immigration has gone beyond limits and, as a psychological reaction, we see the rise of Le Pen’s nationalist party. The immigration is largely North African and here we must bear in mind that the French have been expelled completely from the Maghreb. In addition, one should not forget that Europe has a good number of unemployed, but that the South European immigration had a very different character: many “Latins” were merely guest workers who, having worked hard and earned a lot of money, went back home.

In the Baltic countries the very low birthrate of Estonia and Latvia has resulted in a considerable Russian immigration into this predominantly Lutheran area. The Latvians would be in an even worse situation if their Catholic eastern part had not kept this ethnic group on a somewhat steady level. The case of Catholic Lithuania is far better because there the percentage of Lithuanians is still 85 percent. The Russian birthrate has gone way down (it used to be one of the highest in Europe) due to several factors: 1) the decline of religious convictions due to atheistic propaganda, persecution of the faithful and the impossibility of giving or receiving religious instruction; 2) the hopeless housing situation, with families often crowded into one room; 3) the hard work brutally imposed on women; 4) the food situation; 5) the easy, legalized opportunities for abortion; 6) the government’s indifference regarding the family, supplemented by easy divorce; and 7) the lack of hope for a better future. A nation without concrete hopes will have no interest in procreation, will show no vitality, taking this word in its full sense.

Of course, natality for the ex-Soviet Union as a whole is not so bad because nearly one third of its population is Islamic and among these Asians the birthrate is still substantial. The non-Moslem birthrate
was still high in the years between the two World Wars, in spite of great material hardships. An economic improvement set in up to 1958 when war damages were overcome and the Soviet economy reached its modest peak. After this, in the seventies and eighties it declined again, as did hope for a better future and with it the birthrate.\(^\text{32}\)

As for Europe, the birthrate in the countries belonging to the Reformation faiths is low, but in the Catholic ones it is nothing to boast of either. Really shocking is the Italian situation: the birthrate went down at the same rate as living standards rose. With the exception of the deep South, Italy is today a wealthy (and expensive) country. The Italians have become intoxicated with their material success; their GNP is today as high as that of Britain, if not higher. The family is, by and large, still intact, but the average number of children per family is down to 1.3. (To maintain the level of a population an average of more than two or nearly three children per family is necessary.) For Italy this is more ruinous than for other countries because of the enormous number of genuine family enterprises.

Typical is the small business where dad, sometimes even granddad, works with brothers, sons, daughters, nephews, nieces, cousins and even in-laws—all, needless to say, part of a semi-underground economy chiselling on taxes but thriving. If, however, the progeny dwindles, that system will disappear. The laws of the Church? The Italian has always been an anarchist at heart. Laws mean very little to him, his life is ruled by likes and dislikes, love and hatred, sympathy and antipathy, certainly not “by prescription.” I would venture to say that the Italian situation highlights the growing plight of Europe—a serious plight indeed.

One must view the problem of declining birthrates and consequent underpopulation in a comprehensive way, adding up all pertinent factors. What we perceive is a cultural crisis as severe as the one following the fall of the Roman Empire, when steps were taken already under Augustus toward bolstering the birthrate.\(^\text{33}\) A sort of Provider State made its appearance, feeding the masses and humoring them with \textit{panem at circenses}—bread and games—in our day sports and television. Rationally, we have to ask what makes people want to have children. It is, as we have said, first of all lust for life, \textit{la joie de vivre}, pride and trust in oneself, the joy in creating a living proof of one's marital affection, in forming a family.\(^\text{34}\) It is a basic
optimism which is related to the Christian virtue of hope, trust in Divine Providence rather than in the Provider State, obeying the Divine Command to multiply, the vocation to be educator and transmitter of valuable traditions, a bit of patriotism and perhaps the thought that one's old age need not be lonely and materially hard.

But nearly all these values and aspects of human existence are threatened by the very spirit of the Present Age and the "progressive" and "up-to-date" modern barbarism which engulfs Europe. However, there have been several watersheds between civilization and barbarism in modern history. The first of these was the French Revolution, inspired partly by the Marquis de Sade. The last one is marked by the legalization of murder of the unborn, which is depopulating Europe. We are entering an age of relatively well-fed masses. Modern man does not like ties—no family, no children—but he is in the clutches of mass emotions.

It is an iron law that nature abhors a vacuum. A depopulated Continent will attract masses from elsewhere who believe that a plentiful table is awaiting them in Europe. Such an invasion can ruin the industrial nations. Already immigrants from Asia and Africa are knocking at our doors. Austria is facing a minor invasion of Tamils from eastern Ceylon who have paid "draggers" 2000 dollars apiece. Italy is being swamped by Tunisians, Moroccans and Pakistanis. Vietnamese slave workers, brought in by the former Communist government, are stranded in eastern Germany. And if a major catastrophe takes place in the USSR, millions will migrate westward, expecting open arms or at least employment, which they are unlikely to find.

The end of the Roman Empire comes to mind: East Goths, Visigoths, Langobards and Vandals swarmed all over the map. And it took the West some 800 years to again reach the level of the collapsed Roman civilization. Christianity triumphed too late. The flood happened before a moral reconstruction could take place.

NOTES


2. Hence also the not-infrequent parental hope that a child will succeed where the parent failed. The family is certainly less "finite" on earth than the individual whose soul, however, unlike the family, is immortal.

3. The negative attitude of various Christian faiths toward artificial contraception is due to the
very realistic fear that grave menaces against all mankind are lurking in the biological domain of science. Genuine sex-enmity is pagan and, as a mostly Gnostic influence, made itself felt in early Christianity.

4. Maritain erroneously thought that *persona* is derived from *per se*, whereas it comes from the Etruscan *phersú*, the mask worn by an actor, signifying his role which, in our lives, is unique and untransferable.

5. Compare the role of a (still existing) bootmaker to that of a factory hand; to produce what amounts to a work of art for a specific customer gives not only satisfaction, it creates a link between two persons and cannot be compared to the inferior and repetitious activity of a worker on the assembly line. The bootmaker, moreover, introduced his son or sons to his art, as did the tailor, the carriage maker, and so forth. The “arts and crafts” always instilled great pride.

6. If I represent the American electorate as a black line as long as the Empire State Building in New York is high, one vote amounts graphically to 4 microns. (A micron is the hundredth part of a millimeter.) In other words, modern man as a mere “individual” is a microbe, an arithmetical, not an algebraic unit. An “individual” is the last, not divisible part of a whole. Hence modern man, aware of his smallness and impotence, desperately tries to organize. He feels that he can act only in *numbers*, the bigger the better. A creative person (whether shoemaker or painter) is truly “by himself.”

7. The *serf* was in no way a slave. For example, Russian serfs either worked for their lord or paid him money—something like one dollar a year for every male member of the family. Serfdom was introduced by the monarchy to levy taxes, half the amount to be delivered to the government. Thus the landowners became tax collectors. But there were artists and lawyers in the cities who were legally serfs but did not dream of changing their status which would have made them subject to regular income tax.

8. Cf. the old German adage “Stadtluft macht frei” (city air brings freedom).

9. In Europe there is now a definite trend away from the big cities. When I was born, Vienna had 2.2 million inhabitants, today—over a larger area—it has 1.4 million. The provincial capitals, on the other hand—Linz, Klagenfurt, Innsbruck, Bregenz, Salzburg have tripled, Graz only doubled.

10. *Turpe est de proaevo nescire.*

11. In *Noblesse Oblige*, edited by Nancy Mitford (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1939) p.64, we hear that “birth control is flagrantly middle class.”

12. The very rich who made large contributions to charities and/or cultural enterprises could reasonably hope to be rewarded with a modest title, but titles could not be bought from a monarch. Civic titles (like *Geheimrat*, privy councillor, or *Kommerzialrat*, commercial councillor) were not inheritable.

13. In Britain the system of titles is quite different. The full title is inherited only by the oldest son or nearest male relative and the family name is usually quite another. One might be a plain “Mister” and yet belong to the aristocracy. In Britain titles and family names are still advantageous for a career, not so on the Continent (except in the diplomacy) where in most ways it is now a considerable handicap. Envy is the great European vice!

14. Still, when my brother-in-law arranged a festive family gathering of all descendants of his (and my wife’s) grandparents, 186 of the 217 invited came. One of my maternal great grandfathers, a wealthy bourgeois and for many years the mayor of Brunn, the capital of Moravia, had 24 children by two wives. (My grandmother was the 23d; she had only 5 children.)

15. Honor, like loyalty, is a feudal virtue, an ideal that waned in this century. Any election campaign attempts to destroy old loyalties. Modern politics rest on efforts to “persuade,” to be popular rather than reasonable or honorable.

16. With very few exceptions, titles now given in Britain are not inheritable; the Scandinavian monarchies have not given titles in the last 50 years or more. But without the influx of fresh blood, nobilities run the danger of becoming castes. A titled or untitled nobility without the monarchial corrective tends to be caste-minded and republican in spirit. The typical aristocratic state in Europe was the Republic of Venice, the *Christianissima Republica*.

17. Of the German colonies before 1918 only little Togo was in the black, the Belgian Congo only between 1940 and 1954 (because it exported Uranium); the English used to say that they could afford to lose India, but never Argentina. British and other European investments in the colonies amounted to no more than 12 percent of the total. In 1852 Disraeli spoke about “these miserable colonies” and Richard Cobden exclaimed: “Where is the enemy who would do us the favor and steal from us our overseas possession?” Even such a primitive economist as Karl Marx was convinced that India constituted merely a continuous economic-financial drag for Britain.

18. “Seniors” are part of progressive “newspeak,” as are the terms “underprivileged” or “developing nations.” Plain speech seems to be “undemocratic.”

19. Useless mouths, *bouches inutiles*—is an expression from the French Revolution. The Nobel Prize winner Dr. Francis B. Crick was not only the pioneer for abortion in Britain, he also advocated “euthanasia” for all upon reaching their 80th year.
20. One estimate is that in Stockholm half of one percent of the population goes to church on Sundays. Cf. also Roland Huntford, *The New Totalitarians* (London: Allan Lane, 1971), which gives a good picture of the Swedish Provider State and its moral effects.

21. In "West Germany" abortion is legalized but very strongly restricted. Since reunion, the Left protests vociferously that the "achievements" for women in the former East Germany are thereby in danger of being annulled.

22. Professor Gottfried Dietze (Johns Hopkins) has pointed out in his *Der Hitler Komplex* (Vienna: Karolinger 1990) that, as a reaction against the totalitarian National Socialist rule, all restrictions on libertine attitudes are now branded as "authoritarian" or "fascist."

23. I saw on Austrian television a picture of the Hungarian-Soviet border with an advertisement for a sex shop. This is the way western civilization presents itself to those who cross the former Iron Curtain. The Hungarian authorities make every effort to copy naively the "democratic" institutions, laws and customs of the decaying West.

24. As typical North Europeans and unlike the Italians, Spaniards or Russians, the North Germans easily believe what they are told in school, by government propaganda, by the mass media. "He lies like print" is a South German-Austrian phrase. Between 1933 and 1989 the northeastern Germans were under the domination first of National and then of International Socialism and thus properly collectivized.

25. The reasoning goes that hungry people are "naturally" more fertile than well-fed ones because among the former infant mortality is higher. A similar theory claims that in war time more boys than girls are born to make up for losses at the front. However, I find neither argument nor the data very conclusive.

26. In the 1980s the Federal Republic, "West Germany," had more Catholics than Lutherans. Today the Evangelical periodical *Erneuerung und Abwehr* (December 1990, p.27) gives the latest data for reunified Germany as 38 percent Evangelicals, 35 per cent Catholics and 28 percent non-Christians, most of the latter in the East.

27. The father of "scientific" racism in Germany was Ernst Haeckel, a disciple of Darwin. Religious anti-Judaism had died out in the early 19th century; racist "Anti-semitism" arose independently two generations later.

28. The Spaniards were highly valued as intelligent and ambitious workers. I know of German manufacturers who fired German workers and employed Spaniards. But the Spaniards nearly all went back. Spain, too, has now a thriving economy—and a lowered birthrate.

29. See also the statistical map in the official Latvian publication *Ceturta Tautas Skauti v sana Latvija*, Riga, 1934, p.17.

30. It was actually a *crime* to teach religion to anybody below the age of 18, and in Archbishop-Metropolit Nikodim the Soviets found a man who approved of this, saying that the church too does not want to do violence to the conscience of children. (Nikodim dropped dead while visiting the Vatican in 1978!)

31. Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his famous Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union mentions three times the extraordinary plight of Soviet women. I too have heard people boast that women in the USSR enjoyed perfect equality—because they are permitted to work in the mines. Another child is frequently a real blow for a Soviet family.

32. In 1963 I encountered in the USSR even anti-Communists who nourished the faint hope for material improvement and greater liberties. The latter came true, not so the former. Marx never understood economics, nor did Lenin. Thus hopelessness set in and also a wave of resistance.


34. According to an Austrian poll, personal happiness is considered by 91% to be found primarily in family life, thus topping the list; at the bottom was leisure, with 34%.

35. Faith and charity are frequently cited as theological virtues, hope very rarely. A true believer cannot really be a pessimist. And a pessimist does not want to procreate. Yet, Social Security and the Provider State are opposed to the genuine "human condition"—90 years ago Charles Péguy could write very correctly: "The fathers of families, these great adventurers of our times!" Cf. his *Pensées* (Paris: Gallimard, 1934) p. 47.

36. Voluntary celibacy is only legitimate as a sacrifice for God and as such the New Testament rates it higher than marriage.

37. "Modern man" has no tradition to hand on. He is bored by the past and terrified of the future. None of the utopian novels written in our time are hopeful.
The Coming Mass Migration

Thomas Molnar

There are no ministries of Demography in the countries of Europe or anywhere else—the “mass-migration” issue is usually taboo—but it is a burning matter of private conversations and occasional, half-clandestine measures by some governments.

In the name of the “self-preservation” of nations, pre-1940 regimes used to enact laws favoring higher birth rates, but after World War II such preoccupations were considered “racist” and no government wanted to bear the stigma. Only ethnographers were keeping records, and one of the most prestigious of them, the Frenchman Alfred Sauvy, warned years ago that demographics would soon become a major issue, although not openly discussed. It was, however, taken for granted that with rapid industrialization and therefore with the definitive switch from rural majorities to urban majorities—something taken for granted for past decades in the United States, an immigrant-hungry country—the demographic picture would drastically change: urban populations reproduce much more slowly than rural ones, where additional mouths are more easily fed and children are more easily accommodated—and valued.

Thus two shocks occurred in the time of the post-war generation that the ethnographers either did not foresee or warned against without effect. One was, Europe-wide, the arrival of foreign workers: Arabs and Blacks in France, Turks in Germany and Belgium, Pakistanis, Hindus and West Indians in Great Britain. In proportion as the host-societies became prosperous, then wealthy, then hedonistic in their mores, heavy or “degrading” work was shunned: municipalities and factories hired “guest workers,” etc. and law-makers arranged for their easier transfer to European countries. The new workers were paid less for sweeping the streets and doing unskilled jobs, and nobody cared if they wrote to their families in Central Africa or Sri Lanka to join them because jobs were plentiful.

Not only “nuclear families” came as a result; Moslems and others who practiced polygamy brought dozens of children and half-a-dozen wives (more at times than the four wives authorized by Islam), to
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find work and/or enjoy the various benefits provided by tolerant legislation. Today there are close to five million Moslems in France alone, upwards of two thousand mosques, with new ones being built at a steady rate. Eight million Moslems are expected by the first quarter of the next century. And although Mrs. Thatcher’s legislation began limiting the influx into Britain in 1984, Italy now finds its government and laws in disarray—close to two million Africans have arrived in the past decade alone.

Even if we were to discount racial conflicts and the growth of criminality, the new arrivals create enormous problems against which Sauvy and his colleagues had warned. Just one illustration: in 1990 a few Moslem schoolgirls decided to wear the veil in class in a public school near Paris. This was to break the Republic’s sacred law, as tough as in this country, of separation of State and Church. The Moslem pupils were not supposed to display religious symbols. The government was up in arms, but finally reached a compromise by transferring the girls to another school. This was of course no solution, and problems are unlikely to go away, particularly because Arabs and Blacks are prolific, and also used to less comfort and smaller dwelling-places than the whites. There is no reason why their numbers should not continue to grow.

We thus come to the second shock forecast by Sauvy, the sharp drop in natality among the white population, powerfully encouraged by “liberal” abortion laws. In other words, simultaneously with a veritable invasion from North Africa and South Asia, the original stock was to be further weakened by the widespread practice of abortion, so that almost everywhere in Europe the birthrate dropped to under 2%—and even that low figure was only reached by the higher reproductive rate of the non-European stock.

This happened not only in West Europe, but also in the fluctuating policies of the Soviet sphere prior to the 1990s, when no moral code—nor national interest—prevented the slow liquidation of nations. Throughout Eastern Europe there were other contributing factors: the bleak outlook for families, the unavailability of apartments for young couples, and brutal industrialization in Russia, Poland, Romania and elsewhere.

Yet, the hedonism that Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger denounced a few years ago was the crucial factor in the adoption of abortion as a way of life. Against Sauvy’s warnings and those of doctors like Jérôme Lejeune, French Premier Jacques Chirac gave the green
light to Mme. Simone Veil, the then-Minister of Health, to introduce the first drastic depopulation laws, soon imitated by Italy and post-Franco Spain. We know the argument: if abortion is not legalized, then many women will abort illegally, under medically-dangerous circumstances. But we will never have statistics on how many women still have clandestine abortions, since not all of them want to go through the semi-public or public procedure. The horrendous rate of actually-known and recorded abortions may be much higher due to those we know nothing about.

Why bring up the issue of “foreign workers” and depopulation by abortion? Because the Western world may be about to witness the largest mass migration the world has ever seen, next to which the so-called “Barbarian” invasions shortly after the birth of Christ will be like an off-Broadway theatre compared to Barnum’s circus.

The average German and non-German tribes in the first few centuries of our era had not more than 10 to 20 thousand members; the total number, counting all invading tribes up to the Magyars in the 9th century, could not be more than a million. The gradually-invaded Roman world, on the other hand, counted some 45 million citizens, and let us keep in mind too that the rebelling tribes had lived for decades or more within or on the frontiers of the Empire, thus they spoke Latin, and were mostly Christian.

In other words, to a large extent they were already what we today call assimilated. Yet in other ways, their mercenary status was not unlike the foreign-worker status of Europe’s colored immigrants, or for that matter, America’s. Francis Fukuyama’s confident prediction that “history has ended” with the establishment, planet-wide, of regimes modelled on that of the United States is more like a childish pipe dream: it would be silly to expect that a vast migration of peoples with radically-different racial and religious “views” will not bring about enormous political and cultural changes, similar to those that the “Barbarian” tribes generated in the Greco-Roman world by the fifth century.

But this is another matter. Now, European demographers are preoccupied with events in Africa, a continent as important for their own future as South and Central America are for ours. In spite of the devastating natural and political catastrophes which have taken place there, in spite of the periodic famines in such areas as the Sahel, the Sudan and Ethiopia, by the year 2020 there may be 600 million people in Africa.
True, the Western world and especially the Common Market countries envisage huge investments in Africa, which will provide work for the native population in their own regions and thus stem the northward migration across the Mediterranean. But sober observers do not regard this as feasible. The African standard of living will not reach the level at which people decide that it is better to remain at home rather than occupy the increasingly-depopulated spaces that an abortion-happy Europe will offer.

Add to this the drive of the new, expansive Islam to take back what was once Islamic territory. (When Granada was given up by the last Moslem warlord on the Iberian peninsula, he vowed revenge.) Let us not kid ourselves: the Japanese have not forgotten Hiroshima, nor the Aztecs the invasion by Cortez. Historical memories lie dormant for long periods, then are awakened by circumstances—in a few short years, the Arab and black settlers in France have already induced the Socialist regime to offer them—they are still not citizens!—voting rights in municipal and labor-union elections.

Meanwhile, integral Islamist propaganda is rife among them, holding them back from assimilation, intermarriage and contact with the “Infidel.” I mentioned the growing number of mosques, yet no Arab country allows Christian churches to be built. And, as everybody knows, during the Gulf War the American troops who came to save helpless Saudi Arabia from Saddam Hussein were forbidden to display any Christian (much less Jewish!) allegiance whatever while inside the “host” nation.

Before we turn to another aspect of the coming “great migration,” let us turn briefly to its effects in the United States. This is of course a delicate issue: this country was from the first based on immigration, and the symbolism of the Statue of Liberty disallows any candid discussion of the realities. I have in front of me as I write a recent brochure of The American Immigration Control Foundation, the title being “The Path to National Suicide—An Essay on Immigration and Multiculturalism,” by Lawrence Auster.

My purpose is not to analyze the contents or the thesis, but it is interesting to read even the title in view of the other, more open, concern in academic circles, namely the change at Stanford University, Columbia, and many others from “Western Civilization” courses to courses in “Other Cultures” or “Third World” values.

Let’s have no misunderstanding: Hindu, Moslem, Chinese and other
cultures deserve fully to be studied for their immense achievements in thought, science, literature and art. I have stood in admiration before Islamic architecture from the Alhambra to the Taj Mahal, from the mosques of Isfahan and Shiraz to the sacred city of Kairouan; I have read the Moslem philosophers and Persia’s poets, and explored the labyrinths of Hindu spirituality and Chinese painting. I only remark—a kind of historical notation—that toward the end of the twentieth century American universities do not merely add non-Western courses, they actually eliminate “Western Civilization.” This too is a kind of cultural abortion, or if you wish, a hara-kiri—for no honorable purposes. In fact, one might say that the suicidal Stanford gesture reflects the desire to yield to the new migration, which is not merely a matter of embarking on boats and planes but one of cultural conquest.

The migration is directed not only to Europe, the U.S. and Canada but also to Australia, where it takes a different face. That island continent is virtually empty, and by 2025 authorities expect only 35 million citizens on a land the size of Europe. Compare it to the expected 350 million Indonesians by the same date, who are the nearest neighbors, the 800 million in India, and the more than one billion Chinese.

More than a decade ago Australia decided to open its gates to immigration by non-whites, but they are still kept out of government and high positions. The economy demands, however, friendlier relations with Asian neighbors, and this policy has now gone so far that, semi-officially, Australia lists itself as an “Asian nation.” But even this new and opportunistic label will not save them in the coming decades from exposure to such a large-scale “immigration” that it may be called “mass-migration,” a less amiable term.

Before 1989, only some tens of thousands of people left the Soviet and satellite countries, a trickle of illegal refugees and a similar trickle of legal emigrants. In 1989, when even before the fall of the Berlin Wall exit became easier, 1,200,000 people left East Europe, and the number has climbed ever since; it is expected to be that much or more annually in the years ahead. The reasons are multiple, but it is more than questionable whether West Europe can take them all.

Mind you, these are not refugees in the ordinary sense; their reasons for leaving are economic, and even that is a temporary reason. Most
of them no doubt hope to return once the situation improves—they are not boat-people or lost souls.

Nevertheless, three million people are expected to leave Russia in the near future for the West, causing upheavals of all sorts. Nor will they be exclusively white Russians, but also many tribal people from Asian Russia who may be attracted by their Turkish cousins already in Germany, Belgium and elsewhere. It is important to know that Kirghiz, Tadjik and other Moslem peoples and nations behind the Ural mountain-chain are of Turkish stock: they understand the language and share the religion.

What will Europe do when these people begin moving out of underdeveloped economic areas? Where is the bold legislator in the Strasbourg parliament who would propose a Europe-wide law keeping these migrants out? Incidentally, that demagogic body, which fortunately has no political authority yet, has already approved pro-abortion and pro-euthanasia laws for the entire future Europe, not to mention the approval of homosexual households and “families.” Facing an alien invasion-like migration, Europe continues to depopulate itself.

Numerically, the westward move of some East European masses may not be significant, but it will have other, not necessarily happy, consequences. Consider the present minorities in East Europe such as Germans, Jews, Gypsies, Armenians, and others. In the first two cases the move will prove extremely significant. Jews were almost everywhere city-folk; their absence will transform the cultural scene.

True, Israeli representatives are now demanding that Germany not permit East European Jews to settle there, but rather to encourage them to move on to Israel where their numbers are needed against Israel’s Arab population and neighbors. German migrants are even more a case in point. There are only some three million of them left in East Europe where, in all countries and since the early Middle Ages, their ancestors had been brought in by those nations’ rulers. Especially after the Tartar devastation in the thirteenth century, tens of thousands of Germans were thus “imported” by the tsars of Russia, the Baltic princes, the kings of Hungary and others to replenish the countryside with their then-modern agricultural and mining methods, to rehabilitate the towns through their commercial network (for example the Hanseatic cities which reached as far as Riga and Novgorod), to give an impetus to architecture and the military as well as administrative techniques.

For centuries, Moscow was surrounded by a kind of German suburban
belt, and Peter the Great had useful advisors among them. Catherine could not have become tsarina, German princess that she was, without Russia’s German “connection,” and throughout the nineteenth century German-descended bourgeois and noblemen played an important part in public and diplomatic matters.

The presence of innumerable Germans in all facets of East European life was an important factor in those countries’ “Europeanization”; their near-absence now, for example in Romania, will be adversely felt. One important question for the future is whether the newly-regained influence of Germany in East Europe, including Russia, may compensate for the physical absence, and whether Germans may now return bodily to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, the Baltic states, Poland and Russia, even the Balkans.

At any rate, due to these present and future migrations, the face of Europe may change considerably, a change so significant, even ethnically, that next to it the question of Yes or No to European political integration becomes of relatively small importance. Also, the migrants, from the Kirghiz to the Ukrainians, possess a more vigorously religious outlook than the host nations in West Europe. The latter, depopulating themselves and caught between the religious worldview of Moslems from the south, and East Europeans and Asians from the east, may be overrun in the coming decades by more prolific people, ready to populate the increasingly empty spaces.

One example of what can be expected in the historical dimension: Italian historians have found interesting data for the explanation of ethnic changes in the heart of the Roman Empire. Examining old cemeteries, it has been found that beginning in the third century the inscriptions on tombstones were no longer Latin/Roman names, but increasingly Syrian, Hebrew, Germanic, North African, and others. The third century is also that of a steady military retreat by the legions, themselves more than half recruited among foreigners. What will future historians find in European cemeteries by the twenty-second century?

We have seen 1) that mass-migrations of a new size are occurring, and 2) that the motives display a large diversity: ethnic persecution, economic collapse, ideological drive, religious or racial conflict, but also the less overt desire for historical revenge and the occupation of relatively empty space. Nobody knows whether the move may be stopped or slowed down—or whether it will receive greater impulse.
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Generally, the south moves northward (the United States with its Latin American and Asian settlements is a clear case, with the non-English-speaking population growing), but the east also moves westward. The only move in a different direction is the expected Asian migration in the direction of Australia, that is from north to south, but that too fits into the general south/north category, that is from under-developed to developed areas.

There is only one way, ethnographically speaking, of arresting these migrations; local resistance must be created, which means the reversal of the depopulation trend in the western world. How probable is it, however, that pro-abortion legislation will be reversed, and incentives granted to families for having children? An entire way of life would have to change for that to happen, and it would have to be predicated on a religious and moral revival, not of the fundamentalist type, but by an entire civilization.

A parallel factor would have to be the rehabilitation of national feeling, now a taboo subject if ever there was one. I do not mean Fourth of July parades and other routine shows, but an elite which is able to spread and re-accredit the conviction that nations are one of God’s ways to diversify mankind.
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live in India where, as everyone knows, there are too many people. Most especially, there are too many of the wrong sort of people—the sort who ride bicycles and bullock carts, slowing things down for the right sort who drive properly in cars or at least on motorcycles. When people like me (I don’t have a car, but I’m the right sort—I’m writing an article, aren’t I?) venture into the bazaar, we generally return complaining about the crowds. Of course, if we stayed at home, the bazaar would be less crowded (people like me generally fail to see that we are part of the “population”), but then how would we get our stuff?

It’s not an idle question. Understanding how we “get our stuff” is essential if we are to understand the population problem and the agendas of those who seek to control it. Living in India, where the acquisition of goods is raw and direct (the man who milks the buffalo delivers the milk to our door), I have come to what I believe is a clearer understanding than the one I had in America where the goods I relied upon were far removed from those who produced them. Here it is impossible not to be aware of the effect that my consumption has on the piece of the earth that I inhabit.

But let’s begin at the beginning, with the birth of babies, the source of all the anxiety of people like Ben J. Wattenberg, author of The Birth Dearth, whose voice is both fearful and shrill: “Today there are 1.1 billion women of child bearing age in the less developed world! Even if these women reduced their fertility as the U.N. projects, there will be a flood of Third World babies: Third World population, now 3.7 billion, is slated to rise to over 8 billion by the middle of the next century!”

Mr. Wattenberg’s frantic apprehensions are unusual ones in the population debate. The traditional worry of First World pundits, of course, is that exploding numbers of Third Worliders will rapidly eat up the earth’s resources. We simply cannot, they say, feed so many people.
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Here in the Third World, experts point out that it is in fact the profligate consumption of countries like America which has created the present crisis. And further, countries like India can actually feed themselves quite well. A major U.N. study projects that by the year 2000, with proper land management and good irrigation, India will be able to feed a population of 2,621 million (two-and-a-half-times the expected population for that year).

This doesn’t do much to reassure Mr. Wattenberg, however. His concern is neither the voracious appetites of the starving masses nor their ability to provide for themselves. For him, the problem goes far deeper, and it is an ideological one: too many of Them means too few of Us, and the whole world stands to lose as a result. By his reckoning, the contributions of Western modern society to the “aspiring” Third World have been enormous: “... the aspiring nations have also gained. Over the recent decades, life expectancy has soared, commerce has expanded, food per capita has increased, literacy and communication have exploded. What caused the advance of the poor nations? Modernism, Westernism...”

Of late, however, Mr. Wattenberg notes a disturbing trend: Western families are small; modern women are having too few babies, and that means trouble.

Trouble for whom? The obvious question is “What’s so great about us?” While it may be true, as Mr. Wattenberg observes, that we are “more prosperous and healthier” than ever before, it is also true that we (in the U.S. alone) abort 1.5 million babies a year, divorce at a staggering rate of 50% and have invented and encouraged our own version of the Plague.

What’s so great about us? Believing in democracy is not enough to gain us any special status, particularly when our commitment to it is self-serving and inconsistent, allowing us to condemn Communism on the one hand and support dictators like Marcos and Pinochet on the other. What about character, integrity, virtue? Does Mr. Wattenberg really believe that he is, by nature, nobler than the average Third Worlder? My guess is that he doesn’t know many poor people, and if he met a few, he probably wouldn’t know how to talk to them—he’d be too busy scanning the horizon for that “flood of Third World babies” about to come pouring down the hill in their billions.

Mr. Wattenberg worries whether our values will “continue to dominate in a world where our population shrinks.” Having seen
the effects of Western consumerism on India’s poor, I can only hope that some of our values shrink as well.

Not all. Who can speak against the values that led to penicillin, sewage systems, paved roads or classical music? But there is far more to Western technology than these things. We all love electricity, and the comforts it provides, but it has to come from somewhere. Read “How Green Was My Valley” for a vivid picture of what coal mining did to one small town in Wales. Or visit a migrant labor camp in New Delhi for a glimpse of the lives of the people who build 5-Star hotels for Western tourists to enjoy.

The arrogance of the champions of Western technology is pervasive. In his essay “The Politics of Environment,” Anil Agrawal, director of the Centre for Science and the Environment in New Delhi, points out that modern science has been used to subtly “undermine the confidence of the poor in their own resources and resource-use patterns.” Typically, the resources discredited are free and so widely available that they cannot possibly be monopolized by the business class.

Agrawal writes: “The classic example is mud.” An amazing 50% of the world’s people live in homes made of mud, which is not only economical and environmentally sound, but also the most appropriate material for the climates in which it prevails. Yet the vast majority of the world’s poor long desperately for the status symbol of a cement house, which is hot in summer, cold in winter, highly expensive and environmentally disastrous. Housing authorities the world over ignore or revile traditional building materials and civil engineers and architects with standard educations know nothing of their use.

Medicine is another field where traditional practices are ridiculed and even banned. Although most Western prescription drugs are in fact based on plants and herbs, herbal medicine is dismissed by the “authorities” as quackery and its practitioners can be arrested and jailed.

Mr. Agrawal’s last example is perhaps the most remarkable: the discreditation of breast milk. Even as American and European women have slowly reawakened to the obvious benefits of this natural resource, Third World women, for whom the issue is literally a matter of life and death, continue to be swayed by the superior knowledge of the white man, abandoning their own traditions for bottles and formulas and jeopardizing their babies’ lives in the process.

What is so great about Us? Every culture has its own virtues and
its own failings. People who have experienced only the American way of life often believe they have everything to teach and nothing to learn. This is both patronizing and ignorant. Have we nothing to learn from, say, the Tasaday (natives of the Philippine rain forests), whose language has no words for hate, war or evil? We place an inordinate value on our achievements in science and technology, and seem content to ignore our very serious failings in human relations, to say nothing of our inability to be faithful stewards of the land. Western civilization has made powerful and lasting contributions to the world, but it has also damaged it, in some ways beyond repair (1.5 million dead babies a year is a lot to make up for).

Towerimg above all the small voices in the family-planning/population-explosion debate is the Catholic Church. Although attempts are invariably made to ignore or reduce the significance of its statements (by ridicule, mockery and slander), the fact remains that the Church is one of the few voices worth listening to. Not that one has much choice, for the Church is relentless in its insistence on the spiritual nature of sexuality and unwavering in its support for human life.

"The Church’s growing option for the poor is rendered largely ineffective by a self-defeating opposition to artificial contraceptives.” This is a line from a National Catholic Reporter editorial titled “Too many people arriving too fast”—it illustrates nicely the desire of many Catholics to be seen as reasonable and intelligent (and modern?) on the issue of family planning.

The funny thing is that while the disaffected left-wing of the Church does its best to disassociate itself from its Neanderthal leader, the vanguard of “progressive” international opinion is already reaching some of the same conclusions that the Church has been holding out to us for decades (all the while shockingly unconcerned about its “effectiveness”).

An acquaintance of mine (a pro-choice feminist) attended an international conference on the status of women recently and came away shaken. Not aware of my views on abortion, she told me of a disturbing incident at one of the workshops. It seems that a group of Third World feminists, deeply concerned by the shattering effects of artificial contraception on the health and well-being of poor women, had ("totally innocently," my friend insisted) somehow managed to team up with Right-to-Life women who had been saying the same things for years. These “Lifers” had hard evidence documenting the callous indifference with which the Pill is distributed in slums.
and villages throughout the world (Western medical norms require screening out various physical conditions in which the Pill is contraindicated), and charged that IUDs were inserted routinely in appallingly unhygienic conditions with more attention paid to government quotas than to women’s health.

My friend explained how these feminists, in their ignorance, were actually planning to join forces with the RTL reactionaries, but were fortunately stopped in time.

Whew.

A certain element of the Feminist movement has now latched onto Natural Family Planning, praising it for the way it provides a woman “with a sense of her body and herself.” One almost gets the impression that NFP was invented by feminists rather than through the faithful and painstaking efforts of largely-Catholic organizations like the Couple-to-Couple League and the World Organization of the Ovulation Method (Billings).

Such quibbles are, however, beside the point, which is that experience keeps proving the wisdom of Church teaching. All the same, many (including Catholics) continue to refuse to see what is too plain to deny. The National Catholic Reporter editorial continues: “There is something unconvincing about the sight of a celibate Pope, dressed in medieval finery, standing in the pulpit of a great cathedral in Burundi and telling the congregation, the second most crowded and poorest peasants of Africa, that they need to improve their agriculture and exercise self-control to bring down the population.”

As Anil Agrawal said in another context: “Try asking the women first.” Most of the poor women I know here in India would find the Pope’s advice very convincing indeed; the fact that he is celibate would make it all the more so (and judging by their astonished disappointment at Westerners’ “fancy clothes,” I think they would be charmed by his “medieval finery”).

Many women here have asked me what I do about family planning. When I explain the concept of NFP, their eyes light up at the thought of an effective (I am their proof) method which is free, totally without side effects, and which won’t keep them out of work for even one day. But when they realize the implications of a method which requires that their husbands not only respect their bodies but accept them as equal partners in the sexual relationship, their faces fall. Their men just aren’t ready for such a radical change.
It is ironic that the Church's only approved method of family planning is also the only one whose success depends on the true liberation of women. When the Pope tells the poor that they need to exercise sexual self-control, he is calling for nothing less than a complete re-ordering of the man-woman relationship. And when he tells them that they must improve agricultural methods to bring down the population, he is expressing a profound and largely unrecognized truth: over-population does not cause poverty; poverty causes over-population.

The Pope's statements on family planning invariably anger population experts from the World Bank and the U.N. who are quite certain that he is out of touch with reality, living as he does on the Cloud of Unknowing. He angers feminists, who believe he is the embodiment of Patriarchy, intent on crushing women into submission (a belief I sympathize with, by the way, although not in this sphere!). And my guess is that he must irritate people like Ben J. Wattenberg considerably as well, because that gentleman's "Us" vs. "Them" construct has no place in the Christian context.

Can one even imagine Mother Teresa preferring a white "modern" baby to a black or brown "aspiring" one?

The inclusive, unconditional love of God demands that we see each child born on this earth as a unique and precious creation; no baby, no matter how white or how modern, is more valuable than any other.
Malcolm Muggeridge: Advocate for Life

Ian A. Hunter

The death of Malcolm Muggeridge on November 14, 1990 at the age of 87 silenced a most eloquent voice in the international pro-life movement. While the obituaries acknowledged Muggeridge's stature as a writer and broadcaster, little was made of his role as a Christian apologist—rather as though a first century obituary of St. Paul should have praised his travel writing while ignoring his missionary accomplishments. With the honourable exception of this journal, of which Muggeridge was an editor-at-large, nothing was said of his pro-life advocacy in England, Canada and the United States.

This was nothing new. In 1977 I edited an anthology of Muggeridge's writing, Things Past. The book had a specific purpose: to refute the prevailing misconception that Muggeridge's religious preoccupations were a quirk of advancing years. As I worked through his early writings (the first entry in Things Past is dated 1928; the last 1978—a half century of scintillating prose) I discovered that there was a theme, a golden thread in William Blake's lambent phrase, running through all of Muggeridge's writing, namely a pilgrimage in quest of faith. Like Bunyan's pilgrim Christian, Muggeridge's path through the twentieth century had traversed diverse earthly kingdoms, Vanity Fairs, and Sloughs of Despond. Not a few Giants Despair had sought to imprison him in castles of social, ideological or religious conformity.

But whatever the climate, however fascinating or menacing the surroundings, Muggeridge had invariably folded his tent and made off "with some notion, however indistinct, that at last one will see the Holy City set upon a hill." Reviewers were generous to Things Past but, almost without exception, they missed its central point. The myth of a Damascus road conversion, in the twinkling of an eye transforming the jaded, cynical nihilist into a latter-day St. Mugg, grew apace. Fantasy, after all, is clean-cut and symmetrical; it is reality that is angular and complicated.

In the academic year 1978-79 Malcolm and I swapped houses
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for a year. He came to Canada to be a teaching visitor (or, as he preferred, “old hack in residence”) at Western University; I went to Park Cottage in Robertsbridge, Sussex to write his biography. It was the experience of reading his diaries, hand-written, in innumerable faded notebooks, the tiny scrawl of the earliest entries now almost illegible, which convinced me that the only way to understand Muggeridge was as a twentieth-century pilgrim. In a sense, his diaries were spiritual landmarks, jottings by the way. Incidentally, it is unfortunate that only about a quarter of Muggeridge’s diaries have ever been published, and that quarter doubtfully chosen and scrappily edited; an enterprising publisher who brought out a full, properly-edited set of the diaries would pull off a publishing coup.

Shortly after the publication of my biography, Malcolm proposed that I should edit another anthology, “a sort of sequel to Jesus Rediscovered, including a selection of large and small pensées.” The title he suggested was What is Life About? With that book, and the third volume of his memoirs, completed, “I shall happily chant Nunc Dimittis and lapse into silence.” Alas neither book was to be completed, although Malcolm did write what he called “a fragment of spiritual autobiography” and this book included some of the pensées we had selected.

I assembled quite a lot of material for What Is Life About?, but other commitments intervened and the book was never finished. I intend to draw upon some of this material here, to examine the origins of Muggeridge’s pro-life convictions.

Malcolm Muggeridge was born on March 24, 1903 in Croydon, near London, the third of five sons of Henry Thomas and Annie Muggeridge. His father was secretary of a London firm of shirt manufacturers, and an early Fabian socialist who, in 1931, was elected as Labour M.P. for Romford. After local grammar and secondary schools, Malcolm entered Selwyn College, Cambridge in 1920. His previous training obliged him to read natural science, a subject in which he professed no interest then or since. After four desultory years, “the most futile and dismal of my whole life,” he emerged with a pass degree, and set out for India to teach at Union Christian College in Alwaye.

Here, in addition to holding forth upon English literature, he encouraged student nationalists; the more radical students appreciated the fact that here was a sahib who made no attempt to set himself
apart. Malcolm lived with the students, adopted Indian dress and dietary habits, sat cross-legged on the ground and meditated, and slept without a mattress.

Shortly after Muggeridge arrived, the poet Rabindranath Tagore came to Alwaye to open a student hostel named in his honour. Muggeridge met Tagore and later went to visit his ashram where he donned a saffron robe and sat on a grass mat at the guru’s feet. He also wrote to Tagore suggesting that Tagore advocate celibacy rather than contraception as the answer to India’s population growth. Tagore replied in rather vague terms indicating that “some check upon procreation is common ground between us,” but that they were “diametrically opposed” on how to accomplish this.

Another early visitor to Union Christian College was a then-relatively-unknown populist leader of the Swarajist movement, Mahatma Gandhi. In March, 1925, Muggeridge and many of the students stood for hours at the small railway station at Alwaye awaiting Gandhi’s arrival. When his wooden, third-class carriage pulled in, Gandhi immediately went over to a group of untouchables who had been specially cordoned off and began to sing hymns with them. This made a strong impression on Muggeridge, which he noted in his diary. When Gandhi spoke at the College, he received a tumultuous reception.

Muggeridge followed up Gandhi’s visit by writing to him and urging the Swarajist movement to adopt a more aggressive and explicitly socialist policy. He supported Gandhi’s principle of non-violent revolution, satyagraha, a revolution accomplished by each person transforming himself by the truth force, rather than by violent revolution or the collective overthrow of authority. He praised Gandhi’s call for asceticism and celibacy. Gandhi replied and published their exchange in his newspaper, Young India, thereby midwifing Muggeridge’s first printed journalism.

In the College assembly, Muggeridge urged the students to support Gandhi, to overthrow the British Raj and all vestiges of colonialism including, perhaps especially including, the faculty and staff of Union Christian College. A shocked colleague told him that men had served time for less inflammatory and seditious remarks. Muggeridge later wrote: “Rather to my disappointment the authorities never heard of my vapourings or, if they did, decided, quite rightly, that they were of no importance, requiring no response on their part.”

Immersed in the appalling poverty of India, Muggeridge was forced
to confront the timeless conundrum of how to reconcile belief in a loving God with the ubiquity of human suffering. He must decide whether life was at all times and places sacred, or if only a certain quality of life was worth living. This question is at the heart of pro-life conviction; Muggeridge gave his answer as early as 1926 in an article about a retarded boy who drove geese. It was published in the *Calcutta Guardian:*

His chest is sunken, his face is vacant and his eyes are dull, and yet he drives his geese skillfully; and believe me or not as you like, he speaks to them in the soft, caressing voice a mother uses to a very little baby. He carries no stick to keep order amongst them, but only a large leaf, which he waves slowly to and fro; and one might easily imagine that his speech was nothing but the noise of the wind through this, so like is it to the sound of a forest when, in the evening, a light wind blows. With this he keeps his charges as a compact, disciplined company, not stupidly military in their orderliness, yet not by any means a rabble; rather they remind one of a band of pilgrims, or of workers working voluntarily together. They seem to be not so much numbered and uniformed as to make a harmony of which he is the conductor; not so much to march in step as to dance with perfect understanding of each other’s movements. I realized how supremely successful he was at his work when, one day when perhaps he was ill, I saw another boy at it. This other boy was a bouncing, bumptious fellow who carried a switch like a sergeant-major, and who shouted at the geese as *sahibs* shout when they want something. The result was that they spread over the road in a screaming, cackling mob—some getting left behind; some getting run over by a passing motor; all of them lost and bewildered. And the more he shouted and beat them the more hopeless the position got.

There are pretty morals to be drawn from this contrast between the persuasive methods of the idiot boy with the sunken chest, who understands the speech of geese, and those of the sane boy with the broad chest, but moralizing is a thankless task; indeed it is a confession of incoherence, so I shall avoid it. But I must say I envy the goose boy. I feel that he has found the secret of happiness in that he has done one useful thing which he can do superlatively well, and which he is content to go on doing from day to day until he dies. When his soul leaves the poor, puny body, with its gapingly vacant face, I believe it will be found to be a rare and beautiful soul, pleasing to its maker. Sometimes I wonder about him—whether he will marry; whether he prays or has any kind of religion; whether he ever wonders about the meaning of things. All this is doubtful; what is certain is that he can drive the geese efficiently; and to do that is quite as worthy of praise as to write a book or bleat a lecture or drone a sermon or do any of the things we wretched intelligentsia preen ourselves on.13

In March, 1927, Muggeridge left India and returned to England, where he soon married Kitty Dobbs, a niece of Beatrice Webb. At loose ends, he briefly did some teaching in Birmingham14 before taking up a position at the Egyptian University in Cairo.
Here again he held forth on English literature before “classes of stupefied faces and inert minds” in a classroom in the old Zaffarian Palace—the room had formerly accommodated a harem. It was while he was in Egypt that Muggeridge began sending articles to the Manchester Guardian, and Ted Scott (son of the legendary Guardian editor, C. P. Scott) soon invited Malcolm to join the editorial staff.

Muggeridge spent 1930-32 as a leader writer on the Guardian; when an opportunity arose to stand in for the Guardian’s regular Moscow correspondent (William Henry Chamberlain), he leapt at it. Retaining the socialist idealism of his youth, he considered this a chance to see firsthand the classless Utopia taking shape in the East. To Leningrad he and Kitty sailed, discarding en route their marriage certificate, degrees, and other documentary intimations of the crumbling bourgeois society on which their backs were now turned.

Muggeridge’s Winter in Moscow, his first important book, is crucial to understanding his subsequent intellectual development. It was not just his infatuation with Communism or with leftist ideology that was buried that winter in Moscow; it was a rejection of any and all utopian or materialist schemes for collective human betterment.

I only began to hope when I ceased to be a materialist. I understood that men were not made happy or unhappy, serene or unsettled by their circumstances whether physical or social or economic, but according to their sense of sharing a destiny which transcends their earthly circumstances.

I only began to hope when I became truly hopeless as far as this world is concerned, and saw that the profoundest of all truths was expressed by the saying that except a man lose his life he cannot save it.

In the spring of 1933 Muggeridge made an unauthorized train journey to the Ukraine and North Caucuses. His purpose was to assess Joseph Stalin’s policy of collectivizing agriculture, a policy then just getting under way. What he saw on that trip, he never forgot. He saw famine “planned and deliberate; not due to any natural catastrophe like failure of rain or cyclone or flooding. An administrative famine brought about by the forced collectivization of agriculture . . . abandoned villages, the absence of livestock, neglected fields; everywhere famished, frightened people.”

In a German settlement, a little oasis of prosperity in the collectivized wilderness, he watched peasants kneeling down in the snow, weeping and asking for bread. He made a vow to himself; it was a vow he
never broke. “Whatever else I may do or think or say in future, I must never pretend that I haven't seen this. Ideas will come and go; but this is more than an idea. It is peasants kneeling down in the snow and asking for bread. Something that I have seen and understood.”18 And he saw the dim outline of what we now know as the Gulag Archipelago; at a railway station in the grey, early morning light, he glimpsed a line of kulaks, or rich peasants, “with their hands tied behind them being herded into cattle trucks at gunpoint... all so silent and mysterious and horrible in the half light, like some macabre ballet.”19

Muggeridge’s courage in describing what he had seen (his articles were smuggled out in the diplomatic pouch to avoid censorship) cost him his job. When the articles appeared in England, Muggeridge was denounced as an hysterical liar by the cream of the British intelligentsia. Leading the chorus was Kitty’s aunt, Beatrice Webb, who hotly repudiated his suggestion that there were food shortages or forced labour in the Soviet Union.20 Despite the chorus of denunciation, it was Muggeridge’s dispatches which gave the world its first glimpse of Stalin’s man-made famine of 1932-33.

Shortly before leaving Russia, Muggeridge happened upon an Orthodox church where a clandestine evening service was in progress. He wrote of that experience and its impact more than once in later years;21 however, this is his account written closest to the event (from Winter In Moscow, in which Muggeridge adopts the name Wraithby);

A service was going on with quite a large congregation, mostly peasants. A melancholy passionate service. Religion was a refuge from the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Priests in vestments and with long hair were chanting prayers; little candle flames lighting the darkness, and incense rising. The voices of the priests were dim like echoes, and the congregation curiously quiet; curiously still. Wraithby found their stillness hopeful; even exhilarating. It suggested that even general ideas spent themselves at last and were nothing.

The priest moved down amongst the congregation, swinging censers; their faces battered and frail; people kneeling and crossing themselves before them. They had been purified by suffering. Their spirits had been strengthened and made to burn steadily by it. They had proved strong enough to keep intact a link with the past. When they passed near him, Wraithby, unbelieving, knelt and gratefully received their blessing.22

In 1934 Muggeridge returned to India as assistant editor of the Calcutta Statesman. Finding neither the newspaper nor its editor to his taste, he spent most of his time writing a biography of Samuel
As eighteen aimless months came to an end, Muggeridge returned to England to work for the Evening Standard. This also proved short-lived, in part because Muggeridge passed up no opportunity to mock the Standard’s proprietor, Lord Beaverbrook, whom Muggeridge portrayed as a vain, grasping man, chiefly preoccupied with his own health.

Until the outbreak of the war, Muggeridge freelanced, writing essays for Time and Tide, book reviews for the Daily Telegraph, and a brilliant, quirky novel In A Valley of This Restless Mind. From fugitive pieces written in the Thirties one finds considerable evidence of the deepening and maturing of Muggeridge’s religious views which would later be the basis of his pro-life advocacy. For example, in 1936 he pondered whether or not he believed in “civilization” and, concluding that he did, asked what it truly meant:

I believe that there is such a thing as civilization. I believe that, in this country at least, underneath the confused babble of slogans and salesmanship and egotism struggling to assert itself, to make itself heard, noticed, civilized values do exist.

What are these threatened civilized values? Essentially, a sense that the real significance of life is inward and not outward, that the problems it poses are at once too sublime and too terrible to be solved by the application of any formula, that the individual is immensely precious and immensely important, and at the same time, as a grain of sand on the seashore, that he cannot be treated in the mass, steamrollered out of existence, without his life losing all dignity, all that makes it worth anything to him, that the past and the present and the future are one, and that men have their roots in the past, so that to destroy the past means destroying men. Too, that no civilized people in any circumstances delegate to one man or group of men a right to act for them, think for them, be them, that qualitative standards are more important than quantitative. All that is great in human history has come from such an attitude to life, all that is contemptible from its opposite. The eradication of even the memory of its ever having existed is the avowed object of most governments in Europe today. If we, too, turn our backs on it, then the world may settle down to an unbroken period of Dictatorships of the Proletariat, of Leaders, of Brain Trusts, and other such mob tyrants.

In another essay from this period, Muggeridge considered equality and concluded that political equality is and must ever be a sham; that the only true equality is spiritual:

It is inconceivable that one man should be of greater worth than another, just as it is inconceivable to a parent that one of his children should be of greater worth than another, however varied their capacities. We are all in the same situation—stretching ourselves for a little while on the earth, staring up bewildered at the sun and moon and stars and down bewildered at the ground and bewildered into our hearts, and then no more seen on the earth and soon forgotten.
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Most important, Muggeridge began to experience a mystical awareness of the oneness of all creation, an experience in which briefly, fleetingly, he understood (less as a thought than an experience) the unity of God's purposes. These moments of mystical illumination, however unexpected and unpredictable, would never again be entirely absent from his life:

At these moments, these so rare moments, I think: "I living, am part of life's Oneness. Its destiny and mine are bound up together. If it is eternal so am I; if it is good so is my life. Why should I be afraid, then? And why find each passing moment so urgent? Nothing harmful can happen to me except to lose this sense of identity with life's Oneness, to become separate, like a child walking along a street with his father and then looking up and finding himself alone. No outward circumstance can bring about this separation. Whether I am ill or well, prosperous or needy, intelligent or stupid, successful or a failure, alive or dead even, does not make any difference. As long as I partake of life's oneness I am delivered from fear." And in me a conviction wells up like a spring that quite apart from what happens to me or what I do or fail to do, or what happens in the corner of the earth I inhabit or the corner of Time in which I have my fleshly existence, quite apart from any material circumstance whatsoever, to live is good because life is good, and to grow old and suffer and be disappointed in every hope of sustained happiness is good because these are implicit in life, and to die at last is good, because death is implicit in life, too. "And thus living, growing, old and dying," I think, "in common with all the multitudinous forms of life which make up its Oneness, I am unfolding a purpose, and this purpose transcends me and the circumstances of my life and yet is implicit in them, and the key to this purpose is love."27

Perhaps the most comprehensive statement of a personal credo from this period can be found in his 1937 essay, What Is My Life?, which concluded:

Men have souls, and the significance of their lives lies in the soul and not in what they achieve individually or collectively. No good is so good that it is worth sacrificing a soul for; no Evil is so evil that the soul must succumb to it. No experience is so terrible that the soul cannot be enriched by it. In the soul Time and Eternity meet. It is the seat of paradox, as that to live it is necessary to die, that suffering and renunciation are more blessed than happiness and fulfillment and yet happiness and fulfillment must be sought, that life is good and death is also good, that an individual man is of as little account as grass, one day growing and the next cut down, and so precious in God's eyes that every hair of his head has been counted. In the light of Time alone these paradoxes are meaningless, in the light of Eternity alone they are meaningless; only in the soul where Time and Eternity meet they are comprehensible.28

Muggeridge spent the war as a spy in British Intelligence (MI6).
In the second volume of his memoirs, *The Infernal Grove*, he presents himself as a fumbling innocent, an Inspector Clouseau out of his depth in a world of codes, ruse, and double-cross. This is not so; the historical accounts of the period demonstrate that Muggeridge was an astute and intrepid player of the game of the foxes. However, during this period he wrote little; one diary entry, at war's end, bespeaks weariness of body and soul. "I am supposed to be ill with something wrong with my right lung. Sometimes I think it is really bad and will be the end of me, and sometimes I think it is nothing at all, just an outward and visible manifestation of an inward and invisible desire to escape from the bondage of human life. All my desire is to turn my eyes away from time and towards eternity." [29]

After the war, Muggeridge returned to Fleet Street to the *Daily Telegraph* where he served first as Washington correspondent, then as Deputy Editor.

In 1953 he became the first "outside" journalist invited to occupy the editor's chair at *Punch* magazine. The next four years he spent engaged in the sombre pursuit of "trying to discover what, if anything, was funny enough to make the English laugh." During his tenure as editor, Muggeridge transformed *Punch* from a stodgy, hide-bound and predictable magazine into a boisterous satirical minefield over which the eminent, especially politicians, trod at their peril. Not all readers appreciated the change. The Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Muggeridge chastening *Punch* and its editor for "bad taste." How often today one hears similar accusations levelled against pro-life advocates, particularly those who use pictures to convey the grisly reality of abortion. Muggeridge's response not only deals with the accusation, but provides insight into his own religious beliefs:

My dear Archbishop:

It was very kind and considerate of you to write to me yourself about the question of bad taste in *Punch*. I've thought and thought about this question ever since I became editor.

My own conclusion is (and you probably won't agree with it) that humor itself is in bad taste, as also, incidentally, is truth. I'm sure that the Pharisees (men of taste) rightly felt Our Lord was often guilty of bad taste—for instance, when He said that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. Equally, the gargoyles that adorn our cathedrals are in bad taste, though I personally love them, and always think of them when I am trying to convince myself that editing *Punch* is a worthwhile job.

I am, alas, not myself a believing Christian. I wish I were. But one thing
I can say with the utmost sincerity, and that is that I grow ever more convinced that the Christian gospel was the most wonderful thing that ever happened to the world; that it represents the nearest to ultimate truth that has yet been revealed to mankind; that our civilization was born of it, is irretrievably bound up with it, and would most certainly perish without it; that the basic trouble with the world today is that false prophets (some of them professing Christians) preach that men can live by bread alone which is truly blasphemous. If anything ever appeared in *Punch* which contradicted these convictions I should be ashamed indeed. I don't believe it has.

The advent of television in the Sixties—a medium Muggeridge never lost an opportunity to flay but on which he regularly appeared—made his face and inimitable voice known as widely as his pen. As probing interviewer or acerbic panelist, he acquired a reputation in England as unrepentant sceptic and agnostic; after an interview with Billy Graham, in which Muggeridge appeared to mock Graham's fundamentalist beliefs, many viewers concluded that Muggeridge was an atheist.

It thus came as a surprise to many that in the late Sixties a collection of religious essays called *Jesus Rediscovered* became an international bestseller, running through twenty-seven printings and hundreds of thousands of copies in several languages. It seemed stranger still that its author was none other than the English curmudgeon, Malcolm Muggeridge, irreverent debunker of sacred cows and unlikely apostle of piety and faith. What, reviewers and readers alike asked, had caused a sceptic like Malcolm Muggeridge to rediscover Jesus?

Reviewers' explanations generally fell into one of three categories. First were the dons and divines who, to their profession born, equivocated: “The evident sincerity of Mr. Muggeridge’s beliefs must not be allowed to obscure either his superficial theology or his lack of understanding of the awkward position which the church finds itself in today,” etc. That kind of thing.

Next were old journalistic acquaintances, elbow-bending friends from a dozen Fleet Street pubs, who shook their heads incredulously and concluded that this must be just another Muggeridge turn, the *bon vivant* turned latter-day Job. Their line was: “The infirmities of age having finally quelled his baser appetites, St. Mugg ascends a pulpit to wag a reproving finger at the rest of us poor mortals,” etc. Finally, there were reviewers (especially in religious papers) who played variations on the theme of a Damascus road conversion: “Not since Saul has the light from on high struck so unlikely a straggler as Malcolm Muggeridge,” etc.
At the time, any of these points of view seemed plausible enough. However, as the Sixties gave way to the Seventies, then the Eighties, Muggeridge emerged as the most influential lay exponent of the Christian faith since C. S. Lewis. His books dealt exclusively with Christian themes. His television programme and subsequent book about Mother Teresa of Calcutta, *Something Beautiful for God*, focused worldwide attention on this modern saint. His stunning Third Testament television series analyzed the seminal Christian figures of history. And, with the passage of the English Abortion Act of 1967, Muggeridge emerged as the most eloquent voice of opposition to abortion in England.

When parliamentarians sought public support for what is misleadingly called abortion "reform" and extolled the compassionate purposes of the legislation, Muggeridge replied bluntly: "Alas, the terrible inhumanity of the humane! Herod's slaughter of the innocents was negligible compared with the millions of babies being slaughtered under the legalized abortion procedures now existing almost everywhere. Again, as legalized euthanasia gets underway the Nazi performance in this field pales into insignificance. At Nuremberg the Nazi practice of legalized euthanasia was condemned as a war crime. So it takes thirty years to transform a war crime into an act of compassion!"

In 1971 the Canadian anti-abortion movement was just being formed; it was decided to inaugurate things with a big rally which, it was hoped, would attract publicity. A well-known speaker was essential. Malcolm Muggeridge was approached without, I might say, particularly high hopes that he would agree to participate. All we could offer him was airfare and expenses. He immediately agreed. Shortly before he was to leave England, our treasurer discovered that we had too little money to pay trans-Atlantic airfare and hotel accommodation. Somewhat chagrined, the president advised Muggeridge of this. "Never mind," he replied immediately, "I'll pay my own way." By the time he arrived in Canada, funds had completely dried up and the booking fee for the hall was unpaid. Malcolm cheerfully paid that too. It must surely rank as a rare occasion when an organization brings as distinguished a speaker trans-Atlantic without fee, at his own expense, to address a meeting in a hall for which he is dunned the rent. Such incidents in Muggeridge's life could be multiplied many times over.
Muggeridge’s opposition to euthanasia was no less fierce and implacable than his opposition to abortion. In his final months, speechless in an English nursing home after a crippling stroke, I often thought of Malcolm’s suffering and wondered if it had altered his views. I doubt it. In 1982, when my own father lay dying in hospital, I wrote Malcolm expressing the hope that some compassionate doctor might kindly dispatch him to that Eternal city on which his gaze had been long fixed. Malcolm replied:

I quite understand your feelings about your father’s state but, as I’m sure you’ll agree, the principle of euthanasia, once accepted, can have such ghastly consequences—e.g. the Nazi holocaust—that as Christians we have to abhor it. Talking to the medical students at Western University I realized that the medical profession itself, by making fantastic progress in sustaining life as a result of regarding human beings as bodies merely, has created the very dilemma in which your father finds himself. Fearful symmetry again!

Now in my 80th year the sheer tiredness of living, of sorting out words, etc., etc. often seems scarcely bearable. So I understand the situation perfectly and often have occasion to say over to myself, “Men must endure their going hence even as their coming hither—Ripeness is all.”

It is not my purpose to analyze Muggeridge’s explicitly pro-life writing, much of which appeared in this journal. What I have sought to demonstrate is that his pro-life advocacy had roots in a religious temperament forged in the experiences of a lifetime. Only by understanding the events of his remarkable life can one explain the passion and vigour of his pro-life advocacy. But let the last word be his.

The issue, put very simply, is whether our human society is to express the notion of a family whose father is God, or of a factory-farm whose governing consideration must be the economic viability or the physical well-being of the livestock. If the latter, then a foetus is but a lump of jelly, to be discarded if unwanted, and a body, still more a mind, that is too sick to function properly, is an unnecessary burden on the community, at best put down like an old hen incapable of laying any more eggs. If the former, then from the moment of conception a foetus is potentially a human soul, with all that implies, and a mongoloid child or old derelict no less precious in their creator’s eyes than a beauty queen or a Mensa I.Q.

Either we in the West go on with the process of shaping our own destiny without reference to any higher being than man, deciding ourselves how many children should be born, when, and in what varieties, and which lives should be continued and which cut short. Or we draw back, seeking to understand and fall in with our Creator’s purposes for us rather than to pursue our own; in true humility praying, as the founder of our religion and our civilization taught us: Thy will be done.
3. "I give you the end of a Golden String,
   Only wind it into a ball,
   It will lead you in at Heaven's Gate
   Built in Jerusalem's Wall."
12. The Green Stick, op. cit. n. 9, 111.
14. On July 2, 1927 Muggeridge was sent to the worst slum school in the heart of industrial Birmingham; he thus described his experience in a letter to his closest friend, Alec Vidler: "The children were puny and, in feature, curiously aged. There was a weariness about some of their eyes and lines in some of their faces, which one usually associates only with a world-weary middle age. They seemed to have plunged into tragedy when most of us know only days of careless freedom in the forest of Arden. Winter, with them, had set in desperately early. But with all this the school was full of happiness. There was something real about it; the flavour of the sacredness that comes only when things are being made. It was as though human life felt itself, in such conditions, put upon its metal, and determined therefore to show us all that it was capable of. For these children who were herded together at night—four, five, six in one room; many of whom came breakfastless to school, and had, for mid-day meal, only a hunk of bread; who had been bullied and harassed from earliest recollection; who, instead of a sky—and how may we know God if we are prevented from seeing his eyes?—looked up to a smoky pall, and instead of trees and grass and all the infinite sweetness of nature found around them blackened bricks shutting them in like a prison; these were good at their work, good at their play and good in themselves. Just as I left, three urchins from the top standard—louts of Punch's vicious drawings—brought in a sparrow in a hat. It was injured and they were afraid it might die. I fear I wept at this, for their kindness to the little bird made the world's unkindness to them seem the more cruel. 'Strange' said the head 'that a creature with wings should come here.' I would advise anyone who still believes that there is a difference in kind between the cultured and the uncultured; between the neat-coated and the ragged-coated, to visit one of these slum elementary schools, for there even the most dense cannot fail to see clearly that God, like the birds, never sings out of tune."
Muggeridge to Vidler, Mar. 14, 1927.
17. The Green Stick, op. cit. n. 9, 257.
18. Winter in Moscow, op. cit. n. 16, 244-5.
19. The Green Stick, op. cit. n. 9, 258.
20. A useful compendium of leftist absurdity on this point is to be found in David Caute, The Fellow Travellers, MacMillan, 1973.
22. Winter in Moscow, op. cit. n. 19, 246-7.
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27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
33. Muggeridge wrote of Mother Teresa: “It will be for posterity to decide whether she is a saint. I only say of her that in a dark time she is a burning and a shining light; in a cruel time, a living embodiment of Christ’s gospel of love; in a Godless time, the Word dwelling among us, full of grace and truth. For this, all who have the inestimable privilege of knowing her, of knowing of her, must be eternally grateful.” *Something Beautiful for God*, p. 144.
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[The following column appeared in the New York Post (November 14, 1991) and is reprinted here with the author's permission.]

But there's No 'Magic' in the Message

Suzanne Fields

There's no way Dan Quayle can compete with Magic Johnson. The vice president has neither the charisma nor the speed downcourt to take on Magic one-on-one. Besides, he's square.

Magic Johnson tells teen-agers to get a little "safe sex." Dan Quayle tells them to get none at all, to wait until they're one with one in marriage.

In the 1950s Dan Quayle's message would have been mainstream morality, expressing the need for young people to show responsibility to each other and toward their own futures. Today such ideas are merely reactionary and unrealistic.

"Safe sex" is prescription, not principle, rooted in a reaction to disease rather than an appreciation for conscientious behavior. We've been down this path to the garden before.

The Pill offered "safe sex," when "safe sex" protected against maternity, not mortality. But The Pill also loosened moral standards and deprived young girls of a safe and irrefutable reason for saying no. Since the onslaught of the sexual revolution the number of pregnant teen-age girls without responsible partners has soared.

"Safe sex" is today's slogan because, as everyone will tell you (and tell you and tell you), teen-agers will be teen-agers. When their heroes boast of compliant groupies without number and thousands of sexual liaisons without responsibility, what's a guy or girl to do but follow their example?

"Safe sex" for teen-agers is above all cynical. Teen-agers who forget to turn in homework, who refuse to put on boots when it rains, whose hormones are raging out of control, are not the best candidates for condoms no matter what's at stake.

Bill Moyers once produced a documentary on life in the ghetto and found himself shocked to find so many teen-age boys fathering two or three illegitimate children with different girls. These boys expressed no sense of humiliation or responsibility. Like basketball superstar Wilt Chamberlain, who boasts of 20,000 sexual trophies, they were proud of themselves.

When the young women were asked the reasons why they slept with different boys, few spoke of an overwhelming sexual urge. They said they wanted to be loved, to be held, to be wanted, and the boys wouldn't oblige them unless they obliged the boys.

It's odd that now with grown women crying "harassment" at the slightest sexual slur at the office, we don't hear an equal hue and cry on behalf of teen-
APPENDIX A

age girls, admonishing them to keep the boys at a sexual distance to protect their own interests. “Don’t let them take advantage of you” sounds quaint, not tough.

Just as a woman must learn how to tell men to “knock it off” at the office, a young girl can learn how to tell a guy she likes but doesn’t love that she wants to save herself for love—and commitment.

Hedonism coarsens relationships, eschewing simple decency and good manners. Emotional longing and lingering loneliness are crudely ignored in transient relationships. Wilt Chamberlain didn’t send 20,000 bouquets of flowers the next morning. He not only didn’t call on 20,000 mornings after, he couldn’t even remember the names.

Only the most naive among us believe that our celebrities live exemplary lives. We console ourselves that life in the fast lane has its price. We’re learning that the cost is exorbitant in slower lanes as well.

If you need sexual involvement, Magic tells the kids, then you need protection. Kevin Johnson of the Phoenix Suns told David Brinkley of his better idea. “We need to take it back to our traditional values as well, that [sex] can be treasured as a sacred act in itself, and maybe abstinence is the safest way.”

But can a square message make the rounds? Maybe.

‘He’s harassing someone else!!’
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[The following column appeared in the New York Post (November 13, 1991) and is reprinted here with the permission of Tribune Media Services.]

Morality and Magic

Patrick J. Buchanan

In the ease, and even humor, with which he stood up at that press conference to announce he had the AIDS virus—and hence was under a sentence of death—Magic Johnson was a class act. As he has been for more than a decade for the L.A. Lakers.

But the way in which America’s chattering classes (in Peggy Noonan’s phrase) reacted reflects the immaturity of our age. As with the death of Maryland’s All-American Len Bias, of a drug overdose, Johnson’s stunner unleashed a torrent of nonsense. New York Rep. Tom Downey rushed to the House floor to wail: “Magic, we need you more than ever. We need you to remind us that government must take the lead in stopping the spread of AIDS.”

Government? But how is “government” supposed to stop the spread of AIDS? How, after all, did Magic contract AIDS? Here is what one gutsy sports writer, Peter Vescey, USA Today, wrote the day after Magic’s announcement: “At the same time as much as I’m shocked, I’m not shocked. Magic’s promiscuous bachelor lifestyle these last dozen years—I doubt he has ever heard the word ‘no’—left him brutally exposed . . . Even in this day and age of AIDS, an awful lot of players pass around the same women in every city . . . ”

Magic was “my role model,” says Wilt Chamberlain, who brags in his new book about having slept with 20,000 women. Is government supposed to stop the spread of AIDS among athletes fornicating like that? How? Are we to put federal agents outside every locker room in the NBA to hand out condoms as the players head out with their groupies for a night on the town?

“Maybe,” says Wilt of Magic’s situation, this “will make people realize it could happen to anyone.” Sorry, but this is the Myth of Heterosexual AIDS. That Wilt himself does not have the virus, after 20,000 transactions, underscores the point: AIDS does discriminate. All the trendy propaganda aside, we are not all equally at risk.

Of the 195,000 AIDS cases in America, 66 percent are homosexuals, 22 percent are intravenous drug users who got contaminated blood from the former, directly or indirectly—6 percent are wives, lovers or children of AIDS victims. That is 19 of 20 cases. The primary way AIDS is transmitted remains anal intercourse, the defining act of the practicing homosexual; all other cases are derivative. This does not mean that homosexuals who contract AIDS are undeserving of compassion and care. They are. And many prove themselves heroic in how they deal with this horrible disease. But the need for compassion must not lead to a denial of truth.
Appendix B

Magic’s public life—his dedicated team play on the court, his unstinting support of good causes—was admirable. But a private life of sleeping around in every city the team visited is not a “role model” for black youth; it is the road to hell.

We are an infantile people. We want to ignore the traditional morality, but never pay the price; we want to defy The Gods of the Copybook Maxims, but never be called to account.

Thanks to “lifestyles” pursued by millions who emulate Wilt and Magic, two of three black children in our inner cities are born to unwed mothers, raised without a father’s care. And test scores fall, kids drop out, drugs are everywhere, and one in four young black males is in prison or on probation or parole.

The Hollywood pace-setters of our popular culture may live a lavish lifestyle on money made mocking traditional morality, but the society that drinks of their delicious poisons also dies of them.

President Bush “insists that ‘changes in behavior’ will stop the epidemic,” huffs The New York Times. “But, how will those changes occur if the President himself continues to disappear from leadership against this virulent enemy?”

Can The Times be serious? Can anyone believe 10 televised speeches by Mr. Bush is going to roll back a Sexual Revolution, when a body count of 126,000 dead of AIDS has failed to do so?

In their outpouring of affection for Magic Johnson, many are trying to evade the issue of moral accountability. Times columnist Anna Quindlen is particularly upset with those who raise the question:

“Over the last year we have witnessed the canonization of one AIDS patient, a 23-year-old woman named Kimberly Bergalis who says that she ‘didn’t do anything wrong.’ This is code, and so is her elevation to national symbol. Kimberly Bergalis is a lovely white woman with no sexual history who contracted AIDS from her dentist. She is what some people like to call ‘an innocent victim.’ ”

Again, sorry, but there is a moral distinction between Kimberly Bergalis and Magic Johnson that cannot be lost. It is the difference between a young woman who has been mortally crippled by a reckless driver, and a reckless driver smashing into a tree. Every AIDS victim merits compassion, but not every AIDS victim is blameless.

Magic Johnson gave Americans last week an example of manly grace under pressure. But, if this society is ever going to turn away from the suicidal course on which it has embarked, it is going to need more than Magic’s admonitions to “practice safe sex.”

Who among you, if a man asked for bread, would give him a stone? asks the New Testament. Yet, as the bright-eyed children of tomorrow look to us with hope, for the Way, the Truth and the Light, we tell them to hold out their hands—and give them a condom.

Magic Johnson is not the only one carrying a fatal virus.
APPENDIX C

[The following column appeared in the Washington Times (November 4, 1991) and is reprinted here with the permission of Tribune Media Services.]

The Dark Underside of Euthanasia

Patrick Buchanan

Ann Wickett Humphry, 49, was a modern woman. She had it all. Blond-haired, blue-eyed and pretty, she was the daughter of a Boston banker, a Peace Corps volunteer, a student of Shakespeare who had studied for a doctorate in English literature, an author and co-founder with husband Derek of the “death-with-dignity” Hemlock Society.

A month ago, Ann Wickett Humphry went out and killed herself.

Garry Abrams of the Los Angeles Times describes her death: On Oct. 2, Ann left Windfall Farm, her 50-acre ranch near Eugene, Ore. Hitching up a horse trailer with her favorite Arabian gelding, she drove to the mountain town of Sisters. She turned off toward Three Creeks Meadows, parked, saddled her horse, rode three miles up a trail, veered into the woods, dismounted, removed saddle and bridle, turned her horse loose, sat down, swallowed some pills, and, as the leaves fell, waited for death. Six days later, sheriff’s men spotted her blond hair in the decaying autumnal leaves.

Sounds like a lovely way to die. It wasn’t. Ann Wickett left a typed suicide note full of bitterness and resentment. “There. You got what you wanted,” she wrote her ex-husband: “Ever since I was diagnosed as having cancer, you have done everything conceivable to precipitate my death . . . what you did—desertion and abandonment and subsequent harassment of a dying woman—is so unspeakable there are no words to describe the horror of it.”

A copy of that note was sent to Rita Marker, who had become Ann’s close friend. “Rita,” a hand-written postscript read: “Derek . . . is a killer. I know. Jean actually died of suffocation. I could never say it until now; who would believe me? Do the best you can. Ann.”

Mrs. Marker heads the international Anti-Euthanasia Task Force. “Jean” was Derek Humphry’s first wife, subject of his best-selling “Jean’s Way” (written with Ann’s help), in which Humphry describes the cup of coffee he concocted with pain killers and an overdose of drugs, to end her life. Jean was dying of incurable cancer.

The lonely death of Ann Wickett should expose the dark underside of the right-to-die movement—before it wins its greatest victory ever, in the state of Washington, Nov. 5. Initiative 119 would give the United States its first euthanasia law, granting a physician the right to kill a patient who asked in writing to die, and whom two doctors had diagnosed as having less than six months to live. The law would also permit the terminally ill to commit suicide with a doctor’s help.

Winter 1992/93
Because Derek Humphry heads Hemlock, because he is America’s leading advocate of assisted suicide, whose how-to-kill yourself manual “Final Exit” is another best seller, his second wife’s death is more than a personal tragedy.

British journalist Cal McCrystal, who knew both when they were married 15 years ago, confirms much of Ann’s story:

“A month after I saw her” in 1990, Mr. McCrystal writes, “she wrote that she was ‘devastated’ over her husband’s affair with [a woman] half his age. ‘I want it put on record,’ she told me, ‘that Derek is trying to kill me and I don’t think there is any doubt about that. . . . I think Derek’s role in death and dying dovetails with part of him that is injured and indeed somewhat sinister. It’s important for him to play a part in encouraging people to die, even nudging them on, you might say.’

Derek “has done everything conceivable,” Ann wrote Mr. McCrystal, “to try and sabotage any and all survival attempts . . . now flaunting publicly the fact that he has a new mistress and has bought a house for her. He knows this will get back to me and he knows the killing effect of the news. In a word: Is this a person who is trying to be loving and supportive?”

Mr. Humphry denies he smothered his first wife with pillows, remains proud that he assisted her suicide, and admits participating in the double suicide of Ann’s parents. (Ann used her inheritance from her parents to buy Windfall Farm.) At Hemlock, those who remember Ann support Mr. Humphry’s story that she was mentally unstable.

America has entered a post-Christian era. Men and women who disbelieve in God and the immortality of the soul are no longer willing to live by old beliefs. They want the right to abort unwanted children, to put their terminally ill parents out of their misery, to take their own lives, when they, and no one else, decide it is time to die. They intend to make themselves the gods of their own destiny. And if the law refuses to give them the freedom to do as they demand, more and more will—like Dr. Jack Kevorkian in Michigan and Derek Humphry at Hemlock—do as they wish, and let the law try to apprehend and prosecute them.

The number of those who reject traditional morality, claiming it as rooted in superstition, now is legion. Thirty years ago, there was a national debate over whether a woman carrying a Thalidomide child should be permitted to have an abortion. The woman had to fly to Sweden to get it. Now, there are 1.5 million legal abortions yearly in the United States; and abortion is, for a large segment of America, a valid form of birth control.

But just as “Silent Scream” pulled back the curtain, showing the reality of abortion, an unborn child recoiling from the death needle, perhaps the tragic end of Ann Wickett Humphry, alone in the Oregon wilderness, will give us a glimpse of what lies behind the comforting phrase “Death with Dignity.”
APPENDIX D

[The following column appeared in the New York Post (November 22, 1991) and is reprinted here with the author's permission.]

The Butcher of Avenue A

Ray Kerrison

The first real awareness of the pain and misery inflicted by incompetent, unsupervised, money-grubbing abortion practitioners has finally begun to seep into public consciousness following prosecution of the doctor now known as “The Butcher of Avenue A.”

The story is as old and bloody as the abortion industry itself, legal and illegal, back-alley and front-door, licensed and unlicensed. Its components are morality, profits, distress, death, deformity, guilt, negligence, politics, social agendas, secrecy.

Dr. Abu Hayat, 61, who is accused of shearing off the arm of a baby during a botched abortion, was able to commit his horrors and slug his poor, frightened client for $1,500 because abortion is the most protected business in New York. It is the great “untouchable” of New York politics, law enforcement and health agencies.

A woman may have the right to choose in New York, but thereafter, she’s on her own. Nobody gives a damn about her fate—especially the radical feminists who make abortion their siren call.

There are about 100 abortion “clinics” in New York City. About a dozen (no one knows the precise number) are licensed by the state. These clinics have to be licensed because they are corporate enterprises and the abortionists are employees. Licensed clinics are supposed to meet certain medical standards of hygiene, staffing and competence, and keep strict records. They are open to annual inspection and subject to fines and other penalties for violations.

Scores of other doctors, like Hayat, just set themselves up in the abortion business, do the job with varying degrees of skill and care, and count the cash. They are subject to no oversight of any kind other than malpractice and misconduct procedures. Their hygiene, staff credentials, equipment and records are never inspected.

Not that that makes much difference. One of the biggest licensed abortion clinics in the city is the Eastern Women’s Center on East 30th Street. In the past couple of years, I’ve written of the deaths of two females (one was a 13-year-old child) after abortions at that facility. Between 1986 and 1988, it was fined $92,000 for all kinds of violations, including lack of medical direction and supervision, hygiene, etc. Not to worry. It’s still in business.

The allegations against Dr. Hayat seem horrendous, but they are anything but rare in the racket. He allegedly performed an illegal third-trimester abortion on Rosa Rodriguez in October, leaving her baby alive but maimed. Hayat reportedly charged $1,500—taking $1,000 in cash and Rodriguez’s passport, green card and jewelry as collateral for the other $500. Another of his clients
suffered a perforated uterus, while yet another was rushed to a hospital after her abortion only to discover that half the baby had not been removed.

An attorney said Hayat’s license should have been yanked years ago. Why wasn’t it? Because nobody cares. In the Rodriguez case, as in all other abortion atrocities, our civic leaders remain silent because it is politically correct. No word from the mayor’s office, nothing from the City Council, nothing from the law.

The biggest scandal of all is the silence of the militant feminists and the Hollywood celebrities who wave the flag at every abortion parade in sight but disappear when things go wrong. This crowd, which professes to care so much for women, was indicted for all time last April when CBS’s “60 Minutes” probed a botched abortion in a Maryland abortion mill that left a woman paralyzed. Barbara Radford, head of the National Abortion Federation, admitted she knew all about the clinic’s grisly record but did nothing about it, hoping “60 Minutes” would “go away.”

Abortion activists fight abortion-clinic regulation. No matter how high the toll, it is their policy to keep quiet. And that’s the principal reason Rosa Rodriguez suffered such agony and her baby will face life with only one arm.

There will be no feminist-sponsored marches on the Hayat clinic, waving coat hangers and pleading “choice”—just as there are none on the Eastern Women’s Center, despite its appalling record.

When you think about it, legal abortion has just moved from the back alley into the front parlor. Only the profits are bigger.
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