

# ABORTION. ONE ISSUE?

Paul Marx

In the «National Observer» of March 3, 1976, staff writer Paul C. Hood writes angrily about abortion as «one issue» in a political campaign and particularly berates Democratic candidate Ellen McCormack as totally unworthy of federal election campaign funds. Too many others, even Catholic reporters like Jim Castelli of the NC News Service, regard abortion as just one social problem among many.

But *is* abortion one issue?

After having closely observed the abortion-euthanasia death movement in many countries, I am totally convinced that it is not. A highly competent German Lutheran doctor, with whom I fought the abortion movement in Germany-Austria-Switzerland-Holland, perceptively listed the abuses stemming from permissive abortion and the effects on a society that gives up the historic moral-medical-legal protection of the unborn. Hood has a lot of company in priests, nuns, and even bishops who glibly or seriously tick off abortion as though it were just another issue — an issue indeed, but only one issue. This common failure to examine the numerous facets of abortion may explain the distressing apathy of those many from whom one expected much.

In their attempt to produce a «just» social order by freeing women forever from the slavery of home and family, the Communists in 1917 allowed abortion-on-demand; the escalation of social, personal, and health problems prompted them to forbid abortion in 1936. But the idea of abortion as a means of birth control and of eliminating an unwanted pre-born had been planted in society; massive illegal abortion and its effects continued; in 1954, given the low birthrate and health problems, the Communists felt they had more to gain by legalizing abortion on a limited basis. Today Russia, like other countries behind the Iron Curtain that imitated her bad example after the Second World War, has the same demographic and health problems that the West has. Thus, nearly all countries behind the Iron Curtain, which began aborting earlier than the West and which are, therefore, more conscious of the resultant problems, have seriously restricted their abortion laws. This writer was astounded to hear the minister

of health at the World Population Conference in Bucharest say that Rumania forbade abortion in 1967 for two chief reasons: the dangerously low birthrate and the health of women in subsequent pregnancies. At the time Rumania was doing an estimated four abortions per live birth. The same reasons were given me by doctors when I visited Bulgaria four years ago.

The Wynn Report, a British document researching the effects of abortion on subsequent pregnancies in seventy-five medical journals in twelve countries with long histories of abortion, substantiates the bad medical aftermath in women with subsequent pregnancies. This report, by the way, was announced at the Wig and Pen in London by none less than the Queen's gynecologist, Sir John Peel, who was willing to stake his reputation on the Wynn findings. There are other research reports from behind the Iron Curtain which one will not find in Planned Parenthood's amazing number of publications, many, of course, at least indirectly financed by the American taxpayer, who may not know that he subsidizes International Planned Parenthood Federation's ninety affiliates around the world, with headquarters in London. This writer has witnessed again and again in the underdeveloped nations these insidious programs of Planned Barrenhood or Planned Unparenthood.

It is not too much to say that Planned Parenthood plans mostly sex-without-childbirth with back-up abortions. In 1974 32 percent of its total patients (43 percent of the new clientele) were under 20 years of age; over 40 percent of its total patients were between 20 and 24. The percentage of patients with no living children rose 56 percent in 1971, 68 percent in 1973, and 71 percent in 1974.

Last year in the United States there were nearly one million teenage pregnancies, of which about one-third were aborted. In its *Five Year Plan: 1976-1980*, Planned Parenthood emphasizes «special services» for teens and young adults. In all Western countries which have embraced free-choice killing of the unborn, approximately 75 percent of abortions are done on unwed women. So abortion is only the reflection of sex-run-loose. To solve «the teenage pregnancy plague», as Planned Parenthood terms it, that organization wants to promote contraceptive education and counseling for the vulnerable young under the guise of sex education in schools and specially sponsored teen «rap sessions»—always, of course, with back-up abortion, also called «postconceptive family planning».

Indeed, his successors have followed well the advice of the late Alan F. Guttmacher when in 1973, as president of Planned Parenthood,

he wrote to «friends» of that promiscuity-promoting, death-dealing organization:

«You have accepted the responsibility of broadening the scope of your family planning services, and you have welcomed a wider patient clientele —most notably, to include minors for whom you have created special services to meet their special needs. All of you recognize the logical inclusion of sterilization and abortion as integral components of modern fertility control service».

However, apart from the medical and health problems and the corruption of youth, what interests this sociologist are the social and demographic effects resulting as night follows day from killing the unborn. Every country without exception which gave up the historic protection of the unborn experienced a serious, dangerous drop in the birthrate. This explains in part why from north Italy and through Scandinavian countries one finds what are euphemistically called «guest workers», that is, foreigners working there because of the lack of young native laborers. Already in both England and Germany there are more funerals than births. Native English and Germans are dying out.

Japan, where well over fifty million abortions have been done since 1948, has attempted to introduce foreign workers. Not able to secure them, it moved much of its textile industry out of Japan and garners profits flowing back from cheap labor. When in Japan, the author was told on good authority that large companies like Mitsubishi actively recruit laborers from the rural areas every spring. It is not fantastic to think that we in the United States, with our presently lowest birthrate in history and having failed to reproduce ourselves for several years, may be importing Mexican laborers within a decade. Responsible persons have maintained that there are already more than 800.000 legal and illegal entrants annually. The socio-economic and demographic effects of killing the unborn are quite evident to anyone who wishes to rise above his parochial view to see the total picture.

Another item in the litany of evils that stem from abortion is the almost inevitable emergence of euthanasia, despite the avid denials of the abortionists before legalization. Daniel Callahan, who supports free-choice killing in the first three months of pregnancy, denies the connection between abortion and euthanasia in his book on abortion, whose research, by the way, was financed by pro-abortion money. Apparently Hippocrates, the father of modern medicine, who lived almost five centuries before Christ, would disagree with Callahan, since that

Greek doctor condemned both evils in the Hippocratic Oath, which doctors took for some twenty-two centuries in the civilized world.

What evidence can we muster that euthanasia is abortion's twin and has a way of insidiously following the legal execution of the unborn? The euthanasia issue has been well debated in Japan; the gentleman most responsible for bringing permissive abortion into that country in 1948, wrote a book a few years ago suggesting that the Land of the Rising Sun give the world another progressive example by legalizing euthanasia. The 1962 decision by the Nagoya Higher Court dangerously distinguished between euthanasia and homicide. The Japanese Euthanasia Society was founded last January. The First International Euthanasia Conference, attended by England, Japan, the United States, the Netherlands, and Australia, was held in Tokyo last August. A Declaration was issued. All agreed that substantial «progress» towards the legalization of Active passive euthanasia would be made within the next decade.

The Socialist government of Austria, despite 823,000 petitions against it in a nation of seven million, voted for abortion-on-demand in the first three months of pregnancy: the night before, a doctor-member of the Parliament had calmly remarked, «Tomorrow we will legalize abortion; soon we will have to give our attention to euthanasia».

In England, some ten months after the Abortion Act went into effect in April 1968, the very same people who had promoted it, namely, the Abortion Law Reform Association and the Family Planning Association, introduced a bill for euthanasia in the House of Lords which was defeated by a vote of 61 to 40. The bill was written by the same gentleman who wrote the Abortion Act, the ace abortionist-euthanasian, Glanville Williams. The spectre of euthanasia has risen three times since and recently was defeated soundly once more in the British House of Lords. As the present writer was told repeatedly in England, so long as we fight abortion, the euthanasians cannot so easily carry out their deadly program. Still, right now, again at the behest of Williams, there is another thrust for euthanasia, this time through the suggestion that anyone who kills a severely suffering, feeble, or dying person should receive a lighter legal punishment than that given for murder.

On this connection, one can only hope that Callahan and other ivory tower kill-at-will intellectuals who see no connection between abortion and euthanasia, would meditate long on the recent words of

Dr. C. Killick Millard, the son of Dr. Maurice Millard, who in England began the euthanasia push in 1931:

«From the state's point of view, can we really afford to put too much money into people who really are, after a certain time, expendable? We accepted abortion in the interests of the state and world population, and I think, before long, we may have to accept as a necessity this little reform, voluntary euthanasia... which will only affect a few people».

Before the United States became the abortion paradise in the Western world, Uruguay owned that dubious title. For some forty years the Uruguayans have intermittently engaged in massive abortion. When this writer visited Uruguay in 1972, doctors there were doing an estimated 150.000 abortions annually in that small nation of barely three million people. Of course, some pregnant women came for free-choice killing from neighboring Argentina and Chile. Is it a mere accident that Uruguay is also the country whose laws give the doctor the most leeway in performing euthanasia?

When I was in New Zealand last fall giving testimony before the Royal Commission on Contraception, Sterilization, and Abortion (note the combination!), pro-life New Zealanders were appalled at my suggestion that they would lose the pro-life fight. I urged them to continue resisting but also to get ready for euthanasia; abortion perhaps, they reluctantly admitted, but euthanasia— no, never! But the New Zealanders will understand better the connection between abortion and euthanasia when their government finally relaxes the present abortion law!

After travelling 1.400 miles to Australia, in one of whose six states the abortion law was loosened in 1970, this writer heard much talk about euthanasia, participated in a national euthanasia seminar, and debated a philosopher fervently espousing euthanasia at Monash University in Melbourne. Soon the writer discovered a euthanasia society in New South Wales. Again: first abortion, then euthanasia. After all, if legally and wantonly you can kill an innocent somebody, you can kill an innocent anybody. Abortion and euthanasia are twin evils, two sides of the same coin, having the same philosophical and theological roots in godless utilitarianism. Incidentally, the situation in Australia was very different when this writer visited there for a month in 1971. The inner dynamism of the many-faceted abortion issue, like a ravenous cancer, spreads incredibly fast. Today in Australia abortions are done virtually on demand in defiance of the law because of bad court

decisions (some 60,000 estimated abortions a year in a nation of hardly thirteen million people and in a rich land-area the size of the continental U. S.).

Professor Jerome Lejeune, the great French geneticist, sees a similar pattern in France, as I have also personally observed in other European countries. Painfully aware of their past demographic problems due to widespread contraception between the wars, the French government cautiously legalized abortion on demand in the first ten weeks of pregnancy, and for the mother's life and health thereafter: the woman presenting for abortion must be told the effects of abortion; the bill was passed on a trial basis for five years. One year after legalization there were 60,000 fewer births in France, while it has already been calculated that the 600,000 Algerians in France, with their large families, can take over that country in so-and-so many years.

Any careful observer of the American scene will have noticed how often those who ardently support abortion likewise favor euthanasia. Take, for example, the late Dr. Alan Guttmacher, the former president of Planned Parenthood, who was on the Board of Directors of the Euthanasia Educational Fund, as were the medical commentator formerly at the Mayo Clinic, Dr. Walter Alvarez, and Joseph Fletcher, an ardent abortionist-euthanasian, the first president of the Society for the Right to Die, Inc. It would be easy to mention many more. It is indeed difficult to understand how Callahan, in his book on abortion, cited by abortionists all over world, can say there is no relationship between abortion and euthanasia — all the more so because the two are logically and apparently even historically related. As we have seen, the Hippocratic Oath forbade both. Euthanasia has reared its ugly head in twenty-three American states. When will some intellectuals and churchmen wake up from their comfortable slumber?

Not least among the social and moral effects of permissive abortion is the fact that it always becomes a means of birth control, «the second line of defense against unwanted pregnancy,» as kill-at-will Guttmacher maintained. No one less than Christopher Tietze of the Rockefeller-sponsored Population Council is now commenting that the safest forms of birth control are the condom and the diaphragm with back-up abortion. At a large secret meeting of abortion proponents in January 1971 in Los Angeles, reported in *THE DEATH PEDDLERS*, medical professors in high places frequently talked about «postconceptive family planning», given contraceptive failure or the non-use of unesthetic preventatives. Now some of the same men are speaking out for euthanasia.



Anyone familiar with the abortion literature and movement in this country will know, as already explained, that well over 70 percent of abortions are done on unwed girls and women, including the divorced and separated. Studies show that a high percentage of these did not even bother with the use of readily available contraceptives, and in the case of the pill and the IUD, better known as abortifacients. Thus, permissive abortion propels the young, and some not so young, into an escalating irresponsible sexual activity, which leads to an ever greater number of irresponsible pregnancies and so to the feeding of ever more pre-borns to abortion mills for the profit of money-hungry doctors. Meanwhile VD becomes rampant and illegitimacy continues or even increases. So too, given, the unacceptable failure rate of all contraceptives and the unesthetic character of contraception in an age that wants things «natural»; given the increasing hesitancy to use health-threatening abortifacient pills and intra-uterine devices, society soon witnesses a massive resorting to male or female sterilization. The pattern is ever the same, country after country.

Take for example, Oregon, where abortions still must be reported. In that state of approximately two and one-half million people, there were 30,000 births and 10,880 reported abortions in 1975, representing a 24 percent increase over 1974, when there had been a 14 percent increase over 1973. As Oregonians have been saying, abortion has become a means of birth control. But this is so everywhere. At both the World Population Conference in Bucharest and the International Women's Year meeting in Mexico City, no distinction was made between contraception and abortion. Fertility control now casually includes both. In a listing of birth control methods and their effectiveness, the International Planned Parenthood Federation places abortion at the top.

No one could have said it more eloquently and honestly than Professor Irvin Cushner at the January 1971 Los Angeles meeting referred to earlier (p. 122):

«I suggest to you that for the individual, the role of abortion will be, as it has been, the second line of defense against harmful pregnancy and the unwanted child. These are contraceptive failures. The societal role will require that we see family planning in a true light; no matter how thin you slice it, ladies and gentlemen, family planning is a euphemism. We don't intend or desire to prevent conception for conception's sake; we want to prevent conception because of what follows conception. Family planning is the prevention of births, and as birth is the end of a sequence which begins with the sexual urge,

then family planning is anti-conception, anti-nidation, and the termination of the conceptus if implanted. This is the social role of abortion in the future».

Abortion is, indeed, a gigantic octopus with tentacles groping and grasping in nearly every area of human life and society. Consider, for example, its prostitution of the medical profession and the totality of health services, the division it creates among them, the divisiveness it creates in society at large, with many taxpayers having to pay for abortions they think are intrinsically immoral; note how public and even private non-sectarian hospitals have been forced to do abortions; think of the parents who could sue a doctor for malpractice for piercing their minor daughter's ears without parental consent but could do nothing (except pay the bill) if the same doctor aborted that same daughter. And speaking of prostituting the medical profession, let us not forget the hurried abortions done carelessly for money in advance, the abortion procedures on women who are not even pregnant, and the refusal of bright medical students to go into obstetrics and gynecology in England, where the conscience clause is not observed, and where gynecologist-obstetricians, anesthesiologists, and psychiatrists will be refused employment in the National Health Service for refusing to do abortions. Because of the abortion mess there, not a few doctors have left England for other countries where they can practice medicine according to the Hippocratic Oath they uphold. Meanwhile, in a desperate effort to curtail teenage pregnancy, the National Health Service made free contraceptives available, only to have an increased number of such pregnancies a year later.

On the same point, the United States is a rich country with many medical facilities and doctors, a country to which many doctors escape via the brain-drain from other countries, most often to make more money. Because of this influx of doctors and our policy of free-standing clinics (some now being erected by Planned Parenthood in areas where abortions are still hard to get), the approximately one million and a half abortion patients of 1976 do not crowd our hospitals; in fact, hospital after hospital is giving up its ob-gyn department because of the low birthrate. But in England one woman told this writer that she had to wait three months for a needed hysterectomy, and another lady said she had to wait two months for a gynecological operation because hospital beds were filled with sex-playing abortion patients. While I was in England, the Health Minister gave out a semi-secret memorandum to the administrators of the National Health hospitals to move abortion out of the hospitals into special medical facili-



ties like the American free-standing abortion clinics, «which seem to be highly efficient and successful». In short, lift restrictions on abortion and you will not only prostitute the medical profession, but you will waste much medical time and talent and facilities. How abortion can prostitute the legal profession is eloquently demonstrated by the horrendous Black Monday decision of our Supreme Court of 1973 and the previous and subsequent decision of lower courts.

And what does abortion do to the mental health of the mothers who have aborted, apart from jeopardizing their future reproductive capacity? The remarkable Laurie Nelson, foundress of Women exploited, has some very interesting things to say about that. She herself had an abortion out of wedlock and gives a most fascinating inside account about the ugly, profiteering abortion industry.

Good government and newspaper surveys in Japan show that at least 80 percent of women think about the unborn babies they have killed. «This writer asked an eminent Swiss gynecologist, Karl Mueller, whether a woman ever shakes the awareness of having had an abortion. His response was interesting. He asked me whether I had ever been in a hospital. Yes, was the answer, for ten days. Was it serious? he asked. No. Well, said the expert, have you forgotten it? Never. Whereupon he asked whether I thought a woman could ever go to a clinic or a hospital, leave her baby in an incinerator, and forget it.

In his litany of evils arising from abortion, my Lutheran German doctor-philosopher-theologian friend, Siegfried Ernst, reminds me that abortion ends human lives not only here and now but also in the future in terms of a considerably increased chance of miscarriages, ectopic pregnancies, stillbirths, prematurity, difficult births, placental damage, harm to the endometrium and myometrium, etc. (Cf. *The Wynn Report* and medical reports from Eastern Europe).

Far from freeing the woman, permissive abortion makes her ever more the sexual slave of playboy man. The Playboy Foundation's sponsorship of and lobbying for abortion should surprise only the naive. Its effects on future parenthood are obvious. Abortion ruins human love and life, occasions massive VD, has always been tied up with the underworld, does not solve the problems the proponents of abortion maintain, ruins God's great gift of human love and sexuality, is the ultimate strike against womanhood and the final abuse of sex. Abortion is really a gigantic, all-consuming, social cancer that quietly but quickly nibbles away the inner, healthy structure of human personality, the family and society. After listing the many evils stemming from killing-at-will, Dr. Ernst pointedly asks, «What is left?».

Moreover, one does not have to leave the United States to hear some new reasons for abortion. Even so, I heard a rather bizarre argument in Switzerland, a small country of six million with 600,000 «guest workers»; the Swiss have killed more than 300,000 babies in the last thirty years and now have the third lowest birthrate in the world. Here an abortionist proposed that the Swiss must have legal abortion in order to give good example to the underdeveloped nations!

There is a reason why the common sense of history has rejected, by and large, euthanasia and abortion except to save the mother's life. Proof that a person has not thought much about the effects of abortion is the glib and shallow remark that «abortion is only one issue». On the contrary, it is a whole group of issues — an exploding complex of issues: it is a gigantic octopus tentacling into every area of society; its effects are multiple; its uncontrolled appetite, gargantuan. Just as the arguments for, the slogans, the rhetoric of abortion are everywhere the same, so too the many evils that stem from abortion in every country of the world where governments have jeopardized or liquidated their future. One country contemplating abortion could learn this from an honest examination of the situation in a neighboring country that has experienced abortion for some years. But as Bertrand Russell once said of individuals, so it is true of nations, «If there is one thing we learn from experience it is that we learn nothing from experience».

Finally, as the great American philosopher George Santayana remarked, «Those who do not remember the past are condemned to relive it.» In fact, by our apathy and naivete in believing that abortion is just another social problem among many, we are condemning ourselves to relive past mistakes. The amazing thing is that so many intellectuals — and not least some naive Catholic theologians, too many priests, and even some bishops — are unwittingly in the vanguard in promoting abortion-euthanasia, not unlike the pre-Hitler intellectuals and clergy of pre-Nazi Germany. In fact, our situation in the West has surpassed the pre-Nazi era. As Solzhenitsyn said, «The West has lost its will to live».

Abortion — one issue only? No, an all-consuming social monster.

# resumen

---

En los últimos años, el tema del aborto ha sido abordado repetidas veces, de forma aislada, como si se tratara de uno sólo de los muchos problemas sociales a los que tiene que enfrentarse la sociedad moderna. En este artículo, el autor subraya sin regatear palabras, que un planteamiento así carece de validez: el aborto no es «un problema más», un problema aparte, sino de hecho, un eslabón de importancia vital en la cadena anti-natalista, que tiene como última manifestación la eutanasia.

En realidad, se ofrece en este artículo una documentación abundante que demuestra claramente que no se puede arrancar el tema del aborto del contexto que le es propio, es decir, el ataque y desprecio a ultranza de la vida como realidad sagrada. En muchos países del llamado «mundo desarrollado», los efectos de las leyes liberales con referencia al aborto, así como de la visión permisiva que es, al mismo tiempo, resultado y manifestación de las ideas que inspiraron dichas leyes, han sido —para enumerar sólo unos pocos males que hallan su origen en el utilitarismo al margen de Dios— los siguientes: el alarmante declive de la natalidad y las consecuencias adversas que dicho declive supone; el aumento de la irresponsabilidad en materia sexual, especialmente en los jóvenes; el aumento de abortos ilegales e incluso de nacimientos ilegítimos, así como de enfermedades venéreas; la destrucción de la familia; el consenso cada vez mayor en torno a la aceptación de la eutanasia. Se ve, pues, que el autor puede con razón afirmar que el aborto no es «un tema aparte», sino un conjunto explosivo de temas, una especie de pulpo maligno cuyos tentáculos tocan a una infinidad de aspectos de la sociedad. Los efectos del aborto son múltiples; su apetito, incontrolado.

El autor basa sus afirmaciones en los resultados de investigaciones llevadas a cabo en muchas partes del mundo, y en las opiniones de numerosos expertos que han colaborado con él sobre este tema. Una y otra vez, se ve que carece de sentido tratar el aborto como «un solo tema», ya que abunda la documentación —tanto histórica como actual— en contra de este planteamiento que, en el mejor de los casos, parte simplemente de la ingenuidad. Frecuentemente, no obstante, dicho planteamiento se halla defendido precisamente por aquellos que cosechan las mayores ganancias de la práctica del aborto.