

White Lies: Eugenics, Abortion, and Racism

by
ERIC RUDOLPH

December 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

“Black Children Are an Endangered Species,” reads a billboard along a stretch of Georgia highway just outside of Atlanta. The sign features a cherubic black baby beside the ominous statement. Erected by the advocacy group Georgia Right To Life as part of a statewide public awareness campaign, the billboard calls attention to an alarming statistic. Although less than 13 percent of the U.S. population, blacks have around 35 percent of abortions in this country. In comparison, non-Hispanic whites, who are around 62 percent of the population, account for about 37 percent of abortions. The abortion rate for blacks is ten times that of whites. Forty-eight percent of black pregnancies end in abortion, making it the leading cause of death among black Americans.¹

A growing number of pro-life leaders blame the statistical disparity on racism. Catherine Davis, spokesperson for Georgia Right To Life and organizer of the billboard campaign, says Planned Parenthood deliberately “targets” predominantly black areas with clinics. Dr. Alveda King, niece of Martin Luther King, Jr., calls abortions “womb lynchings,” and accuses Planned Parenthood of outright genocide. Building abortion clinics in the black community is part of a plot to exterminate black people, she claims.²

Typically associated with the Left, racial politics represents something of a departure from the traditional pro-life message. For decades, white social conservatives have dominated the pro-life movement, using the personhood of the unborn child to argue against abortion. According to this argument, life begins at conception; therefore, anyone who deliberately ends a life through induced abortion commits murder.

Lately, the personhood argument has taken a back seat to the hue and cry of racism. Yet, how is it possible for an organization like Planned Parenthood to commit racial genocide in a nation where McDonald’s fry cooks are fired for telling racist jokes? No modern public figure or mainstream organization would dare to associate with white supremacy.

To support their argument that abortion is the linchpin of a racist plot to exterminate minorities, proliferators frequently cite George Grant’s book *Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood*. Published in the late 1980s, the book has since become something of a best seller among hard-core pro-life activists. *Grand Illusions* explores Planned Parenthood’s history and examines the path it followed to become the world’s largest birth control and abortion provider. Grant says, “Planned Parenthood was self-consciously organized, in part, to promote and enforce white supremacy. Like the Ku Klux Klan, the Nazi Party, and the Mensheviks*, it has been from its inception implicitly and explicitly racist.”³ Grant says that high abortion rates among blacks and other minorities are not statistical anomalies; they represent the culmination of a century-long campaign to exterminate people of color. Presumably,

* The Mensheviks were a faction of the old Russian Social Democratic Party. White supremacy formed no part of their ideology, so it’s a mystery how they ended up on Grant’s list.

aborted white babies, who account for 37 percent of abortions,⁴ are mere cannon fodder, a necessary sacrifice in this war to wipe out the black race.

Grant claims that the racist conspiracy stretches back to the early 20th century and a pseudo-scientific movement called eugenics. Eugenicists encouraged procreation for the so-called “fit,” and sterilization for the “unfit.” The movement originated in England and then spread throughout the western world, influencing a generation of physicians, scientists, and intellectuals. Joined to the theory of white supremacy, eugenics formed part of Nazi Germany’s official ideology, what they call today “scientific racism.”

Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, was an early adherent of eugenics. Her efforts to legalize artificial contraceptives became an important part of the eugenics agenda, Grant says. In her first book *Women and the New Race* (1920), Sanger described the purpose of birth control as “nothing more or less than the facilitation of the process of weeding out the unfit, of preventing the birth of defectives or those who will become defectives.”⁵

In the short term, Sanger called on the state to sterilize defectives who were institutionalized at taxpayer expense: prisoners, mental patients, and poorhouse residents. But the long-term solution to dysgenic population growth was birth control. “Birth control, which has been criticized as negative and destructive, is really the greatest and most eugenic method, and its adoption as part of the program of eugenics would immediately give a concrete and realistic power to the science.”⁶

In the early years, Sanger agitated to overturn the state laws that prohibited the sale and distribution of contraceptives. Abortion, which Sanger publicly condemned but privately supported, would later be added to the birth control agenda in the 1960s, after Sanger’s retirement.

In 1921, Sanger founded the American Birth Control League (ABCL) and began publishing the *Birth Control Review*. Among those whom Sanger invited to sit on the ABCL’s National Council was Lothrop Stoddard, a prominent white supremacist. Stoddard had recently penned a best-seller *The Rising Tide of Color* (1920), and Sanger wanted to use the notoriety surrounding his book to advance the cause. She published several of Stoddard’s articles in her *Birth Control Review*, which propounded the latest theories of “racial hygiene.”

The preceding facts about Margaret Sanger are true and undisputed. What’s up for debate is George Grant’s allegation of intentional racial genocide. In his book, Grant plies false accusations from the facts. He claims that Sanger “commissioned Dr. Ernst Rüdin, the Director of the Nazi Medical Experimentation program, to write for the *Review*...”⁷ and that she “endorsed the euthanasia, sterilization, abortion, and infanticide programs of the early Reich.”⁸

Grant alleges that when Sanger opened her first birth control clinics in the Brownsville and Harlem sections of New York City, neighborhoods heavily populated by blacks, Jews, and Slavs, she did so in order to turn back the rising tide of color.

After the emancipation of the slaves at the end of the Civil War, the black population of the South exploded, threatening to swamp white supremacy. Grant uses a quote without attribution, wrongly implying that Sanger was the author: “The mass of ignorant Negroes still breed carelessly and disastrously, so that the increase among Negroes, even more than the increase among whites, is from that portion of the population least intelligent and fit, and least able to rear their children properly.”⁹

At the request of southern state health officials, Margaret Sanger launched her infamous Negro Project in 1936. The plan called for opening birth control clinics in the states of the former Confederacy. Grant insists the “entire operation was a ruse – a manipulative attempt to get blacks to cooperate in their own elimination. The project was quite successful. Its genocidal intentions were carefully

camouflaged beneath several layers of condescending social service rhetoric and organization expertise.”¹⁰

After the Second World War, eugenicists tried to distance themselves from the Nazi experience. They cut their formal ties to white supremacy. Prominent eugenicists, Sanger among them, condemned the Nazis. The eugenic movement’s birth control agenda, once so concerned with eliminating the “unfit,” now changed its focus to population control. The new argument called for an overall reduction in global population, especially in the Third World. Population control would lead to a “better quality of life,” eliminating poverty, hunger, and war, they said. The decades after the war were a time of increased liberalization. Sanger’s American Birth Control League changed its name to Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Most western nations legalized abortion on demand, adding momentum to Planned Parenthood’s mission. With financial aid from the U.S. government, multinational corporations, and the U.N., Planned Parenthood spread into the slums and barrios of the Third World.

Grant views all of these events through the lens of racial genocide. “In the Third World regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, fertility rates are now declining,” Grant says. “As a result, the world-wide birth rate is now falling faster than the mortality rate for the first time in history.”¹¹

Planned Parenthood’s transformation was ultimately successful. Today, it is an integral part of the liberal establishment. It presents itself to the world as the champion of women and the poor. It is all a ruse, Grant says. He claims that, despite the camouflage, Planned Parenthood’s mission remains the same: to kill off the world’s non-white population.

The foregoing is a short summary of the argument put forward by George Grant and other pro-life activists. Many draw parallels between abortion and the Nazi Holocaust. Others reference slavery and segregation. Father Frank Pavone, founder of Priests for Life, sees the pro-life movement as a continuation of the civil rights movement led by Martin Luther King, Jr. in the 1950s and 1960s. Back then, King fought for black people’s right to vote; today, proliferators like Pavone fight so that black people can enjoy the most basic right of all, the right to life.

King’s niece Alveda King has become a spokesperson for the black genocide argument. A frequent guest on the Glenn Beck show and the 700 Club, Alveda insists that if her late uncle Martin were alive today, he’d be marching alongside her and Father Frank, singing “We shall overcome.” She demands that Planned Parenthood pay black people reparations for 50 years of genocide.

Grant’s argument is counter-intuitive, as history teaches us that white supremacy died with Hitler in the rubble of Berlin. This raises the obvious question: How could Planned Parenthood, an entity that George Grant identifies as “self-consciously organized to promote and enforce white supremacy,” survive to become an integral partner in a liberal establishment that has dedicated itself to eliminating racism? It’s a “grand illusion,” Grant says; hence the title of his book. He explains that Planned Parenthood has pulled the empty box trick: now you see it, now you don’t. It has transformed itself into a bulwark of humanitarianism while concealing its racist past. Hiding in plain sight, Planned Parenthood continues to carry out racial genocide. Those high abortion rates among blacks confirm it.

There’s just one problem with Grant’s allegation of racial genocide: it’s not true. It’s based on shoddy history, quotes taken out of context, and guilt-by-association journalism.

Margaret Sanger did associate with known racialists, but there's no evidence she shared their beliefs. Although a supporter of negative eugenics,* Sanger never espoused scientific racism. Nor is there any evidence that Sanger's birth control movement has served the ends of racial genocide. On the contrary, birth control and abortion have had their greatest impact on white people. Since the introduction of the "Pill" and legal abortion in Europe and America in the 1960s and 1970s, the white share of the world's population has declined precipitously, while the Third World's population has increased exponentially. Even though black Americans have high abortion rates, they also have high birth rates, which more than makes up for any population loss due to abortion or any other cause of premature death in the black community. The proportionally high abortion rate is directly related to the incredibly high illegitimacy rate among blacks, not to Planned Parenthood "targeting" black neighborhoods.

In this paper, I'll support these claims, first by offering a brief history of the eugenics movement from its origins in England to its influence on American society; second, by exploring the birth control movement and its association with eugenics; and lastly, by assessing the charge of racism.

As a pro-life partisan, it pains me to criticize comrades. But I fear that proliferers have made fundamental miscalculations. Using racial arguments can only hurt the pro-life cause. First, truth is the best defense against lies. Lies, even white lies, sully the moral purity of the pro-life message, that abortion is wrong because it kills a human being, regardless of race, sex, or class. Second, proliferers risk alienating their political base.

It's true that the civil rights movement and its anti-racism agenda holds the political high ground these days. For decades, liberals have used the racism cudgel to pummel their conservative enemies. Naturally, proliferers wish to emulate the liberals' success and hammer them with their own weapon. By evoking the image of Martin Luther King, Jr. and calling Planned Parenthood "racist," proliferers hope to climb aboard the civil rights bus and ride it through the halls of Congress. Perfectly understandable, but they make a fundamental mistake. Rather than being a spiritual ally of the pro-life cause, Martin Luther King, Jr. was in fact a great admirer of Margaret Sanger and her birth control movement. In 1966, King graciously accepted the Planned Parenthood Federation of America Margaret Sanger Award. Funded and organized by the same people, the civil rights movement and the birth control movement are separate fronts of the same social revolution. Trying to drive a wedge between them is futile and ultimately counter-productive.

Moreover, the political high ground is not always the moral high ground. Many millions of Americans oppose the anti-racism agenda of the Left, but dare not speak up for fear of being labeled a "racist." They see the fundamental injustice of affirmative action, "hate crimes," and racial quotas. They understand that what the current civil rights leadership wants is not justice but rather a fundamental redistribution of wealth and power, a shakedown that will last indefinitely. They look upon race hustlers like Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson as nothing more than con men. These same folks constitute the pro-life constituency in America.

Therein lies the danger: by using race hustler style arguments, proliferers risk alienating their primary constituency. The American people want leaders who will stand up to the race hustlers, not bow before their false idol parroting lies. With courage in their convictions, proliferers shall prevail because they have truth on their side.

* Positive eugenics is the promotion of greater reproduction among people with desired traits, whereas negative eugenics is reduced reproduction among the poor or people with less-desired traits. Scientific racism is concerned primarily with the former.

II. EUGENICS

Overview of Eugenics

Eugenics founder Francis J. Galton described it this way: “Eugenics is the study of all agencies under social control which can improve or impair the racial quality of future generations.”¹ In short, eugenics was a form of social engineering whose goal was to breed better human beings and thereby create a better society. By the late 19th century, many scientists and intellectuals reached the conclusion that human behavior is entirely reducible to a system of inheritable traits (heredity) and conditioned reflexes (environment). If man was nothing more than an object of scientific inquiry, then he could be engineered. Scientists like Galton firmly believed utopia lay just over the horizon. Once they found the right formula of hereditary control and environmental conditioning, they could eliminate such perennial problems as war, poverty, crime, and mental illness. But it didn’t work out that way. As with most utopian plans, eugenics ended horribly. Instead of helping to build paradise, eugenics led to mass murder.

Even though he coined the word “eugenics,” Galton didn’t create the concept out of whole cloth. Many influences – social, religious, philosophical – contributed to eugenics. To truly understand eugenics, we must follow the various threads back to the beginning.

The story of eugenics begins at the dawn of the modern era in that most modern country, England. For a thousand years, the Roman Catholic Church was the preeminent power in the Western world, exercising indirect control over Europe’s secular magistrates. With its vast treasury and its control over the general culture, the Church could make or break kings and emperors. Naturally the kings resisted the intrusion into their domain. But the papacy always retained its position as a sort of super state over Western civilization. When in 1534 the pope refused to grant Henry VIII, King of England, a divorce from Catherine of Aragon so he could marry his mistress Anne Boleyn, Henry dissolved his relationship with the Roman Catholic Church, forever changing that balance of power in Europe. Henry’s clash with Pope Clement VII shifted the balance decisively toward the secular authority.

With the Act of Supremacy in 1534, Henry declared himself supreme head of the Church of England. He promptly granted himself a divorce and married Anne Boleyn. After the relationship to Rome was permanently dissolved, Henry proceeded to divorce England from the last of the medieval feudal system. He abrogated the common law and made himself the sole source of English law. Henry hammered the nail in the coffin of feudalism in England, completing a process that had begun 100 years earlier.

Feudalism was a mutually beneficial arrangement. Under feudal custom, peasants gave the landlord a certain percentage of their crops, and performed certain duties in exchange for protection and the right to live on the land. Lords maintained common lands that any peasant could use in addition to his personal allotment. Estates also had a communal granary. During lean years, landlords were obligated to open the granary to feed hungry peasants. Only in extraordinary circumstances could landlords evict a tenant. To insure that no one fell through society’s cracks, the Catholic Church maintained a system of hospitals and orphanages. For the poor, feudalism was in many ways the forerunner of our welfare state.

However, feudalism was inefficient. Although it offered plenty of security, feudalism offered little freedom. The landed nobility decided which crops to grow and which items to produce. Guilds controlled prices and discouraged innovation. As Adam Smith described it, “every man was bound by a

principle of religion to follow the occupation of his father, and was supposed to commit the most horrible sacrilege if he changed it for another.”² Feudalism divided Europe into hundreds of tiny fiefdoms, each with its own system of arcane laws, tolls, and taxes. Justice was often arbitrary. Commerce was mostly local. As a result, progress was practically nonexistent. Since the fall of the Roman Empire in 745 A.D., material conditions in Europe had changed very little.

Beginning in the late middle ages, the merchant class joined with kings like Henry VIII to challenge the landed nobility and the guilds. Allied together, they laid the foundations of the modern nation-state, with its uniform laws, individual rights, and a free market. The profit motive encouraged gifted individuals to innovate and accumulate capital. There began a period of unprecedented growth and prosperity.

But progress had a dark side. Though it offered freedom for the strong, Henry’s modern society offered little security for the weak. After he cut his ties to Rome, Henry proceeded to confiscate the Church’s property and close down its monasteries and hospitals. Lands that were not incorporated into Henry’s new church were given away to crown favorites, who then evicted the tenant farmers and enclosed the land with fences. At the time, London’s textile market created a high demand for wool. Instead of keeping uneconomical peasants on their lands, the new landlords decided to enclose the land and raise sheep. The evicted peasants, who had farmed the land for generations, had to fend for themselves. You had to be hard to survive in 16th century England. Hard people require a hard philosophy.

The Philosophical Origins of Eugenics

At the same time the merchants and kings were undermining the authority of the guilds and landed nobility, Protestant reformers were challenging the moral authority of the Catholic Church. Catholic social doctrine upheld feudalism. Rejecting radical individualism, the Church taught that man is inextricably linked to his social environment, as son, husband, father, or citizen. It condemned usury and the profit motive as one of the seven deadly sins (greed). Society, the Church said, constitutes a whole, a Christian community that includes everyone from kings to criminals, some stronger than others, all sinners sanctified through the Church’s sacraments. Of course, the Christian society includes the state. Even though the Church and the state perform separate functions, both represent one Christian community. The Protestant reforms began the process of separating the individual from the community and the church from the state, eventually confining religion to the private sphere.

Henry’s break with Rome made England the standard-bearer for the Protestant Reformation. On the other side of the English Channel loomed France, Spain, and Austria, Catholic powers bent on destroying Protestantism. As the base of operations for the Reformation, England attracted many radical reformers escaping the Inquisition and the religious wars raging on the continent. They brought with them the doctrines of Martin Luther and John Calvin. Henry and his successors tried hard to retain the hierarchical features of the Roman Church. But the doctrines that captured the English people were those of the French Presbyterian John Calvin (1509-1564).

While in France, he broke from the Roman Catholic Church around 1530. After a violent uprising against Protestants in France, Calvin fled to Basel, Switzerland in 1535. There, he developed and published his own theory of Christianity called Calvinism.

Calvin preached the doctrines common to the Protestant Reformation: salvation by faith, not works. To reach Heaven, the Christian didn’t need the intercession of priests, the sacraments, or the Church. Through repentance and immersion (baptism), the sinner could approach God directly. Papal

bulls and canon law were so many scraps of paper. The Bible is the only accepted authority, interpreted by the layman. The presence of three believers is sufficient to form any church.

Calvin diverged from other reformers in his doctrine of election, or predestination. Taken to its logical end, Calvin believed, the doctrine of salvation through faith precluded the instrumentality of human reason and free will. He rejected the Catholic Church's natural law tradition, the belief that the universe constitutes a God-created rational order, and human beings, endowed with reason, participate in it. The rules of natural law, including the distinction between good and evil, are said to be inscribed by God in our minds. Everyone, including pagans, participates in this knowledge. Calvin thought that man's reason had been corrupted by original sin in the Garden of Eden; therefore, all man's work is corrupt. Without grace, the universe is devoid of meaning and purpose. Only God, through His foreknowledge of events, can guide those destined for salvation. Salvation and damnation are predetermined and beyond our control. God "elected" those who would be saved prior to the foundation of the world.

Calvinism recognized only individuals and God. Since most of mankind is damned, human society belongs to the kingdom of Satan, especially the state. Unless the elect control the state directly in a strict theocracy, as Calvin attempted in Geneva and the Pilgrims attempted in New England, the elect should keep their distance from society. "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? ... wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, sayeth the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing ..." (II Cor. 6:14-17)

One question that Calvin wrestled with was how to identify God's elect. If God does the choosing, how do mere mortals recognize His elect? More important, how do we as individuals know if we belong to God's exclusive club? Prosperity is one sign of election, Calvin said. God wouldn't elect a bunch of losers. While it's true that Jesus never cared for the decadent rich (Matt. 19:23), He had no argument with hard work, thrift, and honesty. Justice demands that the industrious reap the benefits of their labor. Calvin attributed chronic poverty to sin. After all, among the poor are the drunkards, prostitutes, beggars, and criminals. However, Calvin didn't rule out compassion. Even though poverty is the mark of sin, good Christians should at least be charitable toward the poor.

In the 1600s, mechanistic science seriously eroded religious faith among Europe's educated classes. Philosophers no longer looked to revelation for answers to how the universe works. On the surface, they dispensed with theological explanations, but underneath, their arguments still reflected their religious backgrounds. Those who were brought up in the natural law tradition (Descartes, Malebranche, Leibniz) gravitated toward rationalism. Conversely, philosophers who were exposed to Calvinism tended toward empiricism.*

Several important philosophers imbibed Calvinist doctrines in their youth: Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679); John Locke (1632-1704); and David Hume (1711-1776). Their writings reflect the Calvinist ethos without its theological content. They replaced God with nature and offered a completely materialistic account of human motivation.* Thomas Hobbes based his critique on Newton's and Galileo's

* *Empiricism* holds that we have no source of knowledge other than through our sensory experience. This contrasts with *rationalism*, which maintains that some things are knowable through intuition, or by being deduced, or through a priori reason (for example, we know that $3 \times 3 = 9$ is true). Rationalists argued that a priori knowledge is superior to any knowledge gained by our senses and experience. Empiricists argued that we can only know what our sensory experience enables us to know.

* In philosophy, *materialism* is the theory that physical matter is the only reality and that everything (thought, feeling, mind, and will) can be explained in terms of matter and physical phenomena.

mechanistic science. All knowledge comes from sensory experience. The objects of our environment affect our senses, which in turn produce our thoughts. We have no innate ideas, as Descartes and the Aristotelians claimed. John Locke said that, at birth, our mind is a *tabula rasa* (blank slate). Sensory experience fills the entire contents of our mind. In keeping with their Calvinist upbringing, their account also left little room for free will. Human beings are no different from any other object in the universe. Newton's law of motion dictates that bodies either at rest or in motion change their state only if caused to do so by some other body acting upon it. Hobbes said that the same determinism governs human bodies. "All the effects that have been, or shall be, produced have their necessity in the thing's precedent."³ Hobbes, Locke, and Hume originated the paradigm that all human thought and behaviors are determined by heredity and/or environment. Their ideas helped shape the political and economic doctrines of classical liberalism and capitalism.

Reasoning is a form of calculation, which enables us to satisfy our desires, Hobbes said. David Hume later coined the famous phrase "reason is the slave of passion." We call the things we desire "good" and the things we dislike "evil."⁴ The rational man tries to maximize the good things and minimize the evil.

Like Calvin, they regarded man as solitary, not a social animal. Hobbes said that man originated in a "state of nature," where individuals lived according to their own law. In that state, each person is entitled to anything he wants. Hobbes argues that this leads to a "war of all against all" (*bellum omnium contra omnes*). Such an existence is one of "continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short."⁵ Out of self-interest, men banded together to form societies. Authority was then delegated to the state to protect the rights of citizens, especially the right of property. If the state should ever overstep its mandate and start violating natural rights, it's the right of the people to abolish it and form another. Locke called this arrangement between individuals and the state a social contract (*Two Treatises of Government*, 1690). As an artificial construct, society is simply an arena in which individuals compete, and the political-legal institutions exist only to provide a degree of order as individuals pursue their own self-chosen idea of the good life. The government and its laws ought to remain neutral between rival religious or moral claims. Individuals rise or fall based on their own solitary effect. Out of ruthless competition, nature selects its winners and losers.

Survival of the Fittest

After Henry VIII cut his ties to Rome, the English state became the primary caretaker of the nation's sick, old, infirm, and unwanted. Those hospitals and orphanages that had once been funded out of the treasury of the Roman Catholic Church were now supported by taxes out of the general fund.

There's nothing that classical liberals hate more than taxes. In their view, the state had only two legitimate functions: (1) maintaining courts of law to protect the rights of citizens, and (2) maintaining a military to protect the nation from foreign invasion. Usually the latter could be accomplished by citizen militias. Liberals also despised standing armies. Anything beyond this mandate breached the social contract. Paying taxes to care for people who couldn't care for themselves violated the contract.

During the next three centuries, English society underwent a radical transformation. Nationalization and the enclosure movement (ending the tradition of common land) dramatically increased the idle poor. Industrialization further concentrated the poor in the slums of England's largest cities. Overcrowding and unsanitary housing created deplorable conditions.

England's Poor Laws, originally formulated in 1598 and 1601, attempted to relieve the effects of poverty while forcing able-bodied persons to work. The laws divided the poor into two categories: the deserving and the undeserving. The deserving poor were those who were very young, very old, infirm,

and those who fell on tough times through no fault of their own. The undeserving were the paupers, criminals, day laborers, and beggars. They constituted a broad category labeled “vagrants.” Vagrancy was a criminal offense punishable by time in the workhouse. Forerunner of the chain gang, the workhouse put vagrants to labor for their daily bread. By the late 1700s, many came to view the poor as a threat to the social order and a serious burden on the treasury. Unlike their Calvinist forebears, these folks became increasingly uncharitable. A man named Thomas Malthus made dire predictions about the poor population.

Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834) had studied at Cambridge and been ordained a minister. But his real love was political economy. In 1798, Malthus published anonymously *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, which argued that the population will inevitably suffer famine and disease sometime in the future, leading to what is known as a Malthusian catastrophe. His critique is primarily aimed at the feudal mercantilist conception of society. He blamed the Poor Laws for continuing the inefficient feudal practice of charity:

A man who is born into a world already possessed, if he cannot get subsistence from his parents on whom he has a just demand, and if the society do not want his labour, has no claim of right to the smallest portion of food, and, in fact, has no business to be where he is. At nature's mighty feast there is no vacant cover for him. She tells him to be gone, and will quickly execute her own orders if he does not work upon the compassion of some of her guests. If these guests get up and make room for him, other intruders immediately appear demanding the same favour.⁶

Relying on statistics that he pulled out of thin air, Malthus claimed that the population doubles every 25 years, while the food supply increases only linearly. War, famine, and disease acted as a natural check on over-population. Reason, Malthus said, is powerless against “vice and misery.” He claimed that over-population is the major cause of poverty, and charity only made matters worse by increasing the numbers of the poor. Unless a solution to unfettered reproduction is discovered soon, England’s future is one of poverty and anarchy. Malthus later convinced Parliament to create tougher workhouse provisions in the Poor Laws of 1834.

Neo-Malthusianism would later become associated with birth control. But Malthus himself never approved of artificial birth control. His solution to over-population was “self-restraint, voluntary celibacy.”⁷

Malthus’s predictions never came true. Populations have actually grown exponentially in relation to advances in agriculture and industrialization. Since Malthus’s time, England has gone from a population of 10 million to some 60 million, with improved living conditions for all classes.

Nevertheless, Malthus’s vision of a brutal nature influenced a generation of intellectuals, one of whom was Charles Darwin. In his youth, Darwin had seriously considered the pulpit. But a crisis of faith led him to follow in the footsteps of his free-thinking grandfather, Erasmus. Charles studied medicine at Edinburgh (1825), then biology at Cambridge (1828). Like his grandfather, Charles was fascinated by the question of life’s origins. The dominant opinion held that life’s complexity indicated a designer. William Paley’s *Natural Theology* (1802) was the best exposition of the “argument from design.” Other thinkers rejected Paley’s argument and put forth the idea of evolution, which held that species somehow evolved to reach their present form. Darwin’s grandfather Erasmus authored an early theory of evolution. But no one could figure out how evolution worked.

Charles thought he’d finally found the solution to human origins on the English farm. Humans had been breeding animals since prehistoric times, selecting mates with desirable characteristics. Through “artificial selection,” they gradually produced the domesticated breeds: from the wild cat came the

Persian; from the wolf sprang the toy poodle; from the aurochs came the Jersey cow. Since the late Middle Ages, English breeders dominated the field. Most breeds we see today originated on English farms.

Darwin theorized that if animal breeders could produce such dramatic changes in a species through artificial selection, perhaps nature does the same thing through “natural selection” if given enough time. It took breeders a few thousand years to turn the wolf into the toy poodle. Imagine what nature could accomplish in a few million years.

Malthus replaced God with nature. Darwin replaced Calvin’s divine election with natural selection. Both processes are arbitrary and ruthless. As Darwin explained in his notebook: “Natural selection is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms; for in this case, there can be no artificial increase of food and no prudential restraint from marriage.”⁸

In 1831, Darwin signed on as naturalist on the *HMS Beagle*, embarking on a scientific expedition through South American waters. He catalogued thousands of plant and animal species, looking for confirmation of his theory. Upon returning to England in 1836, Darwin retired to Downe, Kent, to breed pigeons and work on his book *On the Origin of Species*, published in 1859.

Darwin initially held to the theory of evolution espoused by Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, a French biologist who lived 1744-1829. Lamarck believed that animals evolved following a principle of use and non-use. Body parts that were used grew stronger and passed to future generations; unused parts grew weaker and withered. Lamarckians (as his followers were called) thought, for example, that giraffes developed long necks after successively stretching higher and higher after tree leaves.

It was an Augustinian monk named Gregor Mendel who finally discovered the mechanism Darwin’s followers needed to confirm their theory. His work, published in 1866, described the role that invisible elements, now called genes, played in evolution.

Scientists then combined Mendel’s genetic theory with Darwin’s theory of natural selection, giving us Neo-Darwinism, the dominant theory of evolution today. The Neo-Darwinians said that every now and then, genes make a mistake in the normal process of replication, and a mutation occurs. The organism’s environment then selects (favors) beneficial mutations and disfavors unbeneficial mutations. By “beneficial,” the Neo-Darwinian means better at surviving and reproducing, which ensures that beneficial mutations are passed to the next generation. Through the gradual accumulation of beneficial mutations, evolution takes place and species become better adapted to their environment, sometimes evolving into new distinct species.

Species are pitted against one another in Hobbes’ “war of all against all.” Arms races occur between predators and prey. Each genetic improvement selected in a predator changes the environment for the prey. Such arms races provide the basis for the apparently progressive quality of evolution. Limbs become stronger, eyesight gets sharper, hearing becomes keener, all resulting in what Herbert Spencer called the “survival of the fittest.”

But evolution’s progressive quality is an anthropocentric illusion, the Neo-Darwinians say, because evolution’s engine is genetic mutation, which occurs randomly without meaning or purpose. Evolution’s randomness ran counter to the prevailing wisdom. For millennia, man thought God, or nature, had created him for a purpose. Nature constituted a “Great Chain of Being,” from the lower animals up to man, the angels, and finally God Himself. Evolution demoted man to the ranks of the animals. Moreover, it declared that genes do not exist for man; man exists for genes. Starting from the single-cell organisms of a billion years ago, genes have evolved to build better “survival vehicles,” Neo-Darwinian Richard Dawkins says. Like all the other organisms in existence, the individual human being

“exists only for the benefit of DNA,” not the reverse. The messages that “DNA transmits is all but eternal when seen against the timescale of the individual lifetimes ... Each individual organism should be seen as a temporary vehicle in which DNA messages spend a tiny fraction of their geological life times.”⁹

Social Engineering

As it adopted a completely materialistic account of reality, empiricism inevitably led to social engineering. The absence of free will is materialism’s most important feature, for it is only by getting rid of free will that man can be made into an object of scientific inquiry. If heredity and/or environment determine all human behavior, then it stands to reason that man can be engineered, like any other material object.

Those materialists who leaned toward environment as the primary cause of human behavior relied heavily on John Locke’s *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690). At birth, the mind is a tabula rasa (blank slate), Locke wrote. All knowledge comes from sensory experience. The French philosophe Claude Helvétius was first to draw the political implications of Locke’s theory, implications that Locke himself never reached. In *De l’Esprit* (1758), Helvétius wrote that if man cannot direct his thinking or the actions resulting from it, then our moral concepts are derived from our experiences with pleasure and pain. People are neither good nor evil. They merely act in their own self interests with respect to the avoidance of pain and the pursuit of pleasure.

Without free will, we have no real influence over what we believe or how we act. Therefore, there can be no morality. Morality concerns itself with what a man ought or ought not to do. But if a man cannot choose, then there really is no point in telling him what he ought to do. Helvétius thought that crime and punishment were public health issues. The focus should be on diagnosing bad environments instead of punishing bad choices.

Helvétius reached the conclusion that by controlling man’s environment, it’s possible to determine his thought and behavior. If subjected to a good environment, men will become good, and such social vices as crime, war, and poverty will gradually disappear. Legislation is the means to control man’s environment, and the state is the instrument to cure him of evil. “It is ... only by good laws that we can form virtuous men.”¹⁰ This would become the formula of liberal and radical politics in modern times; that is, social engineering.

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) translated Locke’s materialism into the philosophy of liberal utilitarianism, “that the right or wrong of an action is to be judged by the utility in the production of happiness,” not of the individual, but the “greatest happiness of the greatest number.”¹¹

Karl Marx adapted materialism to Hegelian idealism. Marx’s theory of historical materialism said that socio-economic conditions determined a man’s place in the world. Actions are judged right or wrong based on whether they are in accord or discord with the historical process, whether they assist it or thwart it. “Good” means being on the “right side of history,” as our political leaders often say.

Those materialists who leaned toward heredity as the cause of human behavior relied heavily on Neo-Darwinism. Human beings, like other organisms, are merely taxi cabs transporting the messages contained within our DNA from one generation to the next. If genes are what is important, then it’s essential to cultivate the right kind of genes, the ones that make us more “fit” in the struggle for existence. Just as English farmers breed cows, pigs, and dogs, the hereditarians proposed breeding a better human being.

Darwin’s cousin Francis J. Galton referred to this hereditarian form of social engineering as eugenics (“well born”).

The Rise of Eugenics

Like his famous cousin, Galton was a confirmed materialist. He studied math at Cambridge, becoming an expert statistician. Galton was a great counter of things, continually searching for patterns among the chaos of data. He developed the first modern weather maps, which led to the science of meteorology. He discovered the uniqueness of fingerprints, later used in criminology. In 1869, Galton wrote *Hereditary Genius*. Tracing the genealogies of eminent men and women, Galton found that many descended from the same families. He theorized that not only were physical traits like eye color passed onto succeeding generations, but also intelligence, personality, and character. There exists a natural aristocracy among men that has nothing to do with the environment. It's in the genes.

Galton thought Malthus's idea of reducing the overall birth rate needlessly destructive, as it eliminated the dudes along with the dunces. The gene pool needed more dudes. Instead of curtailing the birth rate, he encouraged reproduction among exceptional people. His ideas became known as positive eugenics, facilitating or encouraging higher birth rates for the "fit."

In 1884, Galton opened the Anthropometric Lab at London's International Health Exhibition. He and his staff of hereditarians began collecting extensive genealogies, creating a model organization later copied in nearly every western country. But Galton warned against trying to breed people like farm animals. Using eugenical criteria to regulate marriage and reproduction through legislation threatened individual liberty. "Eugenical marriage" should be a "religious duty," nothing more, Galton said.¹²

By the late 19th century, a new generation of hereditarians began advocating precisely what Galton warned against: negative eugenics. Negative eugenics called for laws to prevent uneugenical marriages and to sterilize those identified as "unfit." Eugenicians defined the unfit person as having "defective" genes. Because a man is nothing more than the sum of his genes, the carrier of defective genes is ipso facto a defective person. Victoria Woodhull, prominent feminist and free-love advocate, wrote this: "The best minds of today have accepted the fact that if superior people are desired, they must be bred; and if imbeciles, criminals, paupers, and the otherwise unfit are undesirable citizens, they must not be bred."¹³

In 1902, William Bateson resurrected Mendel's work with pea plants. Mendel had discovered that when pea plants with wrinkled skins were crossed with plants having smooth skins, the trait for wrinkled skin dominated. In other words, the wrinkled-skin peas corrupted the smooth-skin peas. Negative eugenicians argued that the same thing happened within the human gene pool. One carrier of defective genes could corrupt an entire population.

Earlier in 1877, a prison executive named Richard Dugdale did a study of criminals in Ulster County, New York. He claimed that almost all the criminals in that one county in upstate New York descended from one vagrant woman with the surname of Jukes. Dugdale's study was completely bogus, but eugenicians continually cited it as proof of what happens when society allows unfettered reproduction. Momma Jukes carried a defective gene that predisposed her offspring to crime. She was the wrinkled pea pod that contaminated Ulster County's smooth skin. Extrapolate the Jukes case to the entire nation, eugenicians said, and you see the reason why our public institutions overflow with criminals, paupers, cripples, and the insane. And every year, our taxes increase as society is forced to build new prisons and insane asylums to house a new crop of defectives. Rather than treat the symptoms, society must cure the disease. Society must stop the Momma Jukeses from having children in the first place. Laws must be passed to sterilize known defectives and prevent uneugenical marriages.

In the early decades of the 20th century, eugenics entered mainstream science. America's leading scientists espoused eugenics. All the best universities – Yale, Harvard, Chicago, Purdue, and Northwestern – offered eugenics courses.

The father of American eugenics was Charles Davenport (1866-1944). A Harvard-educated zoologist, Davenport taught biology at both Harvard and the University of Chicago. He authored a popular eugenics textbook, *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics* (1911). The text combined sound science with nonsense: "Each family will be seen to be stamped with a peculiar set of traits, depending on the nature of its germ plasm [genes]. One family will be characterized by political activity, another by scholarship, another by financial success, another by professional success ... another by insanity, another by imbecility and epilepsy, another by larceny and sexual immorality, another by suicide ..."14

Davenport also served as the director of the prestigious Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. In 1904, he secured a grant from the newly established Carnegie Foundation to open the Station for Experimental Evolution on Long Island at Cold Spring Harbor. Still mostly farmland, Long Island was also home to some of New York's elite. President Theodore Roosevelt's Long Island retreat lay just down the road from Cold Spring Harbor. A casual supporter of eugenics, Roosevelt hosted Davenport on a few occasions. Railroad executive E.H. Harriman's widow also lived nearby. Before his death, E.H. Harriman had controlled the Union Pacific Railroad and the Wells Fargo Express Company. As a hobby, he funded various naturalist ventures. After his passing, his widow sold the businesses but continued funding her late husband's pet projects. She met Davenport, and the two became close friends. She eventually became Davenport's single biggest benefactor. With her enormous trust at his disposal, Davenport transformed Cold Spring Harbor into America's headquarters of eugenics.

Following Davenport's lead, several organizations and publications sprang up to help spread the eugenics message. Yale economist Professor Irving Fisher founded the Eugenics Research Association. Henry Fairfield Osborn, president of the American Museum of Natural History, founded the American Eugenics Society, a big tent organization that gathered together the movement's various factions. In order of importance, Osborn was second only to Davenport. Cold Spring Harbor started publishing *Eugenical News* in 1916. On the world stage, the movement held its First International Congress on Eugenics in 1912. Attendees included the following: Davenport, Alexander Graham Bell, First Lord of the Admiralty Sir Winston Churchill, Darwin's son, and over 400 other delegates.

Scientific Racism

Eugenics claimed to concern itself with the hereditary health of the human race, the term "race" being used in its broadest sense, as in species or stock. Individuals having "defective" genes were thought to exist within every racial, national, and ethnic group. But at the same time that eugenics entered the mainstream of science, new racial theories started to emerge as well. Race in its narrower sense became a group of people sharing common physical characteristics. In the early 20th century, most scientists believed in the existence of distinct biological races. Scientific disciplines such as physical anthropology, cephalometry, phrenology, physiognomy, and anthropometry sought to measure physiological differences among human populations. The thinking was that physical differences translated into mental differences. Cephalometry, for example, dealt with the variations in size, shape, and proportion of skulls among human races. Scientists theorized that larger skulls held larger brains, which resulted in increased intelligence. Races possessing a higher average "cephalic index," that is, the Nordics, were supposedly smarter. Such theories lent themselves to racial discrimination.

Before the 18th century, Europeans believed that all humans descended from the survivors of Noah's Ark. According to the book of Genesis, Noah's sons and grandsons dispersed after the Tower of

Babel, giving us the various racial and ethnic divisions of mankind. Despite their differences, humans shared a common heritage.

Previously, in Europe, religion was the basis of discrimination. Christians treated Jews and Muslims differently because they practiced different religions. Discrimination usually ended after conversion.

With Columbus's discovery of the New World, Europeans came into contact with peoples from very different races and cultures. A new basis of identity emerged along with a new form of discrimination. Psychologist Erik Erikson said that people possess multiple identities, both narrow and broad. They stress different aspects of their identity depending on the situation they find themselves in, and more importantly, the enemy they fear. Fighting for their independence against Ottoman rule, Serbs emphasized their Orthodox Christian religion, while Muslim Albanians fighting the same rulers stressed their ethnicity and language. Pakistani Muslims stressed their religion when they broke away from Hindu India in 1948. When Bangladesh later broke away from Pakistan in 1971, its people emphasized their unique culture and language. In each case, the emphasis changed as the enemy changed. The Arabs have a saying: "My brother and I against my cousins, we and our cousins against the world."

In Europe, the Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Englishmen stressed narrow sectarian-linguistic-national identities. In the New World, immigrants emphasized a broad identity, namely those characteristics that distinguished them from the Indians and African slaves: religion and skin color.

The natives possessed technology far inferior to the immigrants. "Civilized" Europeans looked upon the "barbarian" natives the same way ancient Romans looked upon the Germans, as inferior. Some suggested the natives were not even human, but rather some part of creation not mentioned in Genesis. Others, however, insisted the natives were human, and only needed to be converted to Christianity to become civilized.

After listening to both views, in 1537 Pope Paul declared that all the world's peoples are human. Although the pope's declaration didn't stop Europeans from exploiting the Indians and Africans, who were later brought to the New World as slaves, it did ameliorate their treatment, made assimilation possible, and ultimately led to the abolition of slavery. To make their case, abolitionists stressed the common humanity of the black slaves.

Racial discrimination during this era was largely a reflection of ethnocentrism. As such, racial barriers were not insurmountable. Segregation was customary, but often ignored. Relationships between European men and native women were common, especially in the early days when white women were scarce. The oldest families in the Americas had quite a few women in the vein of Pocahontas and Sally Hemings in their family trees.

Attitudes about race started to harden in the late 1700s. With the elimination of religious answers to the question of human origins, the secular thinkers of the Enlightenment began to offer natural explanations for the varieties of mankind. Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778) divided humanity into four racial groups, each with fixed, unchangeable characteristics. Linnaeus classified races according to skin color as well as mental and spiritual capabilities. Europeans occupied the best group; Africans the worst. The following list summarizes his characterization:

- (1) American Indians ("Americanus rubescens"). Copper-colored, erect. Hair black, straight, thick; nostrils wide; face harsh; beard scanty, obstinate, only content when free. Regulated by customs.
- (2) Europeans ("Europæus albus"). Fair, sanguine, brawny. Hair yellow-brown, flowing; eyes blue, gentle, acute, inventive. Covered with close vestments. Governed by laws.

(3) Asiatic ("Asiaticus fuscus"). Sooty, melancholy, rigid. Hair black; eyes dark; severe, haughty, covetous. Covered with loose garments. Governed by opinion.

(4) African ("Africanus niger"). Black, frizzled; skin silky, nose flat, lips tumid; crafty, indolent, negligent. Anoints himself with grease. Governed by caprice.¹⁵

The philosopher David Hume said the historical record led him to "suspect the Negroes and in general all of the other species of men ... to be naturally inferior to the whites. There never was a civilized nation of any complexion other than white, nor even any individual eminent either in action or speculation."¹⁶ Such opinions were common among the educated classes. Comparing the known cultures of the world, they thought the evident superiority of European culture had to be "natural" rather than cultural. In his *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1784), Thomas Jefferson conjectured: "I advance it, therefore, as a suspicion only, that blacks, whether originally a distinct race, or made distinct by time and circumstances, are inferior to whites in the endowments of both body and mind."¹⁷

In the mid-1800s, writers such as Arthur de Gobineau (*An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, 1855) combined Darwinism with Linnaeus's classification system to arrive at a theory called polygenesis. The theory lay at the heart of the ideology we now refer to as scientific racism. Polygenesists believed that when man made the evolutionary leap from monkeys, five pure races emerged, classified according to Linnaeus's hierarchical scheme. Polygenesists adopted the eugenical concept of genetic degeneration, claiming that interracial breeding diminished racial purity and resulted in inferior stock. As the world now contains "pure" and "mongrel" races, polygenesists were particularly concerned with preserving the integrity of the white race. Polygenesists even classified the white race according to purity: Nordics were most pure; Alpines less pure; and Mediterraneans were least pure. Each racial classification came with an average height, weight, hair and eye color, skull measurement (cephalic index), and mental capacity.

Lothrop Stoddard, an ardent eugenicist, was one of America's leading popularizers of scientific racism. His best-selling book *The Rising Tide of Color* (1920) warned Americans that the white race faced extinction in the very near future. Mass immigration of inferior races threatened to forever change the nation's character and culture:

Our country, originally settled almost exclusively by Nordics, was toward the close of the 18th century invaded by hordes of immigrants, Alpines and Mediterraneans, not to mention Asiatic elements like Levantines and Jews. As a result, the Nordic native American has been crowded out with amazing rapidity by the swarming prolific aliens, and after two short generations, he has in our urban areas become almost extinct.¹⁸

Assimilating the newcomers through interracial marriage is unthinkable, Stoddard said, because after "mating between whites, Negroes, and Amerindians, the offspring is a mongrel – a walking chaos, so consumed by his jarring hereditaries that he is quite worthless."¹⁹

Madison Grant (1865-1937), trustee of the American Museum of Natural History, also warned against the dangers of mass immigration from eastern and southern Europe. He said in *Passing of the Great Race* (1916) the Nordic race is "the white man par excellence."²⁰ Grant likewise supported eugenics.

What separated scientific racism from older ideas about race was the belief that racial differences were fixed and unchangeable. Mankind was divided into superior and inferior races. Racial inferiority justified differential treatment. Assimilating "inferior" races, the old way of eliminating differences, led to genetic degeneration and ultimately civilizational decline. Between 1890 and 1920, segregation, which until that time had largely been customary, became more formal. The legal regime known as Jim

Crow dates back to this period. Racial tests became more severe. Previously, marriages between whites and those who “passed” as white were common. New marriage laws required spouses to submit genealogies. W.A. Plecker, director of Virginia’s Bureau of Vital Statistics, made it his mission in life to prohibit marriages between whites and anyone with even “one drop” of non-white blood. Plecker became the driving force behind Virginia’s Racial Integrity Act of 1924, which included his “one drop” provision. Other politicians began clamoring for “one drop” laws in their states. Georgia and Alabama followed suit.

Plecker, Stoddard, and Grant relied upon “sciences” like cephalometry and eugenics to make their arguments. While cephalometry and eugenics lent themselves to racist conclusions, it’s important to keep in mind that the disciplines themselves didn’t necessarily reach these conclusions, and not all those who subscribed to them supported white supremacy. Many were enemies of white supremacy. Utopian free-love socialists Havelock Ellis and Victoria Woodhull subscribed to eugenics, as did liberals Raymond Fosdick and Rabbi Louis L. Mann. The Soviet Union taught eugenics in its science academies, but outlawed racial discrimination. Even W.E.B. DuBois, the founder of the NAACP, fell for eugenics. Publishing articles in Margaret Sanger’s *Birth Control Review*, he thought blacks could use eugenic principles to improve their lot in life.

Everyone, from nationalist to communist, adapted eugenics to their own agenda. Those they labeled “unfit” invariably turned out to be their political opponents. In a letter to his friend Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., the British socialist Professor Harold Laski jokingly said he’d like to “sterilize all the unfit, among whom I include all [Christian] fundamentalists.”²¹

Scientific racism has since been discredited. Through efforts like the Human Genome Project, scientists now know that there is no clear genetic basis to racial groups. While some genes are more prevalent in certain groups, there are no genes found in all members of one group that are not found in members of other groups. In other words, pure races don’t exist. All humans share a common ancestry. As humans spread across the planet, geographical isolation and in-group preferences give rise to racial characteristics, which appear to be adaptive features related to different climates. Through the centuries, though, interbreeding among human populations has been fairly constant. Relative isolation and the tendency of individuals to select mates from within their own group appears to be the causes for the perpetuation of racial traits. But even with in-group preferences, it’s safe to say that all humans constitute a mixed race to one degree or another. The Australian aborigines, due to their long isolation, are actually the “purest” race on the planet.

Applied Eugenics

Charles Davenport, the dean of American eugenics, espoused scientific racism. He believed different racial and ethnic groups possessed different character and personality traits: Italians were violent; Irish were crazy; Germans were smart; blacks were stupid, having a “mental development ... far below the average Caucasian.”²² Nevertheless, Davenport’s program of negative eugenics wasn’t aimed exclusively at non-whites. “Defectives” were thought to exist within every racial group. Most of those who ended up being targeted by Davenport’s organization were poor whites.

In the early days at Cold Spring Harbor, Davenport and his staff mostly bred plants and animals with the object of finding the basis for breeding humans. He worked closely with the American Breeders Association (ABA), which was created by the Association of Agricultural Colleges at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture. Davenport added a Eugenics Committee alongside the ABA’s various plant and animal committees. The committee’s purpose was to “devise methods of recording the value of the blood of individuals and families, peoples and races” with the goal of emphasizing “the value of superior blood and the menace to society of inferior blood.”²³ The ABA’s President Willet M. Hays expressed the

hope that one day the government might assign “every person a lineage number and genetic percentage rating, that the eugenic value of every family of every person might be available to all who have need of the truth as to the possible efficiency of offspring.”²⁴

Toward that end, Davenport devised a family record questionnaire. The inventor Alexander Graham Bell, an early supporter of Cold Spring Harbor, helped Davenport design the questionnaire. Bell and Davenport soon had a falling out over the nature of the questions to be asked. As a positive eugenicist, Bell wanted to catalogue beneficial hereditary traits for the purpose of promoting reproduction among the “fit.” But Davenport was a negative eugenicist and interested only in cataloguing human defects, with the ultimate goal of removing the carriers from the national gene pool.

Another infusion of E.H. Harriman’s money allowed Davenport to open the Eugenics Records Office (ERO) down the road from the experimental farm. The ERO’s mission was to compile family records on the unfit and to take a census of America’s defective population. Davenport hired a lawyer Harry Laughlin to organize the ERO’s field work. Given free reign of Carnegie Grant hospitals, prisons, refuge homes, and insane asylums, Laughlin’s field workers fanned out across the country, compiling family records. The records were brought back to the ERO to be collated. Conrad Black, historian of the eugenics movement, writes this: “By no means was this campaign directed solely against racial groups, but rather against any individual or group – white or black – considered physically, medically, morally, or socially inadequate in the eyes of Davenport and Laughlin.”²⁵

In 1911, the ABA created an advisory committee to make recommendations on the ERO’s findings. Some of America’s best and brightest sat on the committee: Dr. Alexis Carrell, who won the Nobel Prize in Medicine, and O.P. Austin, Chief of Bureau of Statistics in Washington, D.C. Ten groups were identified as defective: (1) the feeble minded (a broad category that included stutterers, people who spoke poor English, and those who were shy); (2) paupers; (3) alcoholics; (4) criminals; (5) epileptics; (6) the insane; (7) the constitutionally weak; (8) those predisposed to disease; (9) the deformed; (10) those with defective organs (the blind, deaf, or mute).²⁶

Based on a representative sample contained in the ERO’s family records, the committee estimated 10 million “defectives” in the United States. Discussion then focused on what to do about all the defective people, the vast majority of whom were not institutionalized. The committee rejected euthanasia as a solution: “With euthanasia, as in the case of polygamy, an effective eugenical agency would be purchased at altogether too dear a moral price.”²⁷ The committee weighed institutionalization and sterilization. Louis Marshall, the ABA’s legal advisor, cautioned the committee that sterilizing non-institutionalized persons clearly violated the Constitution’s Due Process clause. Unless public opinion changed dramatically, most defectives would remain off limits, free to continue polluting America’s gene pool. The committee, therefore, narrowed its focus to defectives that were already committed to state hospitals, asylums, and prisons.

Individual doctors had already experimented with sterilization, but on a much smaller scale. Dr. Sharp, Director of Medicine at Indiana Reformatory, performed the first vasectomy on a person in state custody in 1899. As superintendent of a home for the feeble minded, Dr. Pilicher of California had sterilized 58 children in his care.²⁸

Dr. Sharp used his influence on the Indiana legislature to help pass the nation’s first sterilization law in 1907. Altogether, 23 states would pass compulsory sterilization laws. Iowa’s law was typical in mandating the sterilization of “criminals, idiots, feeble minded, imbeciles, drunkards, drug fiends, epileptics, moral and sexual perverts” in custody.²⁹ Most victims of compulsory sterilization were permanent wards of the state: the mentally ill, poor-house residents, and prisoners. Others, however, were deemed defective but not in need of permanent institutionalization. To save money, states wanted

to release them, but didn't want them having babies on the outside. A young white woman named Carrie Buck was such a case.

Having contracted syphilis, Carrie's mother, a prostitute, was institutionalized in Virginia's Colony for Epileptics and Feeble-minded in 1920. The daughter Carrie was placed with foster parents, John and Alice Dobbs. Initially, Carrie did well in school, but John Dobbs later forced her to drop out and get a job cleaning houses. At the age of 18 she became pregnant. The ever-charitable Mr. Dobbs promptly remanded her into the custody of the state. Sent before the same judge who had committed her mother, Carrie was committed to the same institution in 1923, diagnosed as "feeble-minded." In 1924, after the birth of her child, Dr. Albert Priddy sterilized Carrie under Virginia's new eugenic law.

Until then, no one had challenged the constitutionality of compulsory sterilization. The state of Virginia wanted to see if its new law rested on firm legal ground, so it provided Carrie with a defense attorney, Irving Whitehead, who filed a lawsuit in federal court claiming cruel and unusual punishment and violation of due process. An ardent eugenicist, Whitehead had actually served as one of the Colony's original directors. He shepherded the case all the way to the Supreme Court, where Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. wrote the decision in *Buck v. Bell*.

To this day, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. is considered one of America's finest jurists. He grew up among Boston's elite. A famous abolitionist, his father wrote for the *Atlantic Monthly*. The family socialized with the Emersons, the Longfellos, and the Hawthornes. At the age of 21, Oliver volunteered to serve the Union, distinguishing himself in some of the Civil War's bloodiest battles.

After the war, Holmes taught law at his alma mater Harvard. His lectures (collected and published as *The Common Law*, 1881) are considered a classic of American jurisprudence. In 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed him to the Supreme Court, where he delivered landmark decisions and dissents, specifically on freedom of speech.*

Lauded by legal scholars as a proponent of the "living Constitution," Holmes was a real master of the type of judicial review which federal judges have used to systematically dismantle our Republic.

Today, liberals condemn sterilization laws like the one Holmes upheld in *Buck v. Bell*. They excuse Holmes' decision as a reactionary aberration on an otherwise progressive record. But the fact is that both hereditarianism, which Holmes espoused, and utilitarianism, which modern liberals espouse, share a common ancestor: materialism. Holmes actually subscribed to both utilitarianism and hereditarianism.

Like many educated men of his generation, Holmes read the works of Darwin and Spencer, and consequently rejected his father's Christian humanism, along with the belief in the sanctity of human life. "Man at present is a predatory animal. I think that the sacredness of human life is a purely municipal idea of no validity outside of jurisdiction. I believe that force ... is the *ultima ratio* (the final argument), and between two groups that want to make inconsistent kinds of worlds, I see no remedy except force," Holmes wrote to Sir Frederick Pollock.³⁰ To the Darwinian, human life has little value in the big picture. This perspective comes through clearly in Holmes' personal letters. Writing to Harold

* (1) *Shenck v. U.S.*, 1919 – argued that defendants who distributed leaflets urging men to avoid the draft could be convicted of an attempt to obstruct the draft.

(2) *Abram v. U.S.*, 1919 -- dissented against a ruling upholding the Sedition Act of 1918. Under the act, defendants were convicted on the basis of two leaflets denouncing American actions to impede the Russian Revolution. In this case, Holmes rejected the argument that the defendants' leaflets posed the "clear and present danger" that was true of the defendants in *Schenck*.

(3) *U.S. v. Schwimmer*, 1919 – dissented against a ruling that denied an immigrant applicant for naturalization the possibility of becoming a United States citizen based on her pacifist convictions.

Laski, Holmes said: “We look at men with sympathy, but nature looks at them as she looks at flies.”³¹ When you start believing that human beings are little more than flies, it’s only a matter of time before you start treating them like flies.

To Holmes, Ms. Buck was the locus of genetic material, nothing more. Unfortunately for Carrie, her genetic material was deemed defective. From his written opinion:

Carrie Buck is a feeble-minded white woman who was committed to the State Colony ... she is the daughter of a feeble-minded mother in the same institution, and the mother of a feeble-minded child ... We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the state for those lesser sacrifices, often not felt to be such by those concerned, in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetence ... It is better for all the world, if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime, or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. The principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes. Three generations of imbeciles are enough.³²

Sterilization laws remained on the books until the 1970s. In the decades after the *Buck* decision, the states retreated from sterilization. Half of the states that passed such laws in the 1910s and 1920s had no sterilizations. All told, about 60,000 Americans were forcibly sterilized or castrated, half of them in California.

For many eugenicists, sterilization was a short-term solution. In the long-term, the only way to deal with a burgeoning defective population was to regulate the entire nation’s reproduction. At exactly the same time that eugenics entered mainstream science, the birth control movement began its campaign to legalize the sale and distribution of artificial contraceptives. Margaret Sanger became the face of birth control. She was also a card-carrying eugenicist. For almost two decades, Sanger would try to bring about a formal alliance between the two movements. Seeking out leading eugenicists, Sanger tried to convince them that birth control was the final solution to dysgenic population growth.

III. BIRTH CONTROL AND ABORTION

Margaret the Liar

In her first autobiography, *My Fight for Birth Control* (1931), Margaret Sanger recounts the legend of Sadie Sachs, a young mother struggling to survive in the slums of Manhattan's Lower East Side. Jammed into a crowded tenement, Sadie discovers that she is pregnant, again. Having already given birth to several children and suffered numerous miscarriages, she doesn't want another child, as the family is already struggling to make ends meet. Worse, her last pregnancy almost killed her when she attempted a self-induced abortion. At that time, she asked the doctor for help avoiding another pregnancy, and he recommended that her husband "sleep on the roof." Now, desperate and pregnant yet again, with nowhere to turn, poor Sadie repeats her attempt to terminate the pregnancy. This time, she lacerates her uterus with a sewing needle and bleeds to death.¹

In 1912, Sanger was a part-time nurse working for the Lillian Wald Visiting Nurse Service. The service did charity work in New York City slums, which is where Sanger supposedly met Mrs. Sachs. The experience convinced Sanger that women needed something more than bad advice; they needed safe and legal contraceptives. So began her crusade to legalize birth control.

The legend of Sadie Sachs is a testimonial, the kind of sob story that social crusaders tell when asked what inspired them to dedicate themselves to the "cause," whatever their cause happens to be. It's a victim's story, and social crusaders love victims. But often such stories turn out to be fictitious. Sanger's biographer Ellen Chesler admits that the Sadie Sachs story is probably "an imaginative dramatic composite of Margaret Sanger's experience."² This is a polite way of saying the legend of Sadie Sachs is a lie.

Sanger had a penchant for lying. There was the time she claimed that after her four-year-old brother died, she and her father exhumed his body to make a death mask for the mom. Margaret's job was to "stand guard and give warning if anyone approached, while her father, in flagrant violation of the laws of the Church and state, uncovered his son's coffin and made a cast of the dead boy's head and shoulders. The two worked in secret for several nights and after presented the sculpture to a tearful and appreciative mother," Chesler writes.³ Then there's the hunger strike legend. After being jailed along with her sister Ethel for operating an illegal birth control clinic, Margaret claimed to have almost died from a hunger strike. Only one problem: Margaret wasn't the one who went without food. Ethel alone endured the hunger strike while Margaret ate soup and bread and wrote letters to the newspapers. The hunger strike legend arose when a Hollywood screenwriter suggested to Margaret that it would make a better story if she, Margaret, had suffered the hunger strike instead of Ethel. Margaret asked Ethel to go along with the fiction, but Ethel refused.⁴ Margaret went on to tell the hunger strike legend anyway, describing it as the most significant act of "self-sacrifice in the history of the birth control movement."⁵

Sanger repeatedly lied about abortion. In the 1920s, when abortion was political poison, Sanger emphatically condemned the practice. Part of her birth control pitch was to insist that if legal contraceptives were made available, women wouldn't resort to back-alley abortionists. In fact, abortion would disappear entirely if birth control was made legal: "Does anyone imagine that a woman would submit to abortion if not denied the knowledge of scientific, effective contraceptives?"⁶

Secretly, Sanger's birth control clinics subsidized illegal abortions. Beginning in 1928, she instructed her clinic director Hannah Stone "to permit staff physicians to administer pregnancy tests without qualifications and to make direct referrals" to "physicians who presumably took charge of the necessary arrangements" for illegal abortions. Stone then claims to have lost track of the referral

“statistics, which may have been legitimate or may have deliberately obscured known outcomes that were criminal,” Chesler says.⁷

Sanger wasn't a compulsive liar. She lied with purpose. Usually, her lies contained some iconoclastic element aimed at the Catholic Church. She lied to conservatives, liberals, communists, and Klanswomen, molding her lies to fit each audience. To one audience she evoked the fiery rhetoric of social revolution, to another she sounded like a reasonable reformer. Sanger's close association with eugenics leads her pro-life enemies to portray her as a Nazi out to eliminate society's underclass. Her early socialist activism causes her admirers to cast her in the mold of a feminist crusader. Both portraits contain some accuracy, but neither fully captures the true Margaret Sanger. Sanger was driven by personal ambition. She was more egoist than idealist. Despite her opportunistic lying, her motives become much clearer after examining her biographies, auto-biographies, and her personal letters.

Today Sanger's name is synonymous with birth control. Any study of the topic certainly requires a thorough examination of her life and career. However, by concentrating all attention on Sanger, people lose sight of the fact that the birth control movement was much older and broader than the ambitions of one woman. Although we will focus on Sanger's contribution to the birth control cause, we will also examine the ideas and the personalities of the broader movement. By doing so, we will come to a better understanding of the motives behind birth control. And by assessing the real impact that birth control has had on modern society, we can determine whether or not it has served the purpose of racial genocide, as George Grant and many pro-life critics contend.

Sanger's Early Years

She was born Margaret Higgins in 1883 in Corning, New York, the sixth child of eleven, to Irish Catholic parents. Her father Michael was a ne'er-do-well stonecutter and part-time agitator for the Knights of Labor. He supported a long series of strikes against Corning's glass works. Michael idolized Robert Ingersoll, Henry George, and Father Edward McGlynn. Atheism, socialism, feminism, and the Single Tax movement were mother's milk for Margaret. A radical from the teet.

Margaret both loved and loathed her father. Michael was the cool Bohemian dad who thumbed his nose at conformity and convention, indulging his large brood of children. But Michael couldn't hold a job or keep food on the table. And there was betrayal too. Margaret's first sexual experiences were with her father. Awakening one night:

I heard heavy breathing beside me. It was my father. I was terrified. I wanted to scream out for my mother to beg her to come and take him away. I lived through agonies of fear ... I was petrified ... I was cold; I began to shiver; blackness and light flickered in my head; then I felt I was falling, falling – and knew no more.⁸

Margaret's mother was very much the opposite of Michael. She remained a devout Catholic and a devoted mother, but she and Margaret never connected. The mother's death at 51 of tuberculosis seems to have come as an unwelcome inconvenience and imposition.⁹ To Margaret, her mother came to symbolize the victimized woman: ignorant and subservient and never having had a life of her own. She died like a broodmare, worn out by 11 pregnancies and seven miscarriages. Sanger's "composite" of Sadie Sachs was probably based on her own mother. Sanger blamed conventional morality, specifically the social doctrine of the Catholic Church, for her mother's fate.

The Higgins lived in the poor section of Corning, in the flat lands along the Chemung River. Corning's middle class families lived on the hills above town. Margaret noticed the contrasting lifestyles: "Very early in my childhood, I associated large families with poverty, toil, unemployment, drunkenness, cruelty to children, quarreling, fighting, debt, jail, and the Catholic Church."¹⁰ In contrast, the families on

the hills above town were small, well dressed, healthy, and Protestant. Margaret decided she wanted to live on the hills. Enrolling in nursing school became her means of escape.

In 1902, Margaret married William Sanger. Bill was Jewish, his family having emigrated from Germany in 1878.¹¹ The young couple bought a house in Hastings, New York, and settled down to live the sort of middle-class existence Margaret thought she wanted. Bill was an aspiring painter and, like Margaret, a committed socialist. The marriage would produce three children, two boys and a girl.

But the young radicals soon tired of the bourgeois lifestyle. They wanted to join the revolution:

A religion was spreading over the country. The converts were liberals, socialists, anarchists, and revolutionists of all shades. They were as fixed in the faith in the coming revolution as ever any Christian in the immediate establishment of the Kingdom of God. Some could even predict the exact advent.¹²

Sanger the Radical

The Sangers moved into a small flat in New York City and joined New York's Socialist Party Local No. 5 in Harlem, famous for its radicalism. The Sangers' living room "became a gathering place where liberals, anarchists, socialists, and IWWs [Industrial Workers of the World] could meet ... Any evening you might find visitors from the Middle West being aroused by Jack Reed, bullied by Bill Haywood, led softly toward anarchism by Alexander Berkman," writes Sanger.¹³

The Sangers' house guests were America's most violent revolutionaries. Jack Reed would go on to chronicle the Bolshevik Revolution in his book *Ten Days That Shook the World* (1918). V.I. Lenin, himself, wrote the preface. Alexander Berkman had just been released from prison after serving 15 years for the attempted murder of Henry Frick during the Homestead Steel Strike in 1896.*

Margaret gravitated toward anarchism and its message of personal liberation: "My own personal feelings drew me towards the individualist, anarchist philosophy, and I read Kropotkin, Bakunin, and Fourier, but it seemed to me necessary to approach the ideal by way of socialism; as long as the earning of food and shelter was on a competitive basis, man could never develop any true independence."¹⁴

Basically, anarchists believe that human beings are essentially good and, if left to deal with one another on an equal basis, are capable of living together without laws or hierarchical institutions. They believe that society ought to be organized into small autonomous communes, which permit their members absolute freedom. They don't oppose private property per se, only its monopolization and the practice of inheritance, which they blame for the rise of the exploitative capitalist class and the modern state. If freedom is the ultimate good, the state is the embodiment of evil. The anarchist's chief goal is the abolition of the state and, beyond that, the elimination of all social hierarchies. When the state is finally abolished, the functions of government will be merged into the commune. Leszek Kolakowski, author of a definitive text on Marxism, describes the anarchist Utopia:

There will be no law or codes, no judges, no family as a legal unit; no citizens, only human beings. Children will not be the property of their parents or of society, but of their own selves as they are destined to be: society will take care of them and remove them from their parents if they are in danger of being deprived or hampered in their development.

* Workers at the Carnegie Steel plant in Homestead, Pennsylvania, went on strike in 1896. Henry Frick, the chairman of the board, refused to negotiate, and instead hired Pinkerton detectives to replace the workers. Violence erupted, killing 10 workers and two guards. Berkman and his friend Emma Goldman tried to kill Frick, who fought off his assailants.

There will be absolute freedom to hold any views, even false ones, including religious beliefs; freedom, too, to form associations to propagate one's views or for any other purpose. Crime, if there still is any, will be regarded as a symptom of disease and treated accordingly.¹⁵

Anarchists and socialists had a tempestuous relationship. While sharing the anarchist's hatred of the capitalist state, orthodox socialists dismiss the dream of a society without laws or organization of any kind. The revolution must be organized, likewise the socialist economy afterwards. Anarchists like Mikhail Bakunin accused the socialists of wanting to replace capitalist tyranny with socialist tyranny: "If there is a state, there is bound to be domination and, therefore slavery ... They [the Marxists] claim that only a dictatorship, their own of course, can bring the people freedom; we reply that a dictatorship can have no other aim than to perpetuate itself, and that it can engender and foster nothing but slavery in the people subjected to it."¹⁶

Violence was another bone of contention between anarchists and socialists. Anarchists supported terrorism as a means of inspiring the workers to revolt, while the socialists considered isolated acts of violence to be counter-productive. Instead, they thought an organized uprising of the working class offered better chances for success. A growing number of socialists wanted to reject violent revolution entirely, and instead work for gradual reform within the democratic system.

Another frequent guest at the Sanger household was "Big" Bill Haywood, leader of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), also known as the "Wobblies." The Wobblies believed in the anarcho-syndicalist myth of the "General Strike," first articulated by Georges Sorel in *Reflections on Violence* (1908). Rather than waiting for the revolution to ripen, as in orthodox Marxism, anarcho-syndicalists called on workers to immediately seize the means of production (factories, plants, mines) through "direct action." If workers organized one General Strike, capitalism will collapse overnight, they said.¹⁷

In 1911, Sanger fell in love with the Wobblies after listening to their favorite female agitator Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. The newspapers dubbed Flynn the "Rebel Girl" because her rhetoric reeked of revolution and violence.

In 1912, the Wobblies organized a strike of textile workers in Lawrence, Massachusetts, one of the bloodiest in our nation's history. The strike lasted for weeks as workers seized factories and the police tried to take them back. Sanger helped shuttle the workers' children out of Lawrence while they battled police.

The Socialist Party, led by the moderate Eugene Debs, funded the IWW and the Lawrence strike. But after the violence at Lawrence and the resulting public backlash, a struggle occurred within the party between socialist reformers and anarchist revolutionaries. Debs and the reformers wanted to renounce violence and pursue electoral politics, while Haywood and the radicals wanted to foment a revolution. The Sangers were good friends of Debs, another frequent guest at their apartment; nevertheless, the Sangers sided with Haywood and the radicals, who resigned their party affiliation en masse. Despite the rift over Lawrence, the radicals, Margaret included, maintained ties with the Socialist Party. She voted for Debs in 1912, and thereafter voted for the party's presidential candidate in every election between 1912 and 1966.¹⁸

Sanger the Free Lover

Margaret Sanger particularly identified with Charles Fourier, William Godwin, and Mikhail Bakunin, all anarchist-socialist thinkers known for their free-love philosophy. Free-love advocates believe that traditional sex roles originate in class oppression. As men began to leave primitive collectivism and claim property for themselves, they invented monogamous marriage to pass their

property on to their heirs. Women and children in effect became the first forms of private property. The capitalist system arose out of the family. Church and state invented the myth of monogamy to keep women in subjugation to men. They developed an artificial model of human nature and imposed this model on society by decreeing that male/female sex is part of the natural order, and the only acceptable model of sexuality is marriage for the purpose of procreation.

Free lovers want a sexual revolution; for them, the sexual revolution is an extension of the larger social revolution. Its goal is to replace the old repressive sexual model with a new one: that all consensual sex is natural and good. Free lovers don't believe that humans have a fixed nature. Therefore, they don't believe there's any such thing as natural sex. The individual must define his or her own sexuality. All varieties of sexual expression are legitimate; one variety is no better than another. In Fourier's utopia, for example, which he called "phalanx," the "only sexual activity that could be forbidden involved inflicting pain on someone against his or her will. Fourier was willing to accept both sadism and masochism, among consenting partners, as well as sodomy, sapphism, pederasty, bestiality, fetishism, sex between close relatives – any sexual activity, in other words, that satisfies the God-given needs of individuals," historian Albert S. Lindemann writes.¹⁹

Other than a general commitment to anarchism, socialism, and free love, Margaret had yet to find her true calling. In 1911, she began publishing articles in *The Call*, the official organ of the Socialist Party. One article discussed prostitution and offered practical advice on how to avoid contracting venereal disease: "The more we look into the so-called evils of the day, the more we realize that the whole structure of present day society is built upon a rotten and decaying foundation. Until capitalism is swept away, there is no hope for young girls to live a beautiful life. ... Soon women will rise in one big sisterhood to fight this capitalist society which compels a woman to serve as an instrument for man's use."²⁰ After an initial run, the post office began seizing copies of *The Call* containing Sanger's article under the Comstock Act. It was the first of many battles between Margaret Sanger and Anthony Comstock.

Anthony Comstock was a former abolitionist who had fought for the Union during the Civil War. After the war, Comstock devoted himself to fighting obscenity. He founded the Society for the Suppression of Vice and succeeded in convincing Congress to pass the so-called Comstock Act in 1873. The act prohibited anyone from using the mail to traffic in pornography, contraceptives, and abortifacients. Twenty-four states passed similar laws. The post office empowered Comstock to act as its "special agent," with authority to search, seize, and arrest.

Sanger began collecting lovers, both male and female. Although she doesn't admit it in her two autobiographies, her predilection for promiscuity appears to have been the primary cause of the breakup of her marriage. Bill Sanger loathed the free lovers, describing Greenwich Village as a "hellhole of free love, promiscuity and prostitution masquerading under the mantle of revolution."²¹

The Woman Rebel

Sanger began publishing *The Woman Rebel*. The first edition (winter 1914) was formatted on her kitchen counter. Here, we get the first glimpse of Margaret Sanger's worldview. The newsletter's name was a variation on "Rebel Girl," the media's nom de guerre for Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Emblazoned across the front page was the old wobbly banner "No Gods, No Masters." For the first time, Margaret began to find her voice: "The aim of *The Woman Rebel* is to stimulate working women to think for themselves, to build up a conscious fighting character." The fight isn't only to be one against "slavery through motherhood" and ignorance of the "prevention of conception," but with "equal ferocity to attack prostitution, sexual prudery, marriage, middle-class morality, wage slavery – all things that enslave women."²²

The tone of *The Woman Rebel* was shrill. Margaret called on women “to look the world in the face with a go-to-hell look in the eyes; to have an ideal; to speak and act in defiance of convention.”²³ Monogamous marriage was the most destructive institution in history: “The marriage bed is the most degenerating influence of the social order, as to life, in all its forms – biological, psychological, sociological – for many women and children.”²⁴

The Woman Rebel articulated a brand of feminism pioneered by Emma Goldman. Goldman had been touting birth control and free love when Sanger was still a teenager. After attending the Paris Congress of the Second International (a socialist international organization) in 1900, Goldman toured around the U.S. giving lectures entitled “Free Love,” “The Philosophy of Anarchism,” and “The Right of the Child Not to be Born.” Goldman felt that women’s liberation had to come from within, not through suffrage or other structural changes: “A woman’s development, her freedom, her independence, must come from and through herself. First, by asserting herself as a personality, and not as a sex commodity. Second, by refusing to bear children ... by refusing to be a servant of God, the State, society, the husband, the family, etc., by making her life simpler, but deeper and richer.”²⁵

The anarcho-socialist tradition views birth control as a weapon in the class war. The family was established to “breed children of indisputable paternal lineage” for the purpose of inheritance of property.²⁶ “The modern monogamous family is founded on the open or disguised domestic slavery of women, and modern society is a mass composed of molecules in the form of monogamous families,” Frederick Engels wrote.²⁷ As the family is a pillar of the capitalist system, liberating women from the family is one of the goals of the revolution. “It will then be seen that the emancipation of women is primarily dependent on the re-introduction of the whole female sex into the public industries. To accomplish this, the monogamous family must cease to be the industrial unit of society.”²⁸ If a woman’s capacity to become pregnant is the Achilles heel that holds her in subjection, birth control is needed to break those maternal chains.

Beyond familial oppression, anarcho-socialists believe that capitalism relies upon the working class’s high birth rate to fill its factories with cheap labor and fill the ranks of its war machine with cannon fodder. To deprive capitalism of its slaves, anarcho-socialists such as Emma Goldman, Rosa Luxemburg, and Anatole France called for a “birth strike,” demanding that the socialist parties immediately endorse birth control.

Sanger enthusiastically supported the birth strike strategy. In 1914 she wrote the pamphlet *Family Limitation*:

Women of the working class should have no more than two children at most. ... It [the problem] is workers who are ignorant of the knowledge of how to prevent bringing children into the world to fill jails and hospitals, factories and mills, insane asylums and premature graves. The working class women can use direct action by refusing to supply the market with children to be exploited, by refusing to populate the world with slaves.²⁹

While accepting birth control in theory, the mostly male socialist leaders were reluctant to endorse it for tactical reasons. Orthodox Marxists, led by Karl Kautsky, held fast to Marx’s theory that the increasing impoverishment of the working class would inevitably lead to revolution. Reforms like birth control, Kautsky argued, blunted the edge of working class anger, postponing the day of reckoning. Large families among the working class would increase alienation as well as numbers, and hasten revolution.

Sanger’s biographers agree that it was Emma Goldman who introduced Sanger to birth control. Sanger denied it, insisting that Goldman only “belatedly advocated birth control, not to further it but strategically to utilize in their own program of anarchism, the publicity value it had achieved.”³⁰

Goldman also introduced Sanger to the Ferrer Center (also called the Modern School), a community center containing reading rooms, a lecture hall, and a library. Founded in 1910, the Ferrer Center was a meeting place and a conduit for some of America's most influential personalities. It brought together all the various strands of American radicalism. On any given evening, you were likely to find Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Jack London, Upton Sinclair, and Rose Pastor Stokes lecturing on socialism; Eugene O'Neill, Theodore Dreiser, and Lincoln Steffens on writing; Emma Goldman and Margaret Sanger on free love and birth control; Clarence Darrow on law. Walter Lippmann frequented Ferrer, as did Will Durant. Leon Trotsky spoke there during his visit to New York. It was the U.S. version of the Kremlin.

On July 9, 1914, while the Ferrer Center Association was holding its annual Independence Day picnic in New Jersey, a bomb exploded accidentally in a Harlem tenement, killing three men and a woman. Authorities quickly traced the dead bomb makers back to the Ferrer Center, uncovering a murder conspiracy hatched by Alexander Berkman. The plan was to blow up the Rockefeller home in retaliation for the so-called Ludlow Massacre.*

And estimated 20,000 people packed Union Square to mourn the dead bombers. Many wore red and black armbands. The crowd raised clenched fists and sang the "Internationale", the anthem of the socialist movement.

In the July issue of *The Woman Rebel*, Sanger described the bombers' deaths as a demonstration of "courage, determination, conviction, a spirit of defiance." The greater tragedy, she wrote, was "the cowardice and the poisonous respectability" of those socialist leaders (Debs) who apologized for the incident. Sanger featured another article defending the political assassination of "capitalist tyrants."³¹

The authorities charged Sanger with illegally using the mail to "incite murder and assassination," as well as for "preventing conception," the latter part of the indictment stemming from the earlier publication of *Family Limitation*.³² But before the authorities could arrest her, Margaret fled to Europe. Apparently, she never said goodbye to her three children. The youngest Peggy would die while Margaret was away. The boys would see very little of their globetrotting mother after 1914, spending their formative years in a boarding school.

Havelock Ellis

Sanger spent much of her exile time in England, where she met Havelock Ellis. More than any other individual, Ellis would have the greatest influence on Sanger. Ellis had become famous for compiling the seven-volume *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1897-1928). Ellis had a peculiar upbringing that's worth noting. As a ship's captain, Ellis's father took him along on a voyage around the world when Ellis was eight. His first sexual experiences involved watching the sailors masturbate and perform fellatio on one another. Back in England, Havelock was raised in an all-female household – a strict mother and four spinster sisters. He studied medicine at London, where he fell in love with Olive Schreiner, feminist author of *Woman and Labour*. However, she rejected him after discovering "he couldn't sustain an erection and experience normal coitus," Chesler writes. Heartbroken but determined to find a strong female to mirror his matriarchal upbringing, Ellis married Edith Lees, a "highly neurotic and self-absorbed essayist and novelist, who as a self-avowed lesbian found an occasional diffuse intimacy with her husband satisfactory."³³

* The Ludlow Massacre took place on April 20, 1914, at the mines of the Rockefeller-owned Colorado Fuel and Iron Company in Ludlow, Colorado. Company guards and the Colorado National Guard attacked a make-shift tent colony of striking coal miners. The assault lasted for 14 days, during which a number of people were killed (the exact number is disputed). The deaths were blamed on John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Ellis's *Studies* catalogued the sexual behaviors of human beings the way botanists catalogue plants, without moral judgment. It was a style later copied by Magnus Hirschfeld in Germany and Alfred Kinsey in America. Sexual acts are morally neutral, according to Ellis, and no one variety is any better than another. Sexuality, Ellis insisted, is an inborn drive that culture can either repress or liberate. "Complete sexual freedom, apart from society's interest in protecting innocent individuals from behavior to which they do not consent," is a necessary prerequisite of social progress, Ellis wrote. Rejecting both Christianity and Freudianism, Ellis never asked his patients to change, only to accept themselves. He celebrated sexual perversion. Ellis listed homosexuality as a "genetic predisposition" and demanded that laws against it be repealed. What society labels "abnormal" is actually a form of "erotic symbolism" whereby individuals unite their spiritual and animal capacities. Although some consider it disgusting, fetishism is actually the "supreme triumph of human idealism," a form of artistic creativity in the realm of sexuality. Sado-masochism, that "wonderful mixture of sex and violence, is a distillation in human love-making of artistic tendencies ..." Ellis said. He believed that sex education should begin at an early age, taught by experts instead of "bigoted" parents. He supported enlightened legislation to "liberate men and women from the inherited taboos" against adultery, homosexuality, incest, and contraceptives.³⁴

Sanger came to idolize Ellis: "Havelock Ellis has been called the greatest living English gentleman. But England alone cannot claim him; he belongs to all mankind. I define him as one who radiates truth, energy, and beauty. I see him in the realm above and beyond the shouting and the tumult." Ellis's work is more important to mankind than Newton's, explains Sanger, more important "than the achievement of radio-activity. Despite all the obstacles and obstructions that have hindered his expression, his truth has filtered through the minds ready to receive it. His philosophy ... is that of life more abundant – attained through a more complete understanding of ourselves and an unruffled charity to all." Ellis holds a place in history alongside Jesus and the Buddha. "To Ellis we owe our concept of the Kingdom of God within us, that inner world which hides all our inherent potentialities for joy as well as suffering ... I have never felt about any other person as about Havelock Ellis."³⁵

Part father figure, part guru, Ellis taught Sanger a form of tantric Rosicrucianism, that a steady regimen of uninhibited sex and meditation connect the individual to a supreme power, a "god within," as Sanger called it.³⁶ Of course sex couldn't be confined by monogamy and conventional morality; it had to be free. To Ellis and Sanger, sex wasn't only a sensual pleasure or a means of reproduction; it was the key to happiness and spiritual enlightenment: "Sexual activity is not merely a boldly propagative act, nor, when propagation is put aside, is it merely then relief of distended vessels. It is the function by which all the finer activities of the organism, physical and psychic, may be developed and satisfied."³⁷

As a spiritual sacrament, sex had to be separated from its reproductive ("lower") function. Birth control wasn't just about women's liberation; it was a means to attaining personal spiritual enlightenment: "Birth control is no negative philosophy concerned solely with the number of children brought into the world. It is not merely a question of population. Primarily, it is the instrument of liberation and human development."³⁸ Elsewhere she writes: "We can hope for no advance until we attain a new conception of sex, not as merely a propagative act, not merely as a biological necessity for the propagation of the race, but as a psychic and spiritual avenue of expression."³⁹

Ellis introduced Sanger to novelist Hugh de Selincourt, owner of the Wantley Estate. Wantley had once belonged to the poet Byron. Follower of William Godwin's free-love philosophy, Byron and his friends turned Wantley into England's free-love headquarters in the early 19th century. Hugh de Selincourt and his lesbian wife Janet carried on the tradition. The so-called "Wantley Circle" attracted some of Europe's most influential people. The writer H.G. Wells was a regular guest. Wantley gathered a Who's Who of the elite. After poetry readings or parlor games, couples and groups would retire to one

of Wantley's many rooms to worship the "god within." Hugh de Selincourt and H.G. Wells were added to Sanger's stable of lovers. Altogether, Margaret would collect 25 lovers, many at Wantley. Sanger and Hugh's wife Janet also shared an "embrace beyond earthly experience."⁴⁰ The guru Ellis usually presided. Like a lot of people obsessed with sex, Ellis was sexually impotent. Although attracted to both men and women, Ellis mostly preferred to watch others (voyeur), sometimes taking notes.

Havelock Ellis and H.G. Wells convinced Margaret to devote herself exclusively to the cause of birth control. They introduced her to the Neo-Malthusian League, where she delivered a speech. Ellis and Wells understood that a single cause was more likely to succeed than a broad-based agenda. Every cause needed a single face and personality. Pretty and articulate, Sanger fit the bill. In time she would become synonymous with birth control, making it easy to forget that the movement had been around longer than Margaret Sanger, and probably would have achieved its goals without her.

The strands of the modern birth control movement reach back into the early 19th century. As noted earlier, Thomas Malthus never supported artificial birth control, believing that self-restraint alone would suffice to combat overpopulation. His followers disagreed with that approach. Neo-Malthusians, as they were called, insisted that contraceptives would not only control the population growth, but would create the conditions for a perfect society, eliminating war, hunger, crime, and poverty. Francis Place wrote handbills in the 1820s advocating birth control for the working class. The Neo-Malthusian League was formed in 1861, becoming the world's oldest group promoting birth control. To test the obscenity statute against contraceptives, league members Anne Besant and Charles Bradlaugh got themselves arrested for publishing a pamphlet that advocated birth control. In a landmark ruling (1876), the appellate judge decreed that contraceptives no longer qualified as obscene if prescribed by a doctor to "prevent disease."

Early utopian socialists likewise advocated birth control as well as free love. Humphrey Noyes, founder of the utopian commune Oneida in New York, taught various contraceptive techniques. In the 1830s, Robert Dale Owen and his partner Francis Wright argued for birth control on the grounds of women's right to self-determination. Owen later became active in the spiritist movement, another group that argued for a woman's unqualified right to not only choose her sex partner but to prevent conception and, if necessary, to abort an unwanted pregnancy. At their so-called Free Convention in Vermont (1858), spiritists passed resolutions that included the following: "that the most sacred and important right of woman is her right to decide for herself how often and under what circumstances she shall assume the responsibilities and be subjected to the care and suffering of maternity."⁴¹

Europe's socialist parties were the first major political organizations to endorse birth control. Holland's social democratic trade unions opened the first birth control clinics in 1882.⁴² Germany's Socialist Party added birth control to its platform at the turn of the century. The emerging Soviet Union became the first nation to legalize both contraceptives and abortion in 1921.⁴³

Havelock Ellis and H.G. Wells helped Sanger transform birth control from an issue associated with revolutionary politics to an issue of middle class reform. As socialists, Ellis and Wells shared the same goals as Emma Goldman and Rosa Luxemburg. However, they parted company over tactics. Ellis and Wells, along with George Bernard Shaw, had earlier founded the Fellowship of the New Life, whose purpose was to bring about "the socialization of all the material necessities of life as the only means of obtaining freedom for individual development."⁴⁴ Wells and Shaw soon tired of the fellowship's ineffective idealism and, in 1884, split off to form the more practically oriented Fabian Society. (Ellis decided to remain aloof from direct political involvement.) The Fabian Society later organized Britain's Labour Party in 1900.

Fabian Socialists like Wells and Ellis rejected Karl Marx's theory of historical materialism, that the working class would lead the revolution to overthrow capitalism. Marx didn't believe capitalism could be reformed. He considered reforms like the eight-hour day to be beneficial only to the capitalists, as such measures only served to dampen working class anger. The Fabians dismissed the working class as hopelessly ignorant and incapable of bringing about socialism. They also thought violent revolution needlessly destructive. Rather than Marx's "bottom up" revolution, the Fabians believed that an "educated, scientifically-minded elite" could engineer a socialist society through gradual reform. In this respect, Fabianism combined elements of liberalism and socialism. The Fabian's "top down" revolution involved working from within capitalist society, occupying key positions in the state bureaucracy, the judiciary, the media, and academia, winning elections and legislative majorities when possible, but more often than not, engineering social change through their control of society's key institutions.

H.G. Wells described his socialist utopia in a highly influential essay entitled "The New Republic" (1901). Wells predicted that nations would eventually merge into a one-world state, making war a thing of the past. Material resources will be socialized, forever banishing poverty, crime, and hunger from the earth. Sex roles will be liberalized, ending the historic oppression of women. Achieving the latter made birth control the *sine qua non* of Wells' New Republic. It will not only liberate women, it will improve the eugenic quality of the human race. Wells' brand of Fabianism combined utilitarianism with hereditarianism.

Progressivism

Fabian socialism's influence extended well beyond England's shores. Across the pond in America, Fabian socialism became known as progressivism. H.G. Wells was on a first-name basis with progressive presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, as well as socialist Eugene Debs. Wells' ideas influenced an entire generation of American intellectuals. Inspired by Wells' essay, a group of these intellectuals – Herbert Croly, Walter Weyl, and Walter Lippmann – started publishing in 1915 a journal by the same name, *The New Republic*. Serving as the flagship of progressivism, *The New Republic* would draw up the blueprints for America's future domestic and foreign policy.

One aspect of H.G. Wells' utopia that left-leaning historians try hard to conceal is his espousal of scientific racism. Wells' New Republic was a whites-only paradise: "And how will the New Republic treat the inferior races? How will it deal with the black? ... the yellow? ... the Jew? ...those swarms of black, brown and dirty-white, and yellow people who do not come into the new need of efficiency? Well, the world is a world and not a charitable institution, and I take it that they will have to go."⁴⁵

Other progressives held similar opinions. Theodore Roosevelt thought that whites were on average smarter than blacks. Woodrow Wilson remained a die-hard segregationist till the day he died. But most progressives rejected scientific racism. Nor is there any evidence that Margaret Sanger shared Wells' view, even though she shared his bed.

Progressives generally tried to adopt moderate positions while moving policy leftward. At that time, racial segregation was the norm, supported by a majority of Americans. The major political parties and newspapers deferred to popular opinion. Yes, there were racials in the ranks of the progressive movement, but then again there were racials in every movement, institution, and political party in 1900.

That said, progressives steered their movement toward integrationist activism very early on. Philosopher John Dewey teamed up with Jewish progressive Arthur Spingarn and black socialist W.E.B. Du Bois to form the organization that eventually became the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Dewey became a key player in the progressive cause and a regular

contributor to *The New Republic*. Du Bois likewise wrote for *The New Republic* as well as *Birth Control Review*. *The New Republic's* editorial board included Eugene Debs, Crystal Eastman, Marie Stopes, Walter Lippmann – all known for having integrationist views.

After returning to New York in 1915, Margaret Sanger prepared to face the charges stemming from *The Woman Rebel* publications. The powerful connections Margaret had made in England tipped the scales of justice in her favor. H.G. Wells wrote a personal letter to his friend Woodrow Wilson protesting Sanger's innocence. The National Birth Control League (NBCL), the largest American Neo-Malthusian organization, held a fundraiser for Sanger's defense. *The New Republic's* influential editor Herbert Croly came to her defense, and Harriet Stanton Blatch, the daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, demanded that Sanger be tried by a jury composed of an equal number of men and women.

Up until this time, the only newspapers that had endorsed birth control were far left-wing organs: *The Call* and *The Masses*. Soon after Sanger's return, *The New Republic* took up the birth control crusade. Even though the articles continued to refer to her as a "socialist organizer," Sanger's friends at *The New Republic* were slowly creating a new image: Margaret the Reformer. On February 18, 1916, all charges were dropped. Sanger immediately embarked on a well-booked nationwide speaking tour. There was no more fiery rhetoric about a worker's revolution, only reasonable "liberal reform."

Margaret the Reformer

By 1915, birth control was moving out of radical politics into liberal reform. America's largest birth control group at that time was Mary Ware Dennett's NBCL. Dennett's supporters were mostly upper middle class club women, all progressives. Dennett and Sanger collaborated briefly, but then clashed. Dennett resented Sanger's radical roots. The NBCL made it a policy to exclude "people identified with the far left and civil disobedience," feminist Linda Gordon says.⁴⁶

In 1916, Dennett prepared two bills, one federal and one state, designed to amend the obscenity statutes to remove birth control from the list of prohibited items. She succeeded in convincing only two legislators, one a socialist and the other a liberal democrat, to submit the bills to the legislatures.⁴⁷ Both bills died stillborn.

Sanger and Dennett were swimming against the political stream, as most Americans opposed birth control. Other than radicals, Sanger relied upon her progressive friends and a few allies among liberal Protestants and Jews. The Reverend William R. Inge, Anglican priest and Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, came out in support of her crusade, as did Reverend Raymond B. Fosdick, pastor of New York's Riverside Baptist Church. Sanger found more friends among Reformed synagogues led by Rabbi Stephen Wise and Rabbi Louis L. Mann. A major boost would come from the Anglican Bishops, Christendom's most influential Protestant body. Meeting at Lambeth in 1920, the bishops voted down a resolution supporting birth control; ten years later they would vote to endorse it.

The Catholic Church led the fight against birth control. Its position remained consistent through the centuries. In 1930, after the Anglican reversal, the Vatican would call the Lambeth decision the "liquidation of historic Protestantism by its own trustees."⁴⁸ In defense of Christendom, Pope Pius XI finally issued *Casti Connubii* ("of chaste wedlock"), on Christian marriages (1930). *Casti Connubii* was a wide-ranging encyclical that codified centuries of social doctrine, listing the goods of marriage as "offspring, fidelity, and sacrament, and offspring is the primary one." On contraception, *Casti Connubii* said this:

Certain persons [Lambeth] have openly withdrawn from the Christian doctrine as it has been transmitted from the beginning and always faithfully kept. ... The Catholic Church ... now standing in the ruin of morals, raises her voice aloud through our mouth, in sign of her

divine mission, in order to keep the chastity of the marriage bond free from this foul slip, and again promulgates: Any use whatever of marriage, in the exercise of which the act by human effort is deprived of its natural power of procreating life, violates the law of God and nature, and those who do such a thing are stained by a grave and moral flaw.

On abortion, *Casti Connubii* said this: "A person who procures a completed abortion incurs excommunication latae sententiae ("sentence already passed"), by the very commission of the offense."

On eugenics:

That pernicious practice must be condemned which closely touches upon the natural right of man to enter matrimony but affect also in a real way the welfare of the offspring. For there are some who even solicitous for the cause of eugenics ... put eugenics before aims of a higher order, and by public authority wish to prevent from marrying all those whom, even though naturally fit for marriage, they consider, according to the norms and conjectures of their investigations, would through hereditary transmission, bring forth defective offspring. And more, they wish to legislate to deprive those of that natural faculty by medical action [sterilization] despite their unwillingness. ... Public magistrates have no direct power over the bodies of their subjects; therefore, where no crime has taken place and there is no cause present for grave punishment, they can never directly harm or tamper with the integrity of the body, either for the reasons of eugenics or for any other reason.⁴⁹

Sanger's radical and liberal supporters weren't powerful enough to make birth control legal in America during the 1920s. To succeed, she needed support from that "educated, scientifically-minded" elite that H.G. Wells and Havelock Ellis identified. Indoctrinated at the university with Darwinism, materialism, and eugenics, they held the key to social change. All Sanger had to do was get them to endorse her crusade. Instead of trying to win legislative majorities, an unlikely scenario in a country overwhelmingly opposed to birth control, Sanger sought to bypass the legislative process and put birth control in the hands of those "educated, scientifically-minded" judges, doctors, and bureaucrats. Sanger said, "The legislative approach seemed to me a slow tortuous method for making clinics legal; we stood a better and quicker chance by securing a favorable judicial interpretation through challenging the law directly."⁵⁰

Bradlaugh and Besant had used that strategy in 1876. Progressives would employ the same strategy in the coming decades to transform America.

In 1916, Sanger opened her first birth control clinic in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn, a neighborhood heavily populated by recently arrived immigrants from Eastern Europe. Prolifers often claim that Brownsville was Sanger's first clinic "targeted" at poor racial and ethnic minorities. Actually, Sanger opened the Brownsville clinic to get arrested. The state of New York already permitted doctors to prescribe birth control to "prevent disease." Sanger's strategy was to stretch the disease clause even further, permitting physicians to prescribe birth control without restriction.

After opening the clinic, Sanger immediately notified the police, who promptly arrested her along with her sister Ethel Higgins Byrnes. The sisters spent 11 days in jail; Ethel went five days on a hunger strike. (As noted earlier, Margaret later falsely claimed that it was she who endured the hunger strike.)

Along with the new strategy and new image came increased financial support. Gertrude Pinchot organized a group of wealthy influential women into the Committee of 100, known also as "The Fashionables." They held a white-glove fundraiser for Sanger's legal defense at Carnegie Hall, raking in \$1,000. Sanger explained: "The answer was to make the club women, the women of wealth and

intelligence, use their power and money and influence to obtain freedom and knowledge for the women of the poor.”⁵¹

Sanger was introduced to New York’s queen of the club women, Juliet Rublee, wife of George Rublee, President Wilson’s appointee to the Federal Trade Commission. Mrs. Rublee became Sanger’s biggest benefactor in the early years. Wealthy progressives, the Rublees were close friends with the Straight family, who published *The New Republic*. Sanger’s networking skills were paying dividends. The appellate court found her guilty in 1918, but the judge confirmed the right of physicians to prescribe birth control for the prevention of disease. The judge defined “disease” so liberally that Sanger could now open birth control clinics in the state of New York as long as she kept a licensed physician on the staff.

Sanger began publishing *Birth Control Review* in February of 1917, entrusting its day-to-day operations to fellow socialist Frederick Blossom. Predictably, the two quarreled. (Margaret quarreled with everyone.) Blossom promptly quit, taking all the records and furniture with him. In a fit of anger, Sanger referred the matter to the district attorney. This was a big no-no in the world of revolutionary politics. Blossom was a member of the Socialist Party. By turning to a henchman of the capitalist state, Sanger had committed treason. Blossom asked a committee of fellow socialists to review the matter, “which condemned Sanger and exonerated Blossom,” Linda Gordon writes.⁵² The experience signaled another turning for Sanger as she moved from revolution to reform.

World War I was another watershed event in the life of Margaret Sanger. As the nations of Europe moved closer to war, socialists were confident that the international solidarity of their movement would prevent the outbreak of hostilities. They expected revolution at any moment. But in the event that the capitalist powers fomented a war, the socialist parties and trade unions were expected to call upon their workers to resist conscription and organize strikes. It didn’t work out as planned. Instead of organizing strikes, in 1914 Germany’s Socialist Party (SPD), Europe’s oldest and largest Marxist party, voted in Reichstag to give the Kaiser’s government war credits. France’s social democrats followed suit. The Second International dissolved over the issue, permanently splitting the socialist movement between a reformist faction that advocated working within the liberal democratic system and a revolutionary faction that was still committed to the immediate overthrow of capitalism. The revolutionary faction would form the basis of the future communist parties around the world.

As the war dragged on, many socialists saw an opportunity to salvage victory from the ashes. The revolutionary faction of Russia’s Social Democratic Party (Bolshevik) struck first, toppling the Tsar in 1917. Germany’s SPD finally led a series of strikes in the latter days of the war, forcing the Kaiser to abdicate. Revolutionary factions set up short-lived Soviet republics in Berlin, Bavaria, and Budapest. In America, the socialist-led trade unions organized a series of crippling strikes in 1919. Anarchists carried out bombings and assassinations.

Attorney General Mitchell Palmer responded expeditiously to head off the threat. In January of 1920 he conducted raids, rounding up almost 6,000 Reds in one night. Emma Goldman was among dozens deported to the Soviet Union. Margaret’s friend “Big” Bill Haywood took flight to the Soviet Union before they could arrest him. Eugene Debs was clapped in jail. Socialist rags *The Call* and *The Masses* were shut down. It was a bad time to be a radical. Liberal historians refer to these events as the so-called “Red Scare.”

As it turned out, Sanger’s abandonment by the Socialist Party over the Blossom affair was a blessing in disguise. She could have ended up in prison alongside Debs. Despite moving away from radical circles, Sanger would remain a radical at heart. She would use her *Birth Control Review* to protest the “persecution” of her comrades Debs and Haywood.⁵³ She would stand by her sister Ethel after the

latter joined the Communist Party. Margaret's hero, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, likewise joined the Communist Party in the 1930s. Flynn would also become one of the only members of the ACLU expelled for her communist affiliation in 1940.⁵⁴ Sanger remained loyal through it all. At the height of the Cold War she continued to vote the Socialist Party line, long after it would have been safer to move to the Democratic Party. The FBI maintained an active file on Sanger till the day she died.

Margaret the Eugenicist

Distancing herself and her birth control cause from radical associations, Sanger spent the better part of the 1920s trying to form an alliance between birth control and eugenics. At the time, eugenics was a popular middle class movement supported by doctors, scientists, judges, academics, and at least three presidents: Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Calvin Coolidge.

Sanger's first book *Woman and the New Race* (1920) tried to wed birth control, free love, and the worker's movement to eugenics. *Woman* expanded on a theme explored earlier by Havelock Ellis in *The Task of Social Hygiene* (1910). The book's title is yet another take-off on H.G. Wells' influential essay "The New Republic."

The new woman, Sanger wrote, is first a "regulator of the birth rate, the disposer of human production. It is in the deliberate restraint and measurement of human production that the fundamental problems of the family, the nation, the whole brotherhood of mankind find their solution." Economic and individual welfare, indeed, "the possibility of abolishing from the world the desolating scourge of war – all these great human needs, depend primarily and fundamentally, on the wise limitation of the human output."⁵⁵

In the past, woman unknowingly laid the foundations of "tyrannies, providing the human tinder for racial conflagrations ... creating slums, filling insane asylums and institutions with other defectives." Her uncontrolled fecundity produced misery in the world. But through intelligent "birth control she will attain to voluntary motherhood" and change the course of human history.⁵⁶

Unlike Wells' whites-only paradise, Sanger's New Republic is more of a melting pot, for "out of the mixture of stocks, the intermingling of ideas and aspirations, there is to come a race greater than any which has contributed to the population of the United States." Nativists are correct to point out that foreigners arrived in America, bringing with them "ignorance of hygiene and modern ways," and "clinging to religious superstition." However, "they also bring in their hearts a desire for freedom from all the tyrannies that afflict the earth." Sanger writes that birth control must not remain a "privilege of the privileged. We must put this means of freedom and growth into the hands of the masses. ... We must give the foreign and submerged mother knowledge that will enable her to prevent bringing to birth children she does not want. We shall see that it will save precious metals of racial culture fused into amalgam of physical perfection, mental strength, and spiritual progress. Such an American race containing the best of all racial elements ..." ⁵⁷

Sanger chastises those eugenicists like Theodore Roosevelt who clamor against "race suicide" and encourage larger families for the so-called "fit." For "women who are in comfortable circumstances" can scarcely remain "cultured and of social value if they were the mothers of large families. Neither could they maintain their present standard of health nor impart it to their children." Children of large families suffer such a high mortality rate under normal circumstances that often "the most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it."⁵⁸

While criticizing positive eugenics (larger families for the "fit"), Sanger whole heartedly endorsed negative eugenics, saying, "By all means there should be no children when either mother or father suffer from such diseases as tuberculosis, gonorrhoea, syphilis, cancer, epilepsy, insanity, drunkenness, and

mental disorders.” * No one has a “right to bring into the world those who are to suffer from mental or physical affliction. It condemns the child to a life of misery and places upon the community the burden of caring for it, probably for its defective descendants for many generations.”⁵⁹

Legal birth control will forever end the heinous practice of abortion, Sanger claims. “Does anyone imagine that a woman would submit to abortion if not denied the knowledge of scientific, effective contraceptives?” Every year in America, there are an estimated one million illegal abortions, she claims. The question is this: “Shall family limitation be achieved through birth control or abortion?”⁶⁰

While Sanger made a deliberate effort in *Woman* to moderate her radical political opinions, she refused to tamp down her irrational hatred of the Catholic Church. In an era when it would have been far more expedient for her to curtail her criticism of Christianity, Sanger never let an opportunity slip without taking a swipe at the Church. To Sanger, the Church was the source of evil in the world. She has this to say: “This Church’s code of sex morals has nothing to do with the basic sex rights of woman, but enforces, rather, the assumed property rights of the man to the body and the services of his wife.” The Church deliberately keeps woman ignorant in sexual matters because it knows that “woman, free from sexual domination, would produce a race spiritually free and strong enough to break the last of the bonds of intellectual darkness.”⁶¹

Birth control will create the conditions for the perfect society. It will free woman “to understand the cravings and the soul needs of herself and other women. It will enable her to develop her love nature separate from and independent of her maternal nature.” When woman’s mind is finally purged of “its unclean conception of sex, the fountain of the race will have been cleansed. Mothers will bring forth a race that is morally and spiritually free.”⁶² When children are no longer brought into the world out of ignorance or accident, “they will become the foundation of a new race. There will be no killing of babies in the womb by abortion, nor through neglect in foundling homes, nor will there be infanticide.” When the last fetters fall from woman, “child slavery, prostitution, feeblemindedness, physical deterioration, hunger, oppression, and war will disappear from the earth.”⁶³

Sanger formed the American Birth Control League (ABCL) in 1921 to rival Dennett’s NBCL. Sanger’s group pushed a piece of legislation called the “Doctor’s Only Bill,” which basically mirrored the doctor’s exception in New York law. The plan was to introduce it in other state legislatures and eventually the federal Congress. If passed, it would allow Sanger’s group to open clinics across the nation. On a parallel course, Sanger’s lawyers kept pushing for a friendly ruling in the federal courts that would nullify the legislative approach entirely.

Sanger called *Woman and the New Race* her “heart” book. Academics and physicians criticized the book’s appeal for sexual liberation and they scoffed at its prophetic tone. To answer these critics, Sanger wrote *The Pivot of Civilization* (1922), which she called her “head” book. Her lover and mentor H.G. Wells penned the introduction. Loaded down with statistics and quotations of medical authorities, *Pivot* attempted to give birth control a patina of scientific credibility. In a crass appeal to the eugenics establishment, Sanger employed the ruthless rhetoric of the movement, using words like “defective” and “imbecile,” “human weeds” and “useless eaters.” The book would turn out to be a treasure trove for proliferators hunting for quotes that make Sanger sound like a Nazi.

Sanger says this: “Birth control, which has been criticized as negative and destructive, is really the greatest and most eugenic method, and its adoption as part of the program of eugenics would

* As mentioned earlier, positive eugenics is the promotion of greater reproduction among people with desired traits, whereas negative eugenics is reduced reproduction among people with less-desired or undesired traits.

immediately give a concrete and realistic power to the science.”⁶⁴ As Malthus pointed out over a century earlier, charity is actually a form of cruelty as it treats the symptom of poverty but not the disease of over-population. Mirroring Malthus, Sanger said this: “Fostering the good-for-nothing at the expense of the good is an extreme cruelty. It is the deliberate storing up of miseries for future generations. There is no greater curse to posterity than that of bequeathing them an increasing population of imbeciles.”⁶⁵ Philanthropy “encourages the healthier and more normal sections of the world to shoulder the burden of unthinking fecundity of others, which brings with it ... a dead weight of human waste.”⁶⁶

Sanger preferred negative eugenics over positive eugenics. She explains: “When we realize that each feeble-minded person is a potential source of an endless progeny of defect, we prefer the policy of immediate sterilization of making sure that parenthood is absolutely prohibited to the feeble-minded.”⁶⁷ However, we must not go beyond sterilization into euthanasia, as the eugenical value would be purchased at too dear a price. We “do not believe that the community could or should send to the lethal chamber the defective progeny resulting from irresponsible and unintelligent breeding.”⁶⁸ Birth control is the only long-term solution to dysgenic population growth.

For over 100 pages Sanger laid out the eugenic case for birth control, only to contradict the eugenic thesis at the end: “Birth control is no negative philosophy concerned solely with the number of children brought into the world. It is not merely a question of population. Primarily it is the instrument of liberation and human development.”⁶⁹

In *Woman and the New Race* and *The Pivot of Civilization*, Sanger claimed to support eugenical ends, but not eugenical means. The eugenicists espoused a doctrine called “race suicide” that ran completely counter to Sanger’s thesis. Francis Walker, Director of the Bureau of Census, first articulated the “race suicide” argument after noticing a decline in birth rates among native Anglo-Saxon Americans and steadily high birth rates among immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe. Between 1880 and 1920, some 20 million immigrants entered the U.S., mostly from those areas. At the same time, America’s governing class wasn’t replenishing itself. The fertility rate, for instance, among Radcliffe graduates was barely 1.8; for Harvard alumni it was 2.0.⁷⁰ Walker declared that America was committing “race suicide.” Sanger’s argument promoting birth control for all women while supporting eugenics was illogical, and the leading eugenicists saw through the ruse.

President Theodore Roosevelt took up the race suicide cause when he addressed the National Congress of Mothers in March of 1905. Blaming the declining birth rate among Anglo-Saxon natives on birth control and divorce, he railed against the “viciousness, coldness, shallow-heartedness” of the woman who shirks “her duty” to replenish the nation. The mother’s duty is no different from the soldier’s, he said. Both are necessary to the nation’s survival. Giving birth is like going into combat. The woman who uses birth control is a deserter, a coward, a “criminal against the race ... the object of contemptuous abhorrence by healthy people,” Roosevelt said.⁷¹

To solve the problem of race suicide, eugenicists called for differential birth rates: higher rates for the “fit,” lower for the “unfit.” Unlike social conservatives who opposed birth control on moral grounds (*Casti Connubii*), the eugenicists opposed it for practical reasons. This is an important distinction, lest we confuse the very different motives of social conservatives and eugenicists. An early editorial in *Eugenical News* declared that leading eugenicists would happily endorse Sanger’s crusade if only she would give up her opposition to positive eugenics and “advocate differential fecundity on the basis of natural worth.”⁷² Sanger’s plan to make birth control available to all women, even women they labeled “fit,” alienated the eugenics establishment. In their view, illegal birth control was already decimating America’s middle and upper classes. If the individual woman was the sole arbiter of reproduction and given legal access to birth control techniques, the educated middle class women would become its

primary users. This would result in even more rapid population decline among the “fit,” precisely the outcome eugenicists wanted to avoid.

Even still, Sanger continued to wrap herself in the mantle of eugenics, seeking alliances with eugenicists whenever possible. As her pro-life critics are keen to point out, almost half of those who Sanger invited to sit on the National Council of ABCL during the 1920s were connected to eugenics. Among them was Lothrop Stoddard, the white supremacist author. Sanger invited Stoddard to join the National Council after the publication in 1920 of his best-selling book *The Rising Tide of Color*. One must not read too much into this. The National Council was largely honorary, and it also sat any number of liberal integrationists, such as Raymond B. Fosdick and Rabbi Louis L. Mann. Future First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt likewise served on the board of ABCL.

Sanger did manage to form relationships with lower echelon eugenicists: Yale economics professor Irving Fischer, head of the Eugenics Research Association, and Harry Laughlin, manager of the Eugenics Records Office. However, the upper echelon of the eugenics establishment consistently rebuffed her advances. Typical was Sanger’s attempt to entice Henry Fairfield Osborn, president of New York’s Museum of Natural History, to preside over her First American Birth Control Conference in 1921. Among eugenicists, Osborn was second in importance only to Charles Davenport. Instead of a reply from Osborn, Davenport wrote directly to Sanger:

Propaganda for birth control at this time may well do more harm than good and he [Osborn] is unwilling to associate himself with the forthcoming birth control conference ... [since] there is grave doubt whether it will work out for the advancement of the race.⁷³

Sanger didn’t stop trying. She invited Davenport himself to become the vice president of the Sixth International Neo-Malthusian and Birth Control Conference in 1925. Predictably, Davenport declined:

As to any official connection on my part with the conference as vice president, or officially recognized participant or supporter, that is, for reasons which I have already expressed to you in early letters, is not possible. For one thing, the confusion of eugenics (which in its application to humans is qualitative) with birth control (which as set forth by most of its propagandists, is quantitative) is, or was considerable, and the association of the director of the ERO with a birth control conference would only serve to confuse the distinction. I trust you will appreciate my reasons for not wishing to appear as a supporter of the ABCL or of the conference.⁷⁴

Fischer and Laughlin attended the conference, ignoring Davenport’s warnings to stay away. They thought that Davenport and Osborn were missing an opportunity. They believed that, with very little effort, the eugenicists could get control of Sanger’s conference and use it for their own ends. During one of the conference’s sparsely attended sessions, when Sanger was absent, the eugenicists led by Roswell Johnson quickly passed a resolution advocating exactly what Sanger opposed, that persons “whose progeny give promise of being of decided value to the community should be encouraged to bear us large families, properly spaced, as they feel they feasibly can.”⁷⁵

Sanger was furious. In the next issue of *Birth Control Review*, she wrote an angry editorial repudiating the “Johnson Resolution.”

It is my belief that the so-called “eugenic” resolution, passed at the final session of the Sixth International Neo-Malthusian and Birth Control Conference, has created a lamentable confusion. ... It was interpreted by the press as indicating that we believe we could actually increase the size of families among “superior” classes by passing resolutions recommending larger families.⁷⁶

Sanger met with the same rejection on the international stage. She helped organize the First World Population Conference held in Geneva in 1927. The eminent scientist Sir Bernard Mallet agreed to chair the conference, but on one condition: Sanger would not attend. This was Sanger's conference! As Sanger explains it, Mallet "pledged that I was not to be a party to the conference and no discussion of birth control or Malthusianism would be allowed."⁷⁷

Despite the ruckus over the "Johnson Resolution," Sanger kept searching for a merger of sorts with one of the major eugenics groups. She approached Irving Fischer about a merger between their two organizations. Fischer considered the offer briefly, but eventually declined. When Leon Whitney, the executive secretary of the American Eugenics Society (AES), suggested a merger of its journal *Eugenics* with Sanger's *Birth Control Review*, another ink storm broke. Paul Popenoe, head of California's Human Betterment Society, dashed off a letter to the AES's Madison Grant, hoping to put a stop to the proposed merger. Popenoe reminded Grant that Sanger had repudiated the Johnson Resolution. Any connection to Sanger's group should have ended there. He said this:

It is my judgment we have everything to lose and nothing to gain by such an arrangement. ... The latter society [ABCL] ... is controlled by a group that has been brought up on agitation and emotional appeal instead of on research and education. With this group, we would take on a large quantity of ready-made enemies which it has accumulated, and we gain allies who, which believing that they are eugenicists, really have no conception of what eugenics is ...⁷⁸

As the West Coast's leading eugenicist, Popenoe oversaw California's sterilization program, the nation's largest. His word carried weight. Grant immediately wrote Whitney, warning him to stay away from Sanger:

I'm definitely opposed to any connection with them [ABCL]. ... When we organized the Eugenics Society, it was decided that we would keep clear of birth control, as it was a feminist movement and would bring a lot of unnecessary enemies. ... I am pretty sure that Dr. Davenport and Professor Osborn would agree with me that we had better go our way indefinitely.⁷⁹

Word of the proposed heresy finally reached the Pontifex Maximus of eugenics, Charles Davenport, who wrote directly to Whitney:

I have grave doubts whether she [Sanger] has any clear idea of what eugenics is. ... We have attached to the word "eugenics" the names of Mrs. E.H. Harriman and Andrew Carnegie – persons with an unsullied personal reputation, whose names connote good judgment and great means. Such valued associations have given the word "eugenics" great social value, and it is that which various organizations want to seize. Now comes along Mrs. Sanger who feels that birth control does not taste in the mouth so well as eugenics, and she thinks that birth control is the same as eugenics, and eugenics is birth control, and she would naturally seize with avidity on a proposal that we should blend birth control and eugenics in some way, such as the proposed [joint] magazine. ... The whole birth control movement seems to me a quagmire, out of which eugenics should keep. Thus it would be necessary for the Eugenics Records Office and the Carnegie Institute to withdraw its moral support.⁸⁰

Just when Sanger thought it couldn't get any worse, Henry Fairfield Osborn delivered a scathing attack on birth control at the Third International Congress of Eugenics in New York:

The country which has birth control in its most radical form is Russia [USSR], where it is connected with a great deal of promiscuity. ... Let us therefore consider birth control as one

of the more or less radical departures from the fundamental principles of our present social structure, not only in the religious but the ethical and moral fields. ... Woman's share in the hard struggle for existence of the race is a very essential element. ... To relieve the animal or plant organism of its struggle for existence is an extremely dangerous experiment, for ... the struggle for existence is the *sine qua non* of every great animal and human quality.⁸¹

Osborn and Davenport understood perfectly that birth control and eugenics would work at cross purposes. If birth control became widely available, middle class women would use it most, "defective" women scarcely at all. The incompatibility between birth control and eugenics was clearly demonstrated in Nazi Germany, the nation most committed to eugenics. George Grant claims that Margaret Sanger was "closely associated with the scientists and theorists who put together Nazi Germany's 'race purification' program. She had openly endorsed the euthanasia, sterilization, abortion, and infanticide programs of the early Reich. She published a number of articles in *Birth Control Review* that mirrored Hitler's Aryan-white supremacist rhetoric. She even commissioned Dr. Ernst Rüdin, the director of the Nazi Medical Experimentation program, to write for the *Review* himself."⁸²

Nothing could be further from the truth. If Sanger's relationship with American eugenicists was tempestuous, her connection with Nazi eugenicists was non-existent.

German Eugenics

While he was serving a five-year prison sentence (of which he served one year) in Landsberg for the failed Beer Hall Putsch in Munich in 1923, Adolf Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf*, his vision of Germany's future. He wrote this: "The People's State must set race at the center of all life. It must take care to keep it pure. ... It must see to it that only the healthy beget children; that there is only one disgrace: despite one's own sickness and deficiencies, to bring children into the world. ... It must declare unfit for propagation all who are in any way visibly sick or who have inherited a disease and can therefore pass it on, and put this into actual practice."⁸³

Hitler had dabbled with crude racial theories going back to his days in Vienna. But it was at Landsberg that he first began to formulate his ideas based in large part on his reading of a book entitled *Foundations of Human Heredity and Racial Hygiene* (1921). The book was written by three leading eugenicists: Edwin Baur, Fritz Lenz, and Eugen Fischer – all of whom had connections to Cold Spring Harbor in New York (but not to Margaret Sanger). Fischer was a friend of Davenport and served as a liaison of German-American eugenics.

Dr. Alfred Ploetz is generally recognized as the father of German eugenics. He travelled to the U.S. in the early 1890s and lived for a time in Connecticut where he opened a medical practice. He studied American eugenics and authored "Foundations of Racial Hygiene" in 1895. (In Germany, eugenics was called Rassenhygiene, or racial hygiene, a term coined by Ploetz.) Upon returning to Germany, he helped found the Society for Racial Hygiene in 1905. The organ served as a conduit for introducing eugenics into Germany's prestigious Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes, the world's finest schools of science. Each institute was independent from the others and located in a different city. There was one for physics, another for chemistry, and so forth. Two schools in particular became associated with eugenics research: the Institute for Psychiatry and the Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics. Ernst Rüdin became the director of the Institute for Psychiatry in 1910. After the First World War, he began compiling family records on prisoners and mental patients, modeling his process on the work done earlier by the Eugenics Records Office (ERO) at Cold Spring Harbor. The director of the Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics was Eugen Fischer, longtime friend of Davenport and co-author of Hitler's favorite book (*Foundations of Human Heredity and Racial Hygiene*). Another of Germany's leading eugenicists was Dr. Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer, who served under Fischer and

authored an influential text *Genetic Pathology* in 1936. By the late 1920s, the German institutes had surpassed Cold Spring Harbor as the world's center of eugenics research.

For Germany, the First World War had been lost on the home front. The German Socialist Party (SPD) organized a series of devastating strikes in the last year of the war. Coming in the middle of a major military offensive on the Western Front, the strikes crippled German industry, making it impossible to continue fighting. The Allies forced the Kaiser to abdicate as a precondition of peace talks. Germany was left in the hands of the Reichstag. Since the SPD was the Reichstag's largest party, its representatives negotiated and signed the onerous Treaty of Versailles. The SPD's policies would come to dominate the period between the world wars known to history as the Weimar Republic.

The SPD had long since adopted socialist gradualism, forcing the revolutionary wing of the party to break away and form the Spartacus League, the kernel of the future German Communist Party (KPD). To prevent an all-out civil war, the SPD's leaders struck a bargain with the army: the SPD agreed not to move for the immediate socialization of the means of production. In exchange, the army pledged to defend the Weimar Republic. The SPD also agreed to look the other way while the army ("Fricorp") crushed their former comrades, the Spartacists, who staged uprisings in Berlin and Bavaria in 1919 and 1920.

While the SPD proceeded cautiously with economic socialism, it made more rapid strides in the social arena. In Moscow their Bolshevik comrades had repealed the Tsarist penal codes against adultery, incest, homosexuality, contraceptives, and abortion in two decrees issued soon after the October Revolution. The SPD wanted to do the same in Germany. Complete repeal, however, wasn't easy. Unlike the Bolsheviks who ruled through decree, Germany's SPD had to govern in coalition with the Liberal Democratic and the Center parties, who were not always amenable to the socialist agenda. Consequently, the codes on homosexuality and abortion remained on the books, but were never enforced under the Weimar Republic. However, the socialists had better luck with contraceptives.

The SPD created so-called Marriage Bureaus that opened dozens of birth control clinics. The clinics taught birth control techniques and made referrals for "therapeutic" abortions. Historian Lisa Pine writes this: "The Association for Sexual Hygiene and Life Reform and the National Union for Birth Control and Hygiene, established in 1923 and 1928 respectively, introduced new educational initiatives on sexual hygiene and birth control."⁸⁴

It was during this time period that Margaret Sanger made two trips (1921 and 1927) to Weimar Germany. She came to study the SPD's birth control program in preparation for the one she intended to establish in the U.S. Havelock Ellis gave Sanger a letter of introduction to Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld. Considered to be the father of the gay rights movement, Hirschfeld had founded the Institute of Sexual Science in Berlin in 1919. He also created the Scientific Humanitarian Committee, whose purpose was to decriminalize homosexuality as well as abortion. As a physician and an SPD member, he knew the doctors who ran the party's Marriage Bureaus, and introduced Margaret to them.

On her second visit to Germany in 1927, Sanger opened a small office in Berlin to act as a liaison between the SPD's Marriage Bureaus and her ABCL in New York. She put her comrades Agnes Smedley and Josephine Bennett in charge. A devoted communist, Smedley staffed the office almost exclusively with members of the German Communist Party.⁸⁵

Sanger toured many facilities, writing this in her autobiography: "Clinics were to be established at Neukölln [a borough in Berlin] under Dr. Kurt Bendix, the health administrator of the section; for the first time in history a government agency was actually sanctioning birth control ..." Anyone could obtain information from the Marriage Bureaus on "sterilization and birth control, homosexuality and inversion,

feeble-mindedness and abortion.”⁸⁶ The Marriage Bureaus would serve as the model for Sanger’s own Clinical Research Bureau in New York.

The SPD’s birth control programs in the 1920s had no connection to the eugenics programs later established under the Third Reich. The eugenics establishment in Germany shared the same ambivalence about birth control as their counterparts in America. The SPD’s Marriage Bureaus offered birth control and abortion to all women regardless of genetic health, as part of its Marxist class war ideology.

The SPD was never able to consolidate its hold on power. Because it had betrayed its KPD comrades and joined forces with the “reactionary” army, it lacked the strength to purge Germany of its former ruling class, as it would have very much liked to do. And because the SPD had agreed to parliamentary politics, it had to tolerate a large right-wing opposition in the Reichstag, which grew stronger as Germany’s economy worsened during the late 1920s. The right-wing opposition blamed the SPD for undermining Germany’s war effort and for signing the hated Treaty of Versailles. They called the SPD “November Criminals,” referring to the month Germany was forced to surrender. Consisting mostly of social and national conservative parties, the opposition wanted to repudiate the Versailles Treaty and restore Germany to her former greatness. They also blamed the SPD’s birth control programs for undermining morality, for destroying families, and for Germany’s declining birth rate. During the 1920s the birth rate dropped faster than at any other point in German history. The Catholic Church condemned the Marriage Bureaus as well. Many other religious and political organizations (League of Queen Louise and the Evangelical Women’s Federation) sprang up in the Weimar years to fight birth control, abortion, and homosexuality.⁸⁷ The right-wing opposition finally formed a coalition, the *Bürgerblock*, which threatened to end the SPD’s 10-year reign. One of the *Bürgerblock* partners was the National Socialist German Workers Party, or the Nazi Party.

An ultra-nationalist party, the Nazis had borrowed a few superficial features of socialism, including its name, to undermine the SPD’s popularity among the German working class. But the Nazis were no part of the socialist tradition. Led by a charismatic war veteran, the party made rapid gains running on an anti-Versailles and anti-communist platform. Unlike the religious and national conservatives, who shied away from street politics, the Nazis formed paramilitaries (“Brown Shirts”) that battled the SPD and KPD paramilitaries almost daily. What separated the Nazis from the other *Bürgerblock* parties was their race-centric worldview, or *weltanschauung*. Most Germans ignored this aspect of Nazism, until it was too late. In the 1932 elections, the Nazis became the Reichstag’s largest party, earning its leader Adolf Hitler the post of Chancellor.

The Nazis opposed birth control, abortion, and homosexuality as corrosive influences on the “racial hygiene” of the Fatherland. Point 21 of the Nazi Programme: “The State has to care for the raising of the nation’s health through the protection of mother and child.”⁸⁸ Minister of Propaganda Josef Goebbels said that a woman’s “most glorious duty” is to “present her people and her country with a child.”⁸⁹ The SPD and KPD responded by putting out flyers which read: “Women! To support the Nazis is to Betray Yourselves” and “The Nazis want to make you into unwilling Breeding Machines!”⁹⁰ Hirschfeld wrote polemics attacking the Nazi’s racial and anti-homosexual agenda. Hirschfeld was the first to use the term “racism.”

After the Nazis came to power in 1933, they reversed the SPD’s social policies. They banned contraceptives and closed down the Marriage Bureaus and the birth control clinics.⁹¹ Sanger described the loss of a former comrade: “Then the Nazis came to power, they [birth control clinics] were closed, and Dr. Bendix committed suicide.”⁹² A gang of Nazis burned Hirschfeld’s Institute of Sexual Science to ashes. Hirschfeld went into exile in Switzerland, where he died in 1936.

The Nazis added paragraphs 219 and 220 to the Criminal Code, toughening penalties for abortion. Historian Lisa Pine writes this: "Eventually in 1943, the death penalty was introduced for anyone performing an abortion to terminate a 'valuable' pregnancy, as this was considered to be an act of 'racial sabotage' during the crisis of the war."⁹³

It's safe to say that no state has been so obsessed with raising the national birth rate. Girls were required to join the League of German Girls (BDM). The BDM girl's goal was motherhood inside of marriage. But should she become pregnant outside of marriage, the *Lebensborn* ("well of life") offered private pre-natal and post-natal care and adoption services. In 1938, the Marriage Loan Scheme was established to provide vouchers for wives who agreed to forego a career and stay at home raising children. Medals were awarded: four kids (bronze); six kids (silver); eight kids (gold).⁹⁴

At the same time that the Nazis were incredibly solicitous about raising birth rates among those they deemed to be "fit," they took monstrous steps to lower the birth rate among those they condemned as "unfit." Unlike the American eugenicists who were limited in what they could do by the U.S. Constitution, the Nazis had absolute power to carry out their eugenic experiments. The scale of German eugenics eclipsed the American program. The Law for the Prevention of Defective Progeny, decreed in 1933, allowed sterilization for manic-depression, Huntington's disease, chorea, feeble-mindedness, schizophrenia, hereditary bodily deformities, deafness, hereditary blindness, and epilepsy. The Nazis sterilized some 320,000 people between 1933 and 1945.⁹⁵ In 1938, Hitler received a letter from a Mr. and Mrs. Knaver requesting a "mercy killing" of their severely handicapped child. Hitler sent his personal physician Dr. Brandt to examine the child and carry out the killing. Thus began the infamous *Action T-4* euthanasia program.* A committee of doctors was given the task of reviewing cases for euthanasia: the severely mentally ill, the disabled, and coma patients. As many as 5,000 children were euthanized; estimates for adults run as high as 70,000, until protests raised by Bishop August von Galen and the Catholic Church forced Hitler to halt the program temporarily in 1941.⁹⁶

The Nuremberg Laws (September 1935) prevented marriages between Aryan and non-Aryans. The Marriage Health Law (October 1935) outlawed marriage with the "unfit" (physically or mentally). To obtain a marriage license, couples had to provide ancestry going back to the grandparents. They also had to undergo a medical examination.

Germany's leading eugenicists – Fischer, Lenz, Rüdin, and Verschuer – designed many of these policies and wrote numerous laws. They taught many of the doctors and physicians later implicated in the Holocaust. Dr. Josef Mengele, the "Angel of Death," had attended Rüdin's lectures during the 1920s and, for a time, served as Verschuer's assistant during the 1930s.

As reprehensible as German eugenics proved to be, it bears no resemblance to birth control and abortion in America. It also bears no resemblance to birth control and abortion in Weimar Germany. Nazi eugenicists wiped out millions; abortionists in America have wiped out tens of millions, but their motives are completely different. Abortion in America is an elective procedure, consented to for reasons of convenience. Over 95 percent of abortions in 2012 were performed on perfectly healthy women, carrying perfectly healthy babies. This kind of abortion was precisely what the Nazis tried to eliminate, eventually applying the death penalty to abortionists.

True, German eugenicists had dealings with birth controllers, but they opposed them for the same reasons as their American counterparts: differential birth rates. In the Weimar years, the Nazis added

* The name T4 was an abbreviation of Tiergartenstraße 4, the address of a villa in the Berlin borough of Tiergarten. This was the headquarters of Hitler's Gemeinnützige Stiftung für Heil- und Anstaltspflege (literally, "Charitable Foundation for Curative and Institutional Care").

their voices to the chorus of protest calling for the SPD's Marriage Bureaus to be closed down. Yes, Ernst Rüdin did write an article for *Birth Control Review*, as George Grant is keen to point out. However, by the time his article appeared in 1933, Sanger had no control over the publication and therefore wasn't in a position to commission Rüdin to write it. Sanger had named Eleanor Dwight Jones to head ABCL in 1926. The two fought, of course, and Sanger withdrew in 1928, leaving Jones in control of both ABCL and *Birth Control Review*.⁹⁷ Rüdin's April 1933 article encouraged precisely what Sanger had always opposed: greater birth rates for the eugenically "fit." The piece stated this: "Not only is it our task to prevent the multiplication of bad stock, it is also to preserve the well-endowed stocks and to increase the birth rate of the sound average population."⁹⁸

Sanger Visits the Soviet Union

Sanger never travelled to Nazi Germany, but she did visit the Soviet Union in 1934. "I resolved to go to Russia to see for myself what was happening in the greatest social experiment of our age," Sanger wrote.⁹⁹ Led by V.I. Lenin, the Bolsheviks had overthrown the Tsar in 1917. Stalin took power after Lenin's death in 1924, beginning the worst reign of terror in human history.

A pilgrimage to the Soviet Union was practically mandatory for fellow travelers like Sanger. George Bernard Shaw, Nancy and Waldorf Astor, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, the Marquis of Lothian – all went on pilgrimage to the Mecca of Marxism during the 1930s. Almost all returned with glowing accounts. Of his visit, George Bernard Shaw wrote this:

If this great communist experiment spreads over the whole world, we shall have a new era in history. ... If the future is the future as Lenin foresaw it, then we may all smile and look forward to the future without fear. ... Were I 18 years old, I would settle in Moscow tomorrow.¹⁰⁰

Shaw quickly composed a long love letter to Stalin entitled "The Rationalization of Russia" (1931):

Stalin has delivered the goods to the extent that seemed impossible ten years ago. ... Jesus Christ [Stalin] has come to Earth. He is no longer an idol. People are gaining some sort of idea of what would happen if He lived now.¹⁰¹

When Sanger arrived in Moscow, Stalin had just completed collectivization of agriculture, a "great experiment" that involved confiscating the land and grain of peasants and forcing them onto collective farms. Naturally, the peasants resisted. The Bolsheviks resorted to burning farms and grain, shooting and starving peasants. Nearly 10 million people were shot or starved to death between 1931 and 1933.¹⁰² Altogether, about 20 million died during the Stalin era, and 40 million were shipped off to slave labor camps (Gulags) in Siberia.¹⁰³

But Sanger never raised a protest. What concerned Sanger was the possibility that Stalin might fail to complete or might even roll back the birth control-abortion program begun by Lenin in 1921. Russian society was still backward. The Soviets used abortion as a form of birth control, but never made serious efforts to teach women contraceptive techniques.

Sanger met with Dr. Kaminsky, Secretary of the Commissariat of Public Health. Praising the communists' achievements in planning industry, Margaret asked Dr. Kaminsky if they had any plans to control families, asking: "I know you have much freedom for women and a fine technique for abortions. To us that is extremely significant, because after a woman has had an abortion, she returns to the same conditions and becomes pregnant again."¹⁰⁴ Kaminsky reiterated the party line, which didn't satisfy Sanger.

However, Sanger was delighted to see one of her old comrades from her time in Weimar Germany:

By chance I was fortunate enough to encounter again Dr. Martha Ruben-Wolf, who with her husband and children had escaped from Nazi Germany and was then at the head of a Moscow abortorium. ... Any woman in Russia who requested it was entitled to abortion on application to a doctor. ... We talked to about fifty patients who had already been there three days. ... Though some of these women had had five abortions in two years, and one had had eight, they could not sing too highly the praises of their country for allowing the operation.¹⁰⁵

Sanger thought the Soviets put too much emphasis on abortion instead of contraceptives. She thought the emphasis should be reversed.

Apparently Sanger's sojourn to the Soviet Union, history's most murderous regime, doesn't qualify as controversial in the eyes of her pro-life critics, but her half-hour speech to the women's branch of the Ku Klux Klan at Silver Lake, New Jersey, in 1927, they say is the essence of evil and yet more "evidence" of her white supremacist convictions. Unfortunately, this accusation also lacks merit. It's the kind of guilt-by-association politics more commonly employed by their leftist counterparts.

Talking to the Klan today would certainly be the kiss of death for any public figure. But in 1927 it was not unusual for activists like Sanger to accept an invitation to speak to the hooded ones. The Ku Klux Klan was America's largest fraternal organization in the 1920s, with over four million members. It controlled several state legislatures and numerous counties and municipalities. It commanded access to the conventions of both major political parties. It claimed members who served as governors, congressmen, senators, and at least two Supreme Court justices. It was a powerful political constituency, an attractive audience to any politician or activist pushing an agenda.

But this was not a friendly audience for Sanger. The Klan opposed birth control, socialism, and free love. Sanger was entering enemy territory when she went to Silver Lake. In condescending tones, she described her trip as "the weirdest experience I had in lecturing." Sanger looked down at the Klanswomen as ignorant rubes. She wrote this: "Never before had I looked into a sea of faces like these. I was sure that if I uttered one word, such as abortion, outside the usual vocabulary of these women, they would go off into hysteria. And so my address that night had to be in the most elementary terms, as though I were trying to make children understand."¹⁰⁶

Prolifers who cite Sanger's "Klan speech" as evidence of her racism miss the point of her trip to Silver Lake. Sanger went there to encourage the Klanswomen to use birth control, not exactly something you'd expect from someone trying to eliminate "dysgenic races," unless you consider the Klanswomen to be among them.

Triumph of Birth Control

During the Red Scare years of the 1920s, it was risky to be a Red. Reading Sanger's writings from the Harding-Coolidge years, you notice a conspicuous absence of her familiar catchwords, such as "revolution," "socialism," and "workers" – words that littered her earlier writing in *The Woman Rebel* publications. However, the climate of opinion changed in 1933 with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The political pendulum swung radically to the left around that time. The Roosevelt administration welcomed into its ranks an unprecedented number of communists, socialists, and fellow travelers, many of whom were friends of Sanger from her Greenwich Village days. Walter Lippmann made the transition from socialist to respected "liberal" columnist. Samuel Rosenman, sponsor of Sanger's Doctor's Only Bill in New York, now served as the president's advisor and speechwriter. Then

there was former trustee of Sanger's New York clinic Harry Hopkins, who became FDR's closest advisor. And of course there was Eleanor Roosevelt, a former board member of ABCL. Because Roosevelt's political coalition relied heavily on the urban Catholic vote, Sanger's old comrades kept their distance in the early years. But their attitude changed after Roosevelt's re-election in 1936, and after the *One Package* court ruling in the same year.

Federal Judge Moscovitz issued the *U.S. v One Package* (1936) decision. Moscovitz decreed that doctors could now use the mail to send and receive contraceptives, thus nullifying the Comstock Act. In 1937, the American Medical Association ruled that contraceptives qualified as "medicine" and informed its physicians to begin prescribing it. Roosevelt's Surgeon General Dr. Thomas Parran, Jr. endorsed contraceptives in 1941, beginning the long relationship between big government and big birth control. A series of court decrees finally took the issues of birth control and abortion from the states and the people, in violation of the Constitution. *Griswald v. Connecticut* (1962) decreed that a state couldn't deny birth control to married couples; *Eisenstadt v. Baird* (1972) extended that decree to cover unmarried people; *Roe v. Wade* (1973) expanded Griswald's perverted reasoning to cover a woman's so-called right to murder her unborn child through abortion. The Fabian strategy had triumphed.

Sanger's Negro Project

During these years, Sanger was busy with the Birth Control Federation of America, whose purpose was to organize a national network of birth control clinics. These clinics would later form the core of what became Planned Parenthood. Sanger hired Dr. Hannah Stone to run the clinic in New York. In 1936, Sanger helped organize the Negro Project, an initiative to open clinics throughout the South. Author George Grant claims the Negro Project's real purpose was racial genocide:

The entire operation was a ruse – a manipulative attempt to get Blacks to cooperate in their own elimination. The project was quite successful. Its genocidal intentions were carefully camouflaged beneath several layers of condescending social service rhetoric and organizational expertise. ... Soon clinics throughout the South were distributing contraceptives to Blacks, and Margaret Sanger's dream of discouraging "the defective and diseased elements of humanity" from their "reckless and irresponsible swarming and spawning" was at last being fulfilled.¹⁰⁷

No other aspect of Margaret Sanger's career has received as much attention as her Negro Project. The name alone begs for criticism in today's race-sensitive society. Sanger's pro-life enemies take full advantage. You'll find the Negro Project mentioned in countless pamphlets. Quotes related to the project appear in almost every pro-life polemic. But, however painful it is to admit, in nearly every case the quotes are taken out of context and used to distort the real purpose of the Negro Project.

The Negro Project wasn't Sanger's first initiative targeted at black people. She had opened a clinic in Harlem back in 1930, with a \$5,000 grant from Jewish progressive Julius Rosenwald. In addition to believing that birth control allowed women to escape patriarchy, birth controllers like Sanger were convinced that larger families were the primary cause of chronic poverty in the black community. Smaller families would offer black women the opportunity to enter the work force, increasing family income. Since birth control was already available to middle class white women, the idea was to bring the panacea of contraceptives to poor black women as well.

Harlem's black liberal establishment had shared Sanger's sentiments. The *Amsterdam News*, the nation's foremost black daily and the oldest black newspaper in the country, had endorsed the Harlem clinic. Sanger was invited to address the congregation of Abyssinian Baptist Church, Harlem's most influential church. NAACP founder W.E.B. Du Bois wrote an editorial in *The Crisis* condemning the

“fallacy of numbers,” calling the “quality” of the black race more important to its advancement in American society than a high birth rate.¹⁰⁸

Du Bois’ editorial was aimed at one particular segment of Harlem, for not everyone supported the Harlem clinic. The so-called Garveyites vociferously condemned the clinic. These were the followers of Marcus Garvey, the black racist who preached that white people were evil and America was fundamentally a racist society. Garvey called on black people to separate themselves completely from whites and eventually repatriate back to Africa. The Garveyites spread rumors in Harlem that the white liberals who sponsored the clinic came to exterminate the black race. Rather than taking the white man’s poison, black women should have as many children as possible, for sheer numbers are the only way to ensure the black race’s survival in America, the Garveyites contended.¹⁰⁹

Even though a black physician and a black social worker ran the clinic’s day-to-day operations, the Garveyite rumors persisted. The clinic attracted few black women. After a few years, the Harlem clinic was handed over to the Urban League. It lasted a few more years but eventually closed down in 1937. Altogether, the clinic dispensed birth control to over 4,000 patients, half of whom were white.¹¹⁰

Sanger wanted to avoid the same type of situation with the Negro Project. The experience with the Garveyites in Harlem convinced her that the project had to be staffed from the beginning with black doctors and ministers to quash any potential rumors about the motivation of the clinic organizers. This is the contextual origin of the quote that pro-life activists use most extensively. In a letter to Dr. Clarence J. Gamble, a Negro Project organizer, Sanger expressed her concerns about staffing:

It seems to me from experience ... that while the colored Negroes have great respect for white doctors, they can get closer to their own members and more or less lay their cards on the table, which means their ignorance, superstitions, and doubts. They do not do this with the white people, and if we can train the Negro doctor at the Clinic, he can go among them with enthusiasm and with knowledge, which I believe will have far-reaching results among the colored people. ... The minister’s work is also important and also he should be trained, perhaps by the Federation, as to our ideals and goals that we hope to reach. We do not want word to get out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it ever occurs to any of their more rebellious members. [Underlining added]¹¹¹

The underlined portion of the previous quote usually appears alone (sometimes with ellipses), taken completely out of context to make it sound more ominous.

The Negro Project was a piece of left-wing social engineering. It was certainly elitist, but not racist. The project’s utilitarian motives are spelled out in its proposal: “Birth control, per se, cannot correct economic conditions that result in bad housing, overcrowding, poor hygiene, malnutrition, and neglected sanitation, but can reduce the attendant loss of life, health and happiness that spring from these conditions.”¹¹² Wealthy Jewish progressives, Albert and Mary Lasker, funded the Negro Project. The Laskers were personal friends of Eleanor Roosevelt. The First Lady directed them to the project after Sanger inquired about financial support.

The Negro Project’s Proposal includes another sentence quoted extensively in pro-life literature, more “proof” of the project’s racist intentions: “The mass of ignorant Negroes still breed carelessly and disastrously, so that the increase among Negroes, even more than the increase among whites, is from that portion of the population least intelligent and fit, and least able to rear their children properly.”¹¹³ George Grant cites this quote without attribution, an understandable omission once you find out who wrote it. The quote first appeared in an article in *Birth Control Review* written by W.E.B. Du Bois in 1932.

From the pen of some white bureaucrat, the quote would certainly sound racist; from W.E.B. Du Bois, the founder of the NAACP, not so much.

Even though the Negro Project managers were not motivated by racism, there's evidence that the southern public health officials who cooperated on the project were concerned with overpopulation among Negroes. The southern states were the first to offer birth control through their public health programs. It's clear from the documentation that at least some state officials were racially motivated.

But many more southern segregationists adamantly opposed birth control, for the same reasons as the eugenicists. One prominent opponent of Sanger's crusade was Walter A. Plecker, the driving force behind the "One Drop" laws in Virginia. * Plecker wrote a scathing letter to Sanger's ABCL castigating her efforts to legalize birth control:

I believe that Mrs. Sanger and her group have done far more to ruin the future of our country than all other methods combined, unless it is the amalgamation of the white and Negro races, now rapidly in progress. The evidence which I have is that universal adoption of the methods advocated by you has done much to increase immorality among the unmarried. ... You may now be securing the adoption of such measures by the feeble-minded and lower type, but I very much doubt it. You have, however, met with overwhelming success among the higher type. ... [This] will mean their ultimate deterioration, just as it occurred in [ancient] Rome.¹¹⁴

In any event, the Negro Project ended after only five years of operation, its birth control program reaching "proportionally fewer blacks than whites, despite their intentions," Linda Gordon notes.¹¹⁵

From Eugenics to Population Control

After a decade of being rejected by eugenicists, Sanger's crusade finally gained an endorsement from the American Eugenics Society (AES) in 1932. Importantly, the endorsement included a repudiation of the "Johnson Resolution" and its call for differential birth rates. The AES announced its commitment to advancing "hereditary endowments without regard to class, race, or creed."¹¹⁶ Just one year earlier, the AES's founder Henry Fairfield Osborn, the veritable dean of eugenics, had delivered a major attack on birth control at the International Congress of Eugenics in New York. So why the change? The sudden policy shift signaled a changing of the guards, not a change of Osborn's heart. Henry Fairfield Osborn stepped down as head of AES to be replaced by his nephew Frederick Osborn. Frederick held very different opinions from his uncle. His uncle's eugenics had stressed hereditarianism, differential birth rates, forced sterilization, and explicit racialism. Frederick would transform eugenics into population control, advocating policies that were indistinguishable from liberal utilitarianism. He had this to say: "There are social forces at work which, for good or for ill, are in the process of determining the ultimate future of our civilization. These forces are undoubtedly subject to social control and it is our responsibility that they be directed to useful ends."¹¹⁷ Frederick preached the Neo-Malthusian gospel: a reduction in the overall birth rate would improve living standards for everyone, rich and poor, white and black.

* The "one-drop rule" meant that any person with "one drop of Negro blood" was considered black. This rule became law in several states in the 1900s. The rule was adopted in Virginia under the state's 1924 Racial Integrity Act. The rule defined a person as legally "colored" (black) for classification and legal purposes if the individual had any African ancestry. Prior to this time, Virginia law stated that to be defined as mulatto (multi-racial), a person had to have at least one-quarter (equivalent to one grandparent) African ancestry.

Frederick Osborn purged the movement of racialism and repudiated the elitism that had characterized his uncle's eugenics. Osborn said:

Before 1930 eugenics had a racial and social class bias. This attitude on the part of eugenicists was not based on any scientific foundation. It had developed naturally enough of the class-consciousness of Galton's England, and out of the racial problems presented so vividly to the U.S. by great immigration of the early part of the century. The ruling race and ruling class seemed, to members of the ruling race and class, to be evidently superior to the non-ruling races and classes.¹¹⁸

Undoubtedly, the Second World War and the Nazi experience accelerated the transformation. American eugenicists distanced themselves from the Nazis: "Galton's view has been perverted by German race superiority, by irresponsible and unimportant racial agitators in America, and by cranks with various plans for breeding a better race," the *Eugenical News* editorialized.¹¹⁹ By the late 1940s the renovation was nearly complete. Eugenics became genetics. The names of organizations changed: *Eugenical News* became *Social Biology*; the American Breeders Association became the American Genetic Association. The Eugenics Records Office closed down, its vast archive of Family Records on "defectives" was handed over to the American Philosophical Society as useless to science. To this day, Cold Spring Harbor remains the epicenter of genetic research, its past carefully concealed behind the usual excuse: "By the standards of the day." James Watson, the discoverer of DNA, studied there in 1948 and became director of Cold Spring Harbor lab in 1968.

Birth control became part of the population control agenda. In 1942 Sanger's Birth Control Federation of America became Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Once again, Margaret was pushed aside by colleagues who found her impossible to work with. Contrary to Grant's assertion otherwise, Sanger hated the name change: "Family planning for what, for summer vacation?" she scoffed.¹²⁰ To Sanger, birth control had always been a means to liberate women *from* the family, not a tool to plan a better one. Frederick Osborn organized the Population Council and later the Population Association of America. He helped organize and secure funding for International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), formed in 1952, which has been organizing family planning programs in the Third World for over 60 years. At this stage, Margaret Sanger was semi-retired, acting as an ambassador of birth control until her death in 1966.

White Suicide

George Grant's chief claim is that the population control establishment, Planned Parenthood in particular, remains true to its eugenics past, despite the cosmetic changes after the Second World War. He claims that a deep structure exists within Planned Parenthood and the other population control organizations that remains committed to the goal of eliminating the world's non-white populations. This has resulted in a dramatic population decline in the Third World. "In the Third World regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, fertility rates are now declining..." Grant claims. "As a result, the world-wide birth rate is now falling faster than the mortality rate for the first time in history."¹²¹

For the sake of argument, let's assume that Grant is correct. If IPPF is committing racial genocide, then we should see those results. However, we see the exact opposite. Precisely what Charles Davenport and Henry Fairfield Osborn feared would happen has happened. As contraceptives and abortion were made legal, middle class white women used them most consistently, resulting in a rapid population decline in the Western world. At the same time, the non-white populations of the planet have exploded in numbers.

In 1900, Europe and its former colonies – America, Canada, and Australia – controlled about half the planet’s land surface and all of its oceans. Whites accounted for roughly 25 percent of the earth’s population.¹²² By 1960, westerners numbered about 750 million souls. Even after two suicidal world wars, whites still made up some 20 percent of earth’s three billion inhabitants.¹²³

Over the next half century, there occurred the most dramatic demographic shift ever recorded. Between 1960 and 2000, the world’s population doubled, reaching six billion people. However, the number of whites remained mostly static. The increase came almost entirely from the Third World. And this trend is expected to continue. United Nations population projections estimate that another three billion people will be added to the planet by 2050, but again the increase will come entirely from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, shrinking the white share of the population to less than five percent.¹²⁴

Population decline has reached crisis proportions in Europe, where the fertility rates is now 1.4 children per woman. A rate of 2.1 is required to replenish the population. In Catholic Spain, the rate is lowest, at 1.07. If current trends hold, there will be seven percent fewer Europeans in 2050.¹²⁵

While European women are choosing to remain childless, the women of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are giving birth to the future. Guinea-Bissau and Niger have the world’s highest fertility rate: 7.1 children per mother. Mexican mothers come in at 3.0, as do women of India. Middle Eastern women are up to 3.3. About 80 percent of all newborn babes hail from Africa and Asia.¹²⁶ Every 15 months, the Third World adds another 100 million souls to the planet, while the First World fills its rest homes and graveyards.¹²⁷

America has the highest fertility rate among western nations, at 2.1 children per woman.¹²⁸ But a closer look at these numbers reveals that America’s relatively high fertility rate is due to its large non-white population. Look at whites alone, and their fertility rate is only slightly higher than their European cousins.

Switch to birth rates per 1,000 people, and we see the same disparity. The birth rate for black women in America is 14.7 per 1,000, as compared to 12.1 for whites. For Hispanic women, the birth rate is 17.1 per 1,000.¹²⁹

Couple these suicidal birth rates with an estimated two million Third World immigrants crossing our borders every year (some legal, others not), it’s easy to see why America’s white majority is swiftly becoming a minority. As recently as 1960, whites accounted for 87 percent of the U.S. population; blacks for only 10 percent; Hispanics for less than three percent.¹³⁰ Fifty years later, these numbers look different. In the 2010 census, whites numbered 196.6 million, or 64 percent of the U.S. population; blacks rose to 13 percent; but the biggest increase came among Hispanics, who reached 50 million, or 16 percent.¹³¹ Two years later (2012), whites shrank to 62 percent; blacks up to 13.7; Hispanics to almost 19 percent.¹³²

America’s white population is aging rapidly. Although still 62 percent of the population, only 52 percent of all babies under one year old are white. America’s complexion is projected to grow much darker by 2050, when whites will be a minority at 45 percent; blacks up slightly to 14 percent; Hispanics are expected to reach 31 percent; and Asians will round it out at 10 percent.¹³³ In short, white people face imminent extinction unless these trends are reversed.

Why is this happening? There are several causes, but demographers point to the short period between 1963 and 1973 as the tipping point, for in that decade both the “Pill” and legal abortion became widely available to western women. The new forms of birth control were for a new woman, living in a New Republic.

The New Republic Lifestyle

The New Republic combines the liberal ideal of the autonomous individual with the socialist ideal of the nanny state. As individuals have unequal capacities, traditional institutions like the family breed hierarchy, which in turn creates inequality, especially for women. The New Republic cures inequality by replacing the family. It levels the playing field for everyone, curtailing men's strength and compensating for women's weakness. Individuals no longer depend upon the family to survive, the state becomes the provider of last resort. The vital relationship is no longer husband and wife, parent and child; it's individual and state. It is the state that cares for everyone in sickness and in old age. In the New Republic, organic relationships have been replaced by the artificial welfare state, where relationships between individuals are purely a matter of convenience.

For women, the New Republic offers a radical break from her traditional role as wife and mother. The new woman can marry if she wants and divorce at will, but first she must be a class warrior and enter the workforce as a competitor to men. Domestic relationships come second. Birth control gives the new woman freedom from her biology, freedom from being a woman. She can have sex whenever and with whomever she likes, and if she should "accidentally" become pregnant, she can dispose of the unwanted fetus as an inconvenience to her autonomy. It's a lifestyle that offers women choices to become everything they want and fill every role – at the expense of the one role ordained exclusively for women. The new lifestyle enables a woman to overcome pregnancy and childbirth, the very things that make her uniquely a woman.

Putting aside the tremendous moral damage done to the culture, the emotional and psychological damage done to women and men, the New Republic lifestyle is economically unsustainable. To paraphrase Margaret Thatcher: Socialism doesn't work because eventually you run out of other people's money.*

Presently it takes about five workers to cover the retirement benefits of one senior.¹³⁴ As westerners are choosing not to have children and seniors are living longer, maintaining that ratio is no longer possible. More workers are needed to pay for the ever-expanding benefits ("entitlements") of the welfare state. Western politicians are faced with few options:

- (1) Raise taxes, which are already way too high to sustain economic growth.
- (2) Cut benefits, which is political suicide in a democracy.
- (3) Recruit more Third World immigrants, who lack the education and skills to earn high incomes, and many of whom hold values inimical to the New Republic.

* Thatcher made the statement during an interview with journalist Llew Gardner for Thames Television's "This Week" program on 5 February 1976 (a year after Mrs. Thatcher won the leadership of the opposition Conservative Party, and three years before she became prime minister). Gardner asked her questions about the timing of Conservative plans to bring down the majority Labour Party in Parliament. Llew Gardner: "There are those nasty critics, of course, who suggest that you don't really want to bring [the Labour Party] down at the moment. Life is a bit too difficult in the country, and that ... leave them to sort the mess out and then come in with the attack later ... say next year." Margaret Thatcher: "I would much prefer to bring them down as soon as possible. I think they've made the biggest financial mess that any government's ever made in this country for a very long time, and Socialist governments traditionally do make a financial mess. They always run out of other people's money. It's quite a characteristic of them. They then start to nationalise everything..."

(4) Return to traditional values, which the present leadership considers to be unthinkable. Our leaders would rather let Western Civilization crumble than give up trying to build their barren utopia.

International Planned Parenthood Federation

To quote an old saying, the “barbarians are at the gate.” The powers of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America watch the West slowly growing weaker, patiently waiting for their opportunity to pounce. They’re hoping to fill the vacuum of power left after the West retreats from its role as world hegemon. The leaders in Washington, London, and Berlin plan to counter this anti-western aggression by making the Third World more like us, sending them our technology and industry, and being really, really nice.

Part of the foreign aid package is the gospel of the New Republic, the witches’ brew of liberalism, secularism, feminism, socialism, birth control, and abortion. This is the motivation for positioning the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) in the Third World. IPPF is not in Nigeria to decimate the black race, as Grant’s followers claim, or to “promote and enforce white supremacy.” IPPF is there to make African women more like western women: less fruitful, more decadent, in the mold of the New Republic woman.

Western paternalism caused the population explosion in the Third World to begin with. IPPF is simply trying to “fix” that problem. Between 1500 and 1900, Western empires expanded into Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The cultures the Europeans encountered were primitive. The natives had high birth rates, but rampant disease and Stone Age agriculture and constant tribal warfare kept their populations relatively small. The Europeans changed that equation. They introduced modern agriculture and industry, they built roads and railways, and they established the rule of law. They imported into the region education, modern medicine, and vaccination. With disease and tribal war held in check, native populations swelled.

The West dismantled the last of its overseas empires after the Second World War. Part of the process of decolonization involved handing over to the natives the infrastructure of civilization. Results varied. The Asians, for the most part, accepted the gift and used it to modernize their economies. They would eventually transform the gift and use it against their benefactor. When Admiral Perry sailed into Tokyo Bay in 1853, Japan was still a feudal society. But the Japanese have a strong culture. They quickly learned the white man’s secrets. By 1900 Japan had transformed itself into an industrial giant to rival the imperial powers of Europe and America. In 1904 they defeated the Russians in humiliating fashion, beginning an era of military expansion that ended only with the dropping of A-Bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Today, the Chinese are poised to pick up where Japan left off.

The Africans, on the other hand, decided to return to the Stone Age. The history of Africa since decolonization has been one of kleptocratic thugs engaging in tribal wars and stealing the national wealth while their people suffer and starve. The panoply of Western foreign aid to places like the Democratic Republic of Congo is designed to save the natives from themselves; it’s a continuation of the “white man’s burden” begun by missionaries in the colonial era. IPPF’s birth control program is part of that aid package. Unlike the Christian missionaries, the liberal missionaries mistakenly believe that large families rather than primitive cultural norms cause the social chaos in Africa. If the western missionaries wanted only to eliminate black Africans, there’s a much easier way to accomplish this than handing out condoms, IUDs and Plan B. All they need to do is leave!

According to its website (<http://www.wfp.org/>), the U.N. World Food Programme provides food to millions of people in 41 African countries. In addition, millions of Africans live in U.N. refugee camps. The U.N. refugee agency (UNHCR) states the following on its website (www.unhcr.org/):

UNHCR foresees providing protection and assistance for nearly 3.4 million of refugees and asylum-seekers in 2014, compared to some 3.1 million in 2012. Some 5.4 million internally displaced people (IDPs), mainly in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Mali, Somalia and Sudan, will also be in need of protection and assistance. In sum, it is expected that a total of some 11 million people will be of concern to UNHCR in Africa in 2014...

Remove the food aid, call in the IMF loans, shut down the refugee camps, and evacuate Doctors Without Borders, and it's safe to say that a good part of Africa would disappear within a decade. No family planning agency can decimate a population as effectively as the wars, disease, starvation, tyranny, slavery, and violence that endlessly plague Africa.

Planned Parenthood's Hidden Agenda

The birth control movement has never been monolithic, but two ideas have been there from the beginning, and neither one is white supremacy. Those ideas are feminism and Neo-Malthusianism. From the beginning, radical feminists have vied for control against Neo-Malthusian liberals. During the period between 1940 and 1970, when the major population-control organizations took shape, Neo-Malthusians set the agenda. But then the pendulum swung back the other way, and has remained there ever since.

In the late 1960s, militant feminists made the legalization of abortion their number one issue. Feminist historian and bra burner Linda Gordon says birth control finally came into its own "as a woman's right, as a tool for women's advancement, sex equality, and sexual freedom."¹³⁵ The militants organized underground "abortion collectives," such as *Jane* in Chicago (officially known as the Abortion Counseling Service of the Chicago Women's Liberation Union), which provided 11,000 illegal abortions between 1969 and 1973. The ACLU and NARAL, far left-wing groups, helped on the legal front, litigating cases to overturn state abortion laws.

The women who took part in this movement were schooled in the ideology of Kate Millet, Susan Brownmiller, Shulamith Firestone, Andrea Dworkin, and Catherine MacKinnon – all radical feminists whose writings exhibit considerable insanity, but not white supremacy. The radical feminist doesn't only want legal and political equality for women, she believes instead that the entire "role system" must be abolished before women can achieve equality. Radicals believe that, starting in early childhood, females and males are taught to be slaves and slave masters, indoctrinated into accepting their respective "gender roles" of feminine and masculine, brainwashed into believing these culturally assigned roles are based on natural differences. Kate Millet said this:

Sexual politics obtains consent through "socialization" of both sexes to basic patriarchal polities with regard to temperament, role, and status. As status, a pervasive assent to the prejudice of male superiority guarantees superior status for the male, inferior in the female.¹³⁶

The radical feminist believes that men are basically evil. According to Catherine MacKinnon, any sexual act involving a man and a woman is a form of "rape," even though the woman may believe she gave her consent.¹³⁷ There's no such thing as a good marriage. "Marriage is an institution [that] developed from rape as a practice. Rape, originally defined as abduction, became marriage by capture. Marriage meant the taking was to extend in time, to be not only use but possession of ownership," Andrea Dworkin contends.¹³⁸ The family is the fount of oppression in the world, its origins begin with the ownership of women and children. "Patriarchy's chief institution is the family. It is both a mirror of and a

connector with the larger society; a patriarchal unit within a patriarchal unit.”¹³⁹ Given the history of the institution, “The family, as that term is presently understood, must go.”¹⁴⁰

The radical feminist believes the prerequisites of liberation include the “full self-determination, including economic independence, of women (and children); the total integration of women (and children) into all aspects of the larger society; *and the freedom of all women (and children) to do whatever they wish sexually,*” Shulamith Firestone insists [emphasis added].¹⁴¹

The roots of women’s oppression is biological, as a woman’s weakness in child rearing leaves her vulnerable to men. Shulamith Firestone looks forward to the day when technologies of artificial reproduction will allow women to escape the “fundamental inequality of bearing and raising children.”¹⁴² For those women still in bondage to men, birth control and abortion are the means of escape. Linda Gordon says that “birth control represents the single most important material basis of women’s emancipation in the course of the last century – contraception promised the final elimination of women’s only significant biological disadvantage.”¹⁴³ *Birth control and abortion are weapons.* Patriarchy needs women to bare its children. Feminists must take full advantage of this weakness by holding future unborn generations hostage:

Let feminists insist that the conditions for refraining from having abortions is a sexually egalitarian society. If men do not respond, and quickly, they will have indicated that fetal life isn’t so important to them after all, or at least not important enough to give up the privilege of being male in a sexist society. If this makes feminists look bad, it makes men look worse.¹⁴⁴

Those militants who drank the Kool Aid® in the 1960s and 1970s now run the major family planning organizations, as well as the lobbying groups that keep abortion legal. Cecile Richards controls Planned Parenthood; Nancy Keenan runs NARAL Pro-Choice America; Terry O’Neill heads the National Organization of Women; Eleanor Smeal fronts the Feminist Majority.¹⁴⁵ As abortion providers, they see themselves as conductors on an underground railroad guiding young women to freedom over the corpses of their unborn children. If there’s a hidden agenda at Planned Parenthood, it’s that the organization’s Neo-Malthusian “liberal” goals appear much different from the radicalism of its crazed leaders. The world as the radical feminist describes it sounds more like a fictional dystopia in some sci-fi novel. If exposed to the radical feminist’s bizarre worldview, the average person would conclude that these out-of-the-mainstream, sexually ambiguous “women” are dangerously delusional. Feminists find it more expedient to rely on the pro-choice argument, the right of the individual to control her own person and property. Feminists know that most Americans would become alienated if they were told that killing one million unborn babies every year was a necessary part of the class struggle against patriarchy. To support their pro-choice argument, they simply deny the unborn child’s personhood. It’s a fetus, or a part of a woman’s body, or just a cluster of cells. But the pro-choice argument is a ruse. In their writings, the radical feminists clearly acknowledge that the unborn child is a person. In their view, personhood is unimportant because abortion is an act of war against patriarchy, not an issue of personal autonomy. These feminists also support infanticide, the elective killing of infants up to a year old, being indistinguishable in their eyes from abortion. Even though it is the deliberate taking of life, abortion or infanticide is a legitimate response to oppression. Feminist ideologue Naomi Wolf explains: “Sometimes the mother must be able to decide that the fetus, in its full humanity, must die.”¹⁴⁶

Here in a nutshell is the motive for birth control and abortion in the modern world. As a radical feminist, Naomi Wolf has worked tirelessly to provide women the “choice” of abortion as part of the class struggle against patriarchy. But your typical woman who makes that “choice” doesn’t care about patriarchy. Although some women face life-threatening medical complications from pregnancy, by far the average woman has an abortion because she’s “too young,” “too old,” “too busy,” “not married,” or

“too inconvenienced.” There are any number of reasons for her abortion, just as there are any number of men to support her “choice” in return for sex without consequences.

In this day and age, it’s common to attribute all the evil in the world to Klansmen, or Nazis, or conspirators in high places, but evil is often more banal. Women have been murdering their own babies since the dawn of history. It’s an attractive “choice” to the self-centered woman who either naively denies the humanity she’s carrying, or is callous enough not to care. With few exceptions, the typical woman aborts her child because she doesn’t want it, and society lacks the will to stop her.

If the pro-life movement can’t find an argument to defeat that motive, then they don’t have an argument.

IV. RACISM

What Is Racism?

Before weighing accusations of racism, it's important to first define our terms. For most people, racism is the belief that mankind is divided into biologically inferior and superior races, and this belief justifies differential treatment. Refusing to hire a qualified person solely because of his or her race is a clear-cut case of racism. Most people would agree that this type of discrimination is unjust, but it's also very rare these days. There are isolated acts of overt racism: swastikas painted on synagogue walls and use of the N-word are just two examples. But actual instances of large U.S. institutions overtly discriminating against individuals solely on the basis of their race are almost as rare as the appearance of Halley's Comet, unless those individuals happen to be white men negatively affected by affirmative action and its use of racial quotas.

But there's another order of discrimination that the high priests of political correctness call "institutional racism." According to sociologists David Wellman and Paula S. Rothenberg, institutional racism "pervades American culture." Wellman and Rothenberg authored two books – *Portraits of White Racism* (1977) and *Racism and Sexism* (1988) – that helped shape current definitions of racism and sexism as well as other forms of "institutional oppression."¹

According to Wellman and Rothenberg, when Europeans came to America 500 years ago, they erected a hierarchical capitalist society.* People were ranked according to class, race, and sex. Property-owning white men occupied the privileged classes, while those without property, non-whites, and women constituted the subordinate classes. As the privileged class, white men monopolized America's wealth and power, and designed its institutions to protect that monopoly. The generation living today has inherited those same classist, racist, and sexist institutions.

Wellman and Rothenberg see racism not only as individual bigotry but more importantly as a class-based, collective consciousness. "Racism involves the subordination of people of color by white people," Professor Rothenberg writes. As members of the privileged class, only white people can be racist. "While an individual person of color may discriminate against white people or even hate them, his or her behavior or attitude cannot be called racist." Racism requires something more than just bigotry or hatred, "it requires prejudice plus power. The history of the world provides us with a long record of white people holding power and using it to maintain that power and privilege over people of color, not the reverse."²

It is true that the abolition of slavery and segregation ended formal racism. But those reforms had little impact on institutional racism, they claim. The Thirteenth Amendment, *Brown v. Board of Education*, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 outlawed legal inequality. But changes in the law affect only the "superstructure" of capitalist societies, not its economic "base." It matters not whether all men are equal before the law if they are unequal in wealth. Racial inequality rests on a foundation of economic inequality, and that foundation remains fully intact. As long as we maintain a capitalist

* Capitalism evolved from feudalism and inherited social class structures that had been in place for centuries. Capitalism itself does not impose a class system on the people; however, neither does it overthrow existing social classes. Capitalism is defined as an economic system in which trade, industry and the means of production are controlled by private owners with the goal of making profits in a market economy. A purely capitalist economy does not discriminate by class, race, or sex, even though the society in which the economy operates might have such class hierarchies.

economic system, which allows a handful of white men to monopolize society's wealth and power, racism will continue to "pervade American culture."

Institutional racism theory assumes that free will is largely an illusion, that your fate is mostly determined by socio-economic conditions, not choices. You cannot choose whether to be a racist, or the victim of racism, any more than a plant can choose the soil in which it grows. Racism enters your white subconscious at an early age and is "reinforced throughout your life by a variety of institutions and experiences" that come with being a member of the privileged class.³ It reveals itself through a variety of behaviors that are largely unconscious and unintentional. You might think you treat everyone fairly, yet still be a racist. It takes a trained psychologist or sociologist to spot the tell-tale signs of racism. For example, British diversity consultant Anne O'Connor makes her living advising schools on the use of certain colors. Ms. O'Connor insists that using "reactionary colors," such as white drawing paper, can poison young minds and predispose them to racism. She recommends using more greens and lavenders.⁴ In Portland, Oregon, Principal Verenice Gutierrez recently instructed her teachers to stop using the peanut butter and jelly sandwich as an example in the classroom, because it tended to exclude Somali and Hispanic students "who might not eat sandwiches."⁵ In the Children's Research Lab at the University of Texas, a team of psychologists has discovered racism in toddlers. Shown photographs of other toddlers and asked whom they'd most like to have as friends, 86 percent of white toddlers chose toddlers of their own race.⁶ To these researchers, familiarity becomes racism.

Racism often rears its ugly head in so-called "hate crimes," they say. The definition of a "hate crime" follows the deterministic logic of institutional racism theory: whites attacking blacks out of racial animus, or heterosexual males attacking homosexuals, but never the reverse. The perpetrator must be a member of a privileged class while his victim must be one of the oppressed.

Other than latex paint, sandwich condiments, "hate crimes," and babies, we are told that racism reveals itself in disparate impact statistics: higher incarceration rates for non-whites, lower life expectancy, higher infant mortality, and so forth. Disparate impact is not the result of individual white judges or white doctors consciously discriminating against non-whites; it is caused by the institutional structures of the criminal justice system or the medical system, both of which reflect the fundamental economic inequalities that exist between whites and people of color.

Curing America of racism is therefore not a simple matter of changing people's hearts and minds. To end institutional racism, we must change America's institutions. "Any significant attempt to eradicate race, gender, and class oppression will require fundamental changes in the ways that wealth is produced and distributed in our society," Professor Rothenberg says. She argues that a "genuinely egalitarian distribution of wealth and opportunity is essential if we are to create a society in which every individual has the chance to lead a life of health and dignity."⁷

On the individual level, whites must adopt a guilty conscience for the "crimes" committed by their class. In addition, they must learn to accept a whole host of discriminatory policies needed to rectify centuries of oppression. Conversely, non-whites must adopt racial pride and be given preferential treatment through "affirmative action, targeted economic development, set-asides, and income redistribution."⁸ By punishing the oppressor class while rewarding the oppressed, we will eventually create parity. How long will the purge last? As long as it takes to eliminate disparate impact. If blacks are 13 percent of the population, then they should account for only 13 percent of the prison population. The fact that over 50 percent of all state and federal inmates are black is evidence of racism. All things being equal, people should end up with equal outcomes. Any statistical disparity indicates the presence of racism. As 13 percent of the population, blacks should also account for 13 percent of all politicians, engineers, professors, doctors, lawyers, and so on. The same formula applies to all the other

“oppressed” groups as well. The result would be the clearest indicator, they claim, that society is on the right track to eradicating institutional oppression.

Historical Materialism

Social engineers like Wellman and Rothenberg make no secret of the fact that institutional racism theory derives from a neo-Marxist critique of capitalist society. Racism theory evolved from Karl Marx’s original theory of historical materialism. Marx theorized that technological innovation and the division of labor, which produced surplus food and merchandise, led to the class system when the few discovered that they could live off the surplus labor of the many. Civilization took shape around this basic formula of parasitic exploitation. Society divided into classes: the exploiters and the exploited. The exploiters invented private property to monopolize the means of production and pass it along to their heirs. They invented the state to keep the exploited class in subjection, its laws and courts and armies mere instruments of repression. For the individual man, the division of labor “alienated” him from his “species essence.” Man, in effect, became enslaved by the material forces that he created but could no longer control, reduced to a “unit of labor” to be bought and sold like any other commodity. Marx called this process historical materialism:

In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a particular stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society – the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond particular forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the social, political, and intellectual life processes in general. *It is not the consciousness of man that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.*⁹ (Emphasis added.)

History’s driving forces therefore are technology, the productive forces, the technical division of labor, which determines the basic structure of the relations of production, Marx said. Marx referred to this as the “base.” Built on top of the technological-economic “base” is the “superstructure,” especially the state, all organized religion, laws, and customs. The “superstructure” extends over human consciousness itself, as expressed in ideas about morality, religion, philosophy, and art. In other words, all your ideas about right and wrong, God and the Devil, life and death are, in “the last resort,” class determined. The “class consciousness” you were imbued with as a child serves your class’s interests. The exploiter class consciousness, namely those beliefs and practices and attitudes used to keep members of the exploited class in subjection, Marx called “classism.”

Marx wrote, “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.”¹⁰ The exploited are locked in eternal struggle with the exploiters for control of the means of production. Every mode of production develops “contradictions,” which eventually lead to a social revolution. Frederick Engels explains, “Since the exploitation of one class by another is the basis of civilization, its whole development moves in a continuous contradiction. Every advance in production is at the same time a retrogression in the conditions of the oppressed class, that is, the great majority.”¹¹ Every mode of production creates the forces that will ultimately destroy it. New classes develop around the new mode of production, giving rise to new contradictions and another social revolution. So history progresses “dialectically” toward its final form.

In Marx’s day (mid-19th century) the mode of production was early capitalism. European society was roughly divided into the bourgeois (exploiter) classes, those who profit by surplus labor, including industrial and commercial capitalists and land owners; and on the other side, the proletariat (exploited)

classes, the sellers of their labor, wage earners, and small farmers. Marx claimed that contradictions were already developing within capitalism; a social revolution lay just around the corner. To stay competitive, capitalists must improve their efficiency and produce more goods at lower costs. And wages rise even as workers are forced to work longer hours. To combat rising wages, capitalists lay off workers and introduce labor-saving machinery. This tends to lower profits as capitalists cannot exploit the surplus labor of machines. New machines are needed, but technological innovation cannot keep pace. Working conditions worsen as capitalists put more of their capital into production and squeeze every last ounce of labor from the workers. Their wages depressed, the workers cannot purchase the surplus goods on the market, causing more layoffs and a business slowdown (“slump”). Capitalism produces an endless cycle of booms and slumps. Eventually, the slumps become so severe that the overworked, impoverished workers will revolt, first in Western Europe (Germany, England, and France) where the capitalist mode of production is most advanced, then spread across the entire world. The workers in the factories are already situated to seize the means of production. Once accomplished, they will set up a “dictatorship of the proletariat,” whose task it will be to liquidate the last remnant of the bourgeois class. Unlike previous social revolutions, the coming conflagration will be the last. With the means of production now in the hands of the proletariat, all class differences will disappear. Since it was nothing more than an instrument of class oppression, the state will likewise “wither away.” The people will administer the means of production directly. Other than that, there will be no need for laws or government, as crime and poverty will disappear, too. Marx said communism transcends alienation, forever ending the subjection of man by his own works, and man by other men. Under communism, man will finally recover his “species essence” and enjoy true freedom forever and ever. Amen.

Marx and his followers referred to historical materialism as the “laws of history.” It was just like the laws of physics. Predicting the advent of communism was like predicting an eclipse. History was inexorably marching toward communism. Those who recognized this “fact” were said to be on the “right side of history.”

Marx’s predictions never came true. Instead of collapsing under the weight of its own “contradictions,” capitalism went on to produce unprecedented wealth and prosperity, lifting billions of people out of poverty. Working conditions improved, wages increased, and nowhere did revolution occur in the manner Marx predicted, as a spontaneous uprising of the whole working class, followed by an egalitarian Utopia without laws or government.

It was a devastating blow to the true believers when the working class refused to accept its role as history’s chosen people. To the orthodox Marxist, the “laws of history” had elected the proletariat to lead mankind into Paradise. “Scientific socialism,” as Marx called communism, was an emergent of working class consciousness. The revolution couldn’t occur unless the proletariat led it; socialism couldn’t be built unless the proletariat laid its foundation.

In reality, Marxism was a cult of middle class intellectuals. Marx himself never had an extended conversation with an actual worker. He never set foot in an actual factory. He spent his entire life in libraries reading over dry statistics.¹²

Places where communism did take power (Russia, China, the Third World) were invariably technologically backward, the last countries where Marx’s theory predicted socialism occurring. Still in the “feudal” mode of production, these societies first had to develop an industrial capitalist “base” along with a proper proletariat before transitioning to “scientific socialism,” according to the theory. Russian and Chinese “socialism” looked nothing like the egalitarian paradise described in *The Communist Manifesto*. Party elites ruled through terror, secrecy, and propaganda. A philosophy whose stated goal was to liberate mankind from repression and alienation ended up creating the most repressive and alienating societies in history.

One might think that Marxism's practical failure would cause its true believers to renounce their faith. Not so. If the facts of science and history and economics proved Marx wrong, "So much the worse for the facts!" Marxist Georg Lukács said.¹³

After World War I, socialism, formerly an international movement, split into two basic groups: revolutionaries and gradualists. Outside the west, revolutionaries such as V.I. Lenin and Mao Tse-tung went about trying to build socialism through murder and repression, while gradualists in Western Europe and America worked for the piecemeal acceptance of socialism from within capitalist society. We've already examined Fabianism and progressivism, forms of gradualist socialism, how they played a prominent role in the birth control movement. Neo-Marxism was another successful form of gradualism.

Herbert Marcuse, a seminal neo-Marxist thinker, shared Lukács' contempt for the facts. He said we need to get over "fact worship." Marcuse became a prominent figure in the Frankfurt School, a group of German communist academics (Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, Wilhelm Reich) who escaped Nazi Germany in the 1930s and set up a school at Columbia University in New York. During the 1950s and 1960s, Marcuse held teaching posts at Columbia, Harvard, and Brandeis. Marcuse authored several influential books and essays that made him the veritable godfather of an agglomeration of groups and sects identified under the label "New Left." The New Left centered on the students' revolts of the late 1960s and opposition to the Vietnam War.

In *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), Marcuse argues that capitalist society is one-dimensional in all its forms: politics, art, philosophy, morality, and so forth. (In describing the one-dimensional society, Marcuse means primarily America, the nation that gave him refuge from the Nazis.) We have lost the "second dimension," the critical principle, the practice of contrasting the world as it is with the "true" world revealed by the norms of philosophy. The conflict goes back to Plato and Aristotle and their different conceptions of truth. For Plato, the objects of experience are mere "shadows," copies of universal "forms" (concepts). What's "true" and "real" are not the objects of experience, but the universals. Aristotle, on the other hand, confined knowledge to direct experience. Universal concepts are abstractions based on the objects of experience. Plato's belief that the universals exist independently of the objects of experience is a figment of his imagination, Aristotle believed. Aristotle's mode of thought is the basis of logic and modern science, what Marcuse contemptuously refers to as "fact worship."

Marcuse felt that, without the critical second-dimension, we cannot discern "true" freedom, beauty, reason, or justice. And we cannot conceive a "true" society either. What's required is a return to Plato's ontological conception of truth, not empirical truth, i.e., based on the facts, but universal truth, arrived at through pure "intuition." Marcuse's "true" conception of society is, of course, Marx's Utopia, a "society of perfect unity, in which all human aspirations will be satisfied and all values reconciled."¹⁴ Here is the "universal truth" to which all facts must conform, Marcuse says.

Marcuse claimed that logic and science relegated questions of justice to the realm of personal choice. Science has indeed raised living standards, but at a terrible price. "Science, *by virtue of its own method* and concepts, has projected and promoted a universe in which the domination of nature has remained linked to the domination of man."¹⁵ We must invent a new science, one that doesn't bow to facts but serves the liberation of mankind. Facts that don't fit into the "liberationist" narrative serve only capitalism's vested interests.

Marcuse believed that capitalist civilization satisfies material needs but denies "true" freedom. "Most of the prevailing needs to relax, to have fun, to behave and consume in accordance with the advertisements, to love and hate what others love and hate, belong to the category of false needs," Marcuse writes.¹⁶ Material comforts exist solely to distract individuals from the injustice that surrounds

them. "The range of choices open to the individual is not the decisive factor in determining the degree of human freedom, but *what* can be chosen and what *is* chosen by the individual."¹⁷ Consumer capitalism is a vast matrix designed to sedate and control slaves. That the slaves accept the system doesn't make it any more legitimate. Imbued with "false consciousness," the slaves cannot see the chains that bind them.

Marcuse says that liberal reforms only make capitalism stronger as they remove harsher aspects of the system, dampening revolutionary ardor. Either everything or nothing must be changed. We must destroy the very "structure" of reality, so that people can develop their own lives free from the false consciousness foisted on them by capitalism's vested interests.

But who will lead the global revolution when the one-dimensional society has absorbed the majority, especially Marx's chosen working class? As the working class has been bribed into betraying the revolution, Marcuse says we need a new proletariat, a new chosen people to lead us into Zion. Marcuse tells us that "underneath the conservative popular base is the substratum of the outcasts and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colors, the unemployed and unemployable. They exist outside the democratic process.... The fact that they start refusing to play the game may be the fact which marks the beginning of the end of a period."¹⁸

Marcuse's new proletariat consists of racial minorities, criminals, homosexuals, feminists, and the illiterate peasantry of Third World countries. In his day, Marx had referred to these segments of the population as "lumpenproletariat," meaning cut off from the proletariat class, disconnected from the capitalist mode of production, and therefore wholly lacking in revolutionary consciousness. Now Marcuse was anointing them to carry the torch for alienated humanity. It was a fundamental departure from orthodox Marxist doctrine. So also Marcuse's hatred of science and technology (Marx glorified science and technology), and his cult of primitive societies (in which Marx took scarcely any interest) as the source of progress. Later, Marcuse identified white middle class college students as yet another "victim" class! He envisioned the students' revolt, the movement for sexual liberation, black power racists, and Third World "liberation movements" – joining forces to lead what he called a "global transcendence," i.e., a global revolution. The new pantheon of heroes consisted of Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh, Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, Stokely Carmichael, and Cesar Chavez.

How will the revolution be fought? Marcuse discussed tactics in his essays: "Repressive Tolerance" (1967) and "The Problems of Violence and the Radical Opposition" (1970). The struggle must be uncompromising, the object being not to reform the system but to burn it to the ground. Violence is inevitable. Not just physical violence, but violence of criticism, for the enemy must not be debated but rendered mute. Because capitalism afflicts the majority with false consciousness, only those possessing "true" un-mystified consciousness can liberate the majority – from itself.

Marcuse says that capitalism has created ingenious ways to assimilate dissenting voices and turn their criticism into part of the system. Freedom of speech and assembly, democratic institutions, tolerance are the tools capitalism uses to neutralize criticism and maintain the supremacy of capitalist values. In the past, when the Enlightenment struggled against kings and popes, tolerance was a "liberating ideal." But capitalism assimilated tolerance and now uses it to obtain the consent of the majority. With that consensus, it wages imperialist wars (Vietnam) and builds ICBMs. That kind of tolerance is the tyranny of the majority, "repressive tolerance," Marcuse calls it. Institutions and ideas must be judged according to the "whole" social context. Since the "whole" in this case is capitalism, which is evil, tolerance within this social context is evil. Repressive tolerance is indiscriminate, for it allows the market place of ideas to decide the best argument; it tolerates opinions and ideas and movements that ought not to be tolerated, as they are contrary to "liberationist ideals." Liberationist tolerance "cannot protect false words and wrong deeds which demonstrate that they contradict and

counteract the possibilities of liberation.”¹⁹ And the “true” society “cannot be indiscriminate where the pacification of existence, where freedom and happiness themselves are at stake: here, certain things cannot be said, certain ideas cannot be expressed, certain policies cannot be proposed, certain behaviors cannot be permitted without making tolerance an instrument for the continuation of servitude.”²⁰

To prevent the development of false consciousness and to build up the “forces of liberation may require apparently undemocratic means. They would include the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, discrimination on the ground of race and religion, or which oppose the extension of public services, social security, medical care, etc. Moreover, the restoration of freedom of thought may necessitate new and rigid restrictions on teachings and practices in the educational institutions.”²¹

Marcuse tells us plainly which ideas and movements won’t be tolerated in the “new society”: “Liberating tolerance ... would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left.”²²

If Marcuse’s “liberating tolerance” sounds a lot like political correctness, that’s because it is. Professor Linda Rothenberg and David Wellman, both high priests of political correctness, attended college in the late 1960s, where they imbibed the ideology of the New Left. Marcuse was the New Left’s chief ideologue. (Rothenberg lists *One-Dimensional Man* in the recommended reading section of her book.)²³ The New Left radicals never succeeded in pulling off their “global transcendence,” but they did manage to get control of the major universities, entrenching in the humanities and social sciences. They created entirely new departments (black studies, women studies, Asian studies, Native American studies, etc.) devoted to indoctrinating a new generation of revolutionaries. “Hate speech,” speech codes, political correctness – the whole armory of left-wing thought control evolved from concepts first developed by Marcuse and other neo-Marxist thinkers. Concepts such as institutional racism (as well as institutional sexism, ageism, heterosexism, speciesism) were based on the new proletariat identified by Marcuse; the critique follows Marx’s original historical materialism, i.e., “Social being determines consciousness.” Racism exactly mirrors Marx’s concept of classism, first articulated in the late 1840s. The professors teach these tenets to America’s future filmmakers, writers, and journalists who then issue it to the rest of us in the form of films, books, and news stories, all designed to reinforce white guilt and remind us of the debt we owe for 500 years of oppression.

Disparate Impact

As mentioned previously, disparate impact is an aspect of institutional racism theory that refers to the differences in social class metrics such as incarceration rates, life expectancy, infant mortality, and so forth. Disparate impact is said to be caused by the institutional structures of the social systems in place.

After reading a little pro-life literature, it’s clear that the authors have only a superficial understanding of institutional racism theory. Prolifers still believe in such things as free will and individual responsibility; consequently, their literature often seems to imply that certain nefarious individuals in the abortion industry are consciously conspiring to exterminate people of color. This is nonsense, but at least it’s morally consistent.

At other times, though, prolifers use disparate impact statistics, trying to make the case for institutional racism; for example, those billboards in Georgia. As 13 percent of the population, black women should proportionately account for no more than 13 percent of abortions. Instead, they account

for about 36 percent of abortions, nearly three times the expected number. Thus the claim of racial genocide.

The argument is that black women don't choose to kill their own babies – no, a racist socio-economic system chooses for them. The logic is faulty, but it's closer to the contemporary definition of institutional racism. However, it's also painfully obvious that these proliferers don't understand the implications of using the disparate impact argument. Institutional racism theory assumes the guilt of all white people, even those individual whites who consciously decide to side with the “oppressed.”

Guilt clings to white people like original sin and can only be expiated through continual acts of penance. For example, incoming freshmen at the University of Delaware are required to undergo a series of “treatments,” indoctrination sessions designed to inculcate in them an understanding of what constitutes a racist: “A racist is one who is both privileged and socialized on the basis of race by a white supremacist (racist) system. The term applies to all white people (i.e. people of European descent) living in the United States, regardless of class, gender, religion, culture, or sexuality.”²⁴

When white liberals cite disparate impact statistics, use terms like “racial profiling,” or call America a racist country, they're not talking about conscious racism. They're not talking about the actions of individuals. They're referring to a culture of unconscious social conditioning that affects all white people, themselves included. So when proliferers, who are mostly white, use disparate impact to accuse Planned Parenthood of racism, they're actually accusing themselves, or rather the class to which they belong. The very concept of disparate impact is based on the collective, not the individual's free will.

Here's where scientific racism (hereditarianism) and institutional racism theory (utilitarianism) converge. Although seemingly antagonistic, both share common origins in materialism. Both neglect free will and the sanctity of human life. Importance is placed on genes or socio-economic conditions. Scientific racism judges us according to our race, for example: “All blacks are by nature violent.” Racism theory judges us according to our class: “All white people are racist by virtue of their collective consciousness.”

Collective guilt, implicit in racism theory, contradicts basic Christian teachings. As most proliferers claim to be Christians, it's troubling to see them so readily swallow this poison. Christians are supposed to believe in free will and individual responsibility, that persons are accountable for those wrongs that they themselves have committed. Holding persons responsible for the sins of their fathers goes against everything Christianity stands for.

We need only look at that Georgia billboard (mentioned in the Introduction) to see where disparate impact's perverse moral calculus leads. According to the sign, what makes abortion especially heinous is that it kills a disproportionate number of black babies. Thus, abortion is racist. But could high abortion rates among blacks be due to the fact that a disproportionate number of black women choose to abort their unborn babies? No evidence is provided to the contrary. As with most accusations of racism, proof isn't required, for if America is a racist country, guilt has already been established. But what about those white babies, who account for 37 percent of abortions? The sign's implicit message is that their lives are less valuable, since they are after all members of the racist, oppressor class. Only the victim class warrants our concern. This is the danger when conservatives play the institutional racism game.

Years of social conditioning have taught us to accept disparate impact's twisted morality. In order to level the playing field for “historically oppressed groups,” whites are expected to swallow a whole host of lies and discriminatory practices – in schooling, in hiring, in the courts of law, and elsewhere.

Whites must accept that their lives are collectively less valuable and therefore less deserving of society's protection. That's what the sign says, regardless of whether the proliferers realize it.

For the sake of argument, assume that a disproportionate number of white babies were being aborted in this country. Would it then be appropriate to put up a billboard saying "White Children Are an Endangered Species"? The answer is no, even though a stronger case could be made that birth control and abortion have negatively impacted whites far more than blacks, or any other racial group (see section III Birth Control and Abortion). As noted earlier, the black share of the U.S. population is steadily increasing, while the white share is decreasing. Even though blacks have higher abortion rates, they also have very high birth rates, which more than makes up for any population loss due to abortion or to any other cause of premature death in the black community. (Hispanics have even higher birth rates.) The disparity in birth rates between whites and non-whites is even more striking on a global level. Why is this happening? Because white women use birth control far more consistently than women of other racial groups. Black women, on the other hand, use condoms, IUDs, and the "Pill" less consistently, which results in high fertility rates, high birth rates, and yes, high abortion rates.

Liberals use socio-economic oppression to explain away almost any behavior when it comes to people of color. There's no limit to their mendacity. The Georgia billboard employs exactly the same technique.

What's the truth behind disparate impact? Why do so many black women abort their unborn babies? The answer is found in black culture. For abortion is not an isolated instance of statistical disparity in an otherwise healthy black community. Blacks fair worse than other racial groups in every index measuring social pathology. Only 68 percent of black kids graduate from high school, compared to 88 percent of whites.²⁵ Crime statistics are especially troubling. Although less than 13 percent of the U.S. population, blacks commit the lion's share of crime in this country. Fifty percent of all those arrested for murder in 2012 were black.²⁶ Blacks represent over 50 percent of all state and federal prisoners.²⁷ One in nine black men between the ages of 20 and 34 live behind bars.

Liberals would have us believe that disparate impact is evidence of racism, that these young black men are being "profiled," rounded up, and railroaded by a racist criminal justice system. Hence the reason for those astronomical incarceration rates. But once you examine the evidence, it's impossible to escape the conclusion that blacks account for a disproportionate share of the prison population because they commit a disproportionate share of the crime. Look at the facts. In the 2010 census, the white-to-black ratio in the general population was 5.9 to 1. But in the prison population, it was 1 to 1.18. In that year, there were about 1.6 million state and federal prisoners; 499,600 were white and 588,000 were black. To bring the black prison population into line with their percentage of the general population, as liberals suggest, you would have to release 85 percent of black inmates!²⁸ This would leave 84,678 black inmates. Are we to believe that 85 percent of black inmates have been railroaded by a racist system?

Another incredible statistic is the illegitimacy rate among blacks. The ratio in 2012 was 72.1 percent. Compare this to 29.3 percent for whites, and 52 percent for Hispanics.²⁹

Fatherlessness is indeed linked to pathologies like crime and delinquency. Fatherlessness is also directly linked to high abortion rates. Over 85 percent of women who obtained abortions in 2010 were unmarried.³⁰ This stunning statistic includes women of all races, not just blacks. Obviously, the primary reason a woman decides to abort her unborn child is her status as a single woman. Unmarried and without a man to help her raise the child, she decides it is better off dead. Here is the smoking gun to explain those high abortion rates among blacks. The vast majorities of pregnancies in the black community occur between unmarried couples. The result is that 48 percent of black pregnancies end in

abortion, compared with 15 percent of white pregnancies.³¹ Of those black babies who are carried to term, 72 percent will grow up without fathers in the home.

Once again, liberals cry racism. Starting with the famous Moynihan Report (1965)*, liberals have blamed the legacy of slavery and racism for the dissolution of the black family. To support its claim, the Moynihan Report cited E. Franklin Frazier's work entitled *The Negro Family in the United States* (1939). Relying on mostly anecdotal evidence, Frazier claimed that slave masters often sold the strongest young men, thus leaving mostly fatherless families on the plantation. The practice of patriarchy carried over into the post-emancipation era. The Moynihan Report blamed the patriarchal black family for the various pathologies plaguing the black community.

Granted that a father's absence in the home is a key indicator of future trouble, especially for boys; however, blaming his absence from the black family on the legacy of slavery and racism is a big stretch. If Moynihan's hypothesis is correct, then the black family should have grown stronger in the century and a half after emancipation. But the reverse happened. When Moynihan published his report in 1965, the black illegitimacy rate was only 23.6 percent; today it's 72 percent. In 1965, nearly a quarter of black households had no fathers present. Curiously enough, only 10 percent of black households in the rural South lacked fathers.³² Today, nearly three quarters of all black children grow up without fathers in the home. In other words, the black family's dissolution began *after* blacks migrated from the rural South to the northern cities of Detroit, New York, and Chicago. And the process of dissolution has increased exponentially since the 1960s, so unless you argue that America is more racist today than it was in 1965, you must conclude that something other than the legacy of slavery and racism is causing the black family to dissolve.

An honest assessment of disparate impact reveals that the wounds suffered by the black community are largely self-inflicted. The Moynihan Report correctly identified fatherlessness as one of the chief causes of pathology in the black community, but it neglected to explain what all those black men were doing if not taking care of their families. To get a better idea of what's happening on the other side of the tracks, let me introduce you to a neighbor of mine, a black man whom I'll refer to as W___. Serving life sentences in the same maximum security prison, W___ and I have known one another for about nine years. In his mid-50s, W___ has been in and out of prison since he was a teenager – for drug dealing, robbery, kidnapping, assault, and murder. On the streets, he made his money selling crack cocaine and “turning women out,” that is, addicting them to drugs and then using them as prostitutes. W___ never knew his own father. He himself has fathered 25 illegitimate children by eight different women, none of whom he ever supported. To W___, the women he impregnated were “hos,” no more than slaves who were used up and tossed aside when they no longer served his purpose. His illegitimate children, he refers to as “little N---s.” One of his sons is currently serving a 30-year sentence in a Georgia penitentiary for robbery. Another was recently murdered in a drug deal gone bad. Inside prison, W___ has strangled one cellmate to death and raped at least three others. His life is one long record of predation.

Every community has its W___s; the black community contains a disproportionate number. He is the immediate cause of disparate impact, the reason for those high crime rates, high illegitimacy rates, and high abortion rates. Individuals such as W___ do incalculable damage to a community, far out of

* In 1965, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, then Assistant Secretary of Labor, published a report: *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, which focused on the causes of poverty among blacks in the U.S. The study concluded that the breakdown of the family structure was central to the poverty and other problems affecting the black community. The report claimed that this destructive trend could be traced back to slavery and Jim Crow discrimination.

proportion to their actual numbers. Although a minority, the W___s hold the entire black community hostage. They drive the businesses and law-abiding citizens away. They create a culture where life is “nasty, brutish and short,” as Hobbes said.

I hesitate to compare W___ to a caveman because that would insult the caveman. I’m also tempted to blame bad genes, for in fact W___ is intelligent. At chess, W___ has few equals on the cell block. Nor is he the victim of economic deprivation. For W___ and his “crew” made “sky high stacks” of money selling poison to his own people. None of the materialist explanations suffice.

Man is neither a slave to his genes nor his environment. Exercising free will, he can overcome bad heredity and transform a hostile environment. Unlike the rest of creation, man stands apart from nature, much as the materialists try to deny it. Examples abound of individuals overcoming material handicaps to accomplish great things. Even though he was born blind, John Milton learned to write the most vivid poetry. Born poor, Andrew Carnegie worked his way up the ladder to become the richest man in the world. Such exceptional individuals create culture. Over many generations, they build a pattern of knowledge, beliefs, and practices that is then transmitted to succeeding generations.

Materialists correctly point out that the average individual in any society rarely transcends his or her hereditary or environmental limitations. Yes, this is true. But exceptional individuals can and do transcend, and in the process they invent culture that, if successfully transmitted, raises the group average. Culture is the reason why the average Japanese is educated, healthy, and wealthy; while, on the other hand, the average Congolese is illiterate, sickly, and poor. Culture is the reason why the per capita income in El Paso, Texas, is six times that in Juarez, Mexico, just a stone’s throw across the Rio Grande River.³³ And culture is the reason why so many black women choose to abort their unborn babies.

Access to natural resources, historical oppression, climate change – all the various causes the materialists like to cite as the reason why one society succeeds and another fails – are of secondary importance to culture. Like exceptional individuals who transcend their heredity and/or environment, exceptional cultures overcome historical oppression and find access to natural resources. Here again, examples are numerous. Forty years after Admiral Perry sailed into Tokyo Bay bearing the secrets of the Industrial Revolution, Japan, a nation containing few natural resources, transformed itself into an industrial-military powerhouse to rival the nations of the West. The Jews of Europe and the Chinese of East Asia lived for centuries among cultures that oppressed them. Yet through it all they always managed to maintain a level of material culture superior to that of their oppressors.

Culture is another word for character -- the beliefs, values, customs, and way of life of a social group. For the individual, character is destiny. More often than not, a man’s character will determine his fate, rather than the material circumstances in which he finds himself. For a people, culture is destiny. In a nutshell, W___ is the product of bad culture. He embraces a morality that holds robbery, murder, and rape to be “good” things, while deeming hard work, honesty, and fidelity to be “bad” things. He is a menace to society, and quite proud of it. As law and order is the bedrock of civilization, any society must extirpate its W___s as a precondition of progress. But in the black community, W___ is considered a hero. He’s called a “player,” a “pimp,” or “gangsta.” An entire music genre (“gangsta rap”) exists to celebrate his scumbag lifestyle. The neighborhood children emulate him. The adults shelter him. Those who don’t embrace the “gangsta” culture live in fear of him. The black civil rights leadership shifts the blame for his deprivations onto white America. The white liberal establishment slavishly accepts the blame and promptly transfers another installment of guilt money to patch up the wounds W___ inflicts on his community and to care for the dependents left in the rubble of his destructive lifestyle. Here’s the indirect cause of disparate impact, the culture that enables W___ to exist.

Since President Lyndon Johnson launched his “Great Society” in 1965, the welfare state has spent over \$15 trillion³⁴ trying to fix the problems of the inner city, but to no avail. The entire project has increased welfare dependency and supplied incomes to the army of bureaucrats and race hustlers who earn their living in the white guilt industry.

Welfare programs don’t work because they treat only surface problems, when the real problem plaguing black America is culture. But here we confront another tenet of liberalism, i.e., neo-Marxism. For white America cannot tell black America it has a morality problem. That would be “racist.” Liberals call it “blaming the victim.” According to neo-Marxist gospel, blacks are always the victims, no matter the circumstances. When faced with any problem in the black community, we must suspend our rational thought processes and find some way to blame racism. And instead of placing blame where it belongs, the black civil rights establishment uses white guilt to enrich itself. Without the specter of white racism they’d be forced to get real jobs. In this respect, they’re little more than sophisticated versions of W____, hustlers feeding off the misery of their own people.

Civil Rights Movement

Things could have been different. When blacks came up from slavery, they had two paths to choose from: one leading to freedom and prosperity, and the other leading back into slavery of a different sort. Booker T. Washington showed them the first path. With emancipation, blacks now controlled their own destiny, Washington said. Through hard work, thrift, and self-reliance, blacks could enjoy prosperity and independence. In time, blacks will prove themselves the social equal of whites and come to be accepted fully into American society.

Blacks have succeeded in this country only to the extent that they have followed Booker T. Washington. Unfortunately, the black community as a whole went down the second path. And the man who led them into bondage was W.E.B. Du Bois.

As a life-long communist, Du Bois believed that liberty was meaningless without economic equality. Whites dominate American society because they own all the property and capital, Du Bois said. Until there’s a fundamental redistribution of wealth and power (socialism), blacks will forever remain second class citizens, feeding off the “white man’s crumbs.” Castigating Booker T. Washington’s message of self-reliance and capitalism, Du Bois insisted that blacks couldn’t make it on their own. We must sink or swim together, he said. We must stay in ranks until we reach the Promised Land as a people.

Ironically, it was Du Bois rather than Washington who made his people dependent on the “white man’s crumbs.” Du Bois led blacks onto the progressives’ plantation and enlisted them in their revolution. White progressives wholly funded and organized Du Bois’s NAACP. (The same folks who backed Margaret Sanger.) To this day, the NAACP awards its Spingarn Medal to persons who distinguish themselves working for civil rights. The award was established in 1914 by Joel Elias Spingarn, a white progressive who served as Chairman of the Board of the NAACP. Du Bois became Spingarn’s overseer, whose task it was to turn his people into America’s permanent proletariat. Sadly, most blacks remain on the progressives’ plantation, a loyal Democratic voting bloc kept dependent on the dole, still waiting for the socialist dream to materialize.

The socialist dream seems so lovely. But when you awake, you find yourself living in the housing projects of East Berlin or Cabrini-Green, Chicago. Socialism poisons the human spirit and brings out the worst in human nature. Crime, corruption, bureaucratic inertia – all the hallmarks of Soviet communism – flourish today in America’s inner cities, the place where socialism’s promise still holds sway. (America’s Indian reservations are similarly affected.)

The dream didn't come quickly enough for Du Bois. By the late 1940s he was organizing an insurrection on the plantation. Growing impatient with his white masters' gradualist tactics, he wanted the NAACP to endorse a more radical policy. He tried to get the NAACP to back Henry Wallace over Harry Truman in the presidential election of 1948. Wallace, who had once served as Franklin D. Roosevelt's vice president, had broken with the Democratic Party over its increasing hostility toward his beloved Soviet Union. So in 1948 he set up a third party challenge, running on a far-left policy of appeasement. With the Cold War heating up and conservatives making hay over communists in the government, mainstream liberals wanted to distance themselves from communist associations. So they sabotaged Wallace's campaign and forced Du Bois to step aside at the NAACP. Du Bois was defiant: "If you call [supporting Wallace and advocating communist policies and plans] that following the Communist line, I did it, I did follow the Communist line."³⁵ Du Bois was replaced by the more compliant Thurgood Marshall.

Du Bois went into "self exile" to Ghana. Until his death in 1961, he served as a spokesman for international communism. He directed his final salvos at America. He said blacks could never achieve equality in capitalist America. Instead of fighting for civil rights (the "white man's crumbs"), blacks ought to be fighting for the victory of the Soviet Union over America. Thus the father of the civil rights movement ended his reign.

Today the civil rights movement is considered sacred, and Martin Luther King, Jr. is worshipped like a god. Understandably, proliferators want to use King's image to advance their cause. But they should be warned: The civil rights movement occupies a sacred place in the public's imagination only because the liberal-controlled media has put it there. A closer look reveals a movement built upon deceit and emotional blackmail.

Undoubtedly, the movement's original goals were just. Even though they were U.S. citizens, blacks weren't being treated equally before the law in many parts of the country. Someone needed to rectify that injustice. Unfortunately, as we saw with W.E.B. Du Bois, the individuals who took up the cause had goals that went well beyond achieving civil rights for black Americans.

During the Du Bois era, the civil rights movement focused mainly on legal activism, filing lawsuits that challenged Jim Crow laws. But after Du Bois' departure and the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955, the movement took its cause out of the courtroom and into the street. Focus shifted from Thurgood Marshall's NAACP to Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), which began a direct action campaign in the South. The shift in tactics, however, didn't signal a change in philosophy. Socialism would remain the civil rights movement's guiding philosophy.

In the early years (1955-1965), King's SCLC demanded equality before the law, individual rights, and one-man-one-vote – all of which accorded with the Constitution. King spoke eloquently about a future society where his children would be "judged by the content of their character and not the color of their skin."³⁶ By contrasting the inequalities of Jim Crow with American ideals, King won the support of blacks as well as whites.

But soon after the movement achieved its goals – the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 – civil rights leaders began issuing new demands. The new demands, which included group rights, affirmative action, and quotas, directly contradicted the Constitution and the movement's original goals.

There were warning signs during the floor debate over the Civil Rights Act. Several senators warned that Title VII of the act would eventually be used to enforce racial quotas, despite the bill's language to the contrary. Senator Hubert Humphrey, the bill's floor manager, assured his skeptical colleagues that nothing in the act would empower judges or bureaucrats "to require hiring, firing, or

promotion of employees in order to meet a racial 'quota' or to achieve a certain racial balance. ... Title VII prohibits discrimination ... [and] is designed to encourage hiring on the basis of ability and qualification, not race or religion."³⁷

Title VII had been designed expressly to remove race as a category in employment. It expressly forbade an employer "(1) to fail or refuse to hire ... any individual ... because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origins; or (2) to ... classify his employees ... in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities ... because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origins."³⁸ But by 1965, civil rights leaders began demanding precisely what Senator Humphrey had said the Civil Rights Act would never allow.

On November 13, 1966, King outlined the movement's new demands during a strategy session of SCLC: "Even though we gained legislative and judicial victories ... these victories did very little to improve the lot of millions of Negroes in the teeming ghettos of the North." The Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act constitute only "surface changes; they were not really substantive changes. ... The roots of racism run deep in America." The movement must shift its focus from surface changes to substantive changes, "making demands that will cost the nation something" precisely because they get at "class issues." We must face the fact that "something is wrong with the economic system of our nation ... something is wrong with capitalism." That said, the civil rights movement must not allow its enemies to connect it to communism, King warned. Although "Karl Marx had a great passion for social justice," the SCLC must eschew all Marxist labels.³⁹

King returned to the same topic at the SCLC's annual staff conference in Frogmore, South Carolina, on May 21, 1967. The civil rights movement, King said, used to be "a reform movement.... But after Selma and the Voting Rights bill [1965] we moved into a new era, which must be an era of revolution.... We must recognize that we can't solve our problems now until there is a radical redistribution of economic and political power.... This means a revolution of values and of other things We must see now that the evils of racism, economic exploitation, and militarism are all tied together, and you really can't get rid of one without getting rid of the others." In short, "the whole structure of American life must be changed." (Emphasis added.)⁴⁰

King's demand for a "radical redistribution of wealth and power" wasn't new. Like W.E.B. Du Bois, King was inspired by the ideas of Karl Marx, "Brother Marx," as King liked to refer to him. King's closest aides – Stanley Levison and Bayard Rustin – were both committed communists, hardcore activists since the late 1930s. A high-level player, Levison had organized the legal team for the Communist Party officials who were tried under the Smith Act in the late 1940s. He abruptly "quit" the Party in 1953 to help organize the civil rights movement in the South.⁴¹ Rustin's record included former membership in the Young Communist League as well as a 1952 conviction for pedophilia.⁴²

King functioned as the movement's figurehead. Levison and Rustin wrote King's speeches, organized his marches, and designed the overall strategy. In the early days, King and his handlers hid the movement's socialist agenda behind the façade of American idealism. But the strategy from the beginning was to follow each satisfied demand with a new one, until the goal of socialism was finally reached. King took the moral authority the movement won in Birmingham and Selma and used it as an engine of social revolution.

Rustin explained the new direction in an influential article published in *Commentary* (February 1965) entitled "From Protest to Politics: The Future of the Civil Rights Movement." Individual rights, Rustin said, are not sufficient to rectify centuries of oppression. Blacks need government programs designed to benefit blacks as a distinct group. "[The civil rights movement] is now concerned not merely with removing the barriers to full opportunity but with achieving the fact of equality."⁴³ Equality means

a distribution of wealth and power among blacks roughly equivalent to that among whites. To remedy past discrimination against blacks, we must discriminate against whites today. Judging an individual by the “content of his character” won’t cure institutional racism. Whites control the government and the higher echelons of education and business. To level the playing field, we must also give blacks preference in hiring and advancement, even if better qualified whites are passed over.

The civil rights establishment replaced Title VII’s principle of nondiscrimination with “affirmative discrimination” in favor of blacks. (The leaders later changed the name to “affirmative action,” and expanded preferences to include other “historically oppressed groups”: women, the disabled, and other racial minorities.) They likewise distorted Title VII’s definition of “intent.” According to Title VII, federal prosecutors first had to show that an employer *intended* to discriminate before declaring any employment practice unlawful. But by 1967 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which the Civil Rights Act had created to investigate Title VII violations, shifted its focus from cases of intentional discrimination to disparate impact. The EEOC no longer sought to prove that an employer intended to discriminate. The Commission treated “statistical disparity” as evidence of discrimination. If minorities or women were “underrepresented” in certain professions, then discrimination was the cause, the employer’s intentions notwithstanding.⁴⁴

In *Griggs v. Duke Power, Co.* (1971), the Supreme Court’s first Title VII case, the justices accepted the EEOC’s twisted logic. Even though it found that Duke Power had no “intention to discriminate against Negro employees” when the company enacted standards for promotion that included a high school diploma or passing a general intelligence test, the court outlawed the requirements anyway because they disproportionately impacted blacks.⁴⁵ *Griggs* sent shock waves through the boardrooms of America. Companies scrambled to adopt minority preferences in order to guard against EEOC lawsuits. Companies lacking preferences immediately became the target of EEOC investigation.

A similar situation occurred with the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Enacted to protect the individual’s right to vote, regardless of race, the law was soon interpreted by the Supreme Court to mandate representation on the basis of race. By the 1970s, federal judges and bureaucrats were forcing state and local governments to gerrymander “safe” voting districts that would insure the election of black or Hispanic candidates.⁴⁶

The civil rights establishment came to endorse a theory of civil rights that completely contradicted both the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. A movement to end racial discrimination came to support forms of racial discrimination not seen since the enactment of Jim Crow in the early 20th century.

The demand for reparations is the latest and most pernicious permutation of the civil rights agenda. For the “crime of slavery,” civil rights leaders demand not only that blacks receive preferential treatment but be given direct payments in cash. The race hustlers want whites who have never owned a slave to pay reparations to blacks who have never experienced slavery.

Many conservatives contend that affirmative action, quotas, and reparations are perversions of Martin Luther King’s civil rights movement. They argue that, after King’s assassination, unscrupulous individuals gained control of the movement and distorted its original purpose. King would never have supported these redistributive schemes, they claim. Unfortunately, this is not the case. A month before the Senate started debating the Voting Rights bill, Bayard Rustin published his famous article in *Commentary* magazine (Feb. 1965), outlining the civil rights movement’s future agenda. Within a year, King was demanding “fundamental structural” changes and a “radical redistribution of economic and political power.” King explained the new strategy to freelance journalist David Halberstam: “For years I labored with the idea of reforming the existing institutions of the society, a little change here, a little

change there. Now I feel quite differently. I think you've got to have a reconstruction of the entire society, a revolution of values, and perhaps the nationalization of some major industries."⁴⁷

King's marches between 1965 and 1968 emphasized economic redistribution and opposition to the Vietnam War. Up until his assassination in 1968, King was busy planning a second march on Washington, which he named the Poor People's Campaign. The first march in 1963 was organized to support the Civil Rights bill, then being debated in the Senate. King immortalized the movement's supposed ideas in his famous "I Have a Dream" speech. Unlike the first march on Washington, the Poor People's Campaign wasn't going to the capitol to "have a nice day," King said.⁴⁸ King planned to seize control of Washington, D.C. and force Congress to pass legislation guaranteeing \$30 billion in annual redistribution programs targeted at racial minorities and the poor. King would lead waves of protesters to halt traffic and occupy key government buildings. "The city will not function," King warned, until Congress approved "a massive program on the part of the federal government that will make jobs and income a reality for every American citizen."⁴⁹

Even his communist handlers Levison and Rustin expressed concern about King's increasing recklessness. As veterans of the Smith Act trials of the late 1940s, both understood the potential for an anticommunist backlash. They counseled King to stick to their gradualist program. King's campaigns against segregation in the South had won the movement widespread support among the white middle class. If King went ahead with his Poor People's Campaign, he risked losing that support. King ignored their warnings: "Call it what you may, call it democracy, call it democratic socialism, but there must be a better distribution of wealth within this country for all of God's children."⁵⁰

King's criticism of the Vietnam War likewise threatened to jeopardize the movement's support among middle class Americans. Of America's commitment to protect South Vietnam from communist aggression, King thought "there can be no question that we've [America] taken a stand against a people seeking self-determination."⁵¹ The "people seeking self-determination" were the communist Vietcong guerrillas. To a packed audience in Los Angeles, King said America was "engaged in a war that perpetuates white colonialism." He accused U.S. troops of "committing atrocities equal to any perpetrated by the Vietcong."⁵² He repeatedly compared America's methods in Vietnam to those of the Nazis. In the summer of 1967, King took part in an anti-war demonstration in New York City. He led a procession from Central Park to the United Nations, marching alongside a contingent of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) waving communist Vietcong flags.⁵³

This is the civil rights legacy Alveda King, Catherine Davis, and Father Frank Pavone want the pro-life movement to embrace, for they employ the same hyperbole and false accusations. Davis claims Planned Parenthood is engaged in "genocide" against the black race, deliberately "targeting" black neighborhoods with clinics. Conjuring up images of burning crosses, Alveda calls abortions "womb lynchings."⁵⁴ And they issue the same blackmail demands. Alveda, Catherine, and Father Frank insist that Planned Parenthood pay reparations for almost 50 years of abortion genocide. Reparations would go *only* to the black community. Whites, Hispanics, and Asians need not apply.

For its part, the pro-life establishment is only too happy to have these race hustlers on its side, especially one bearing the hallowed name of "King." Pat Robertson, Flip Benham, Glenn Beck – all have endorsed Alveda and her black genocide nonsense. They casually overlook or ignore the lies and injustice implicit in this type of activism. Conversely, the civil rights establishment looks upon Alveda as an embarrassment. It has no intention of breaking its long-standing alliance with the feminists and their abortion-centric agenda.

So who better represents the civil rights legacy: Alveda or Al Sharpton? I hate to break it to Alveda, but her late uncle Martin was a great fan of Margaret Sanger and her birth control movement. In

1966, Martin Luther King, Jr. graciously accepted the Planned Parenthood Federation of America Margaret Sanger Award. In his acceptance speech, entitled “Family Planning – A Special and Urgent Concern,” King praised Sanger’s legacy:

There is a striking kinship between our movement and Margaret Sanger’s early efforts. She, like we, saw the horrifying conditions of ghetto life. Like we, she was a direct actionist – a nonviolent resister. She was willing to accept scorn and abuse until the truth she saw was revealed to the millions. At the turn of the century she went into the slums and set up a birth control clinic, and for this deed went to jail because she was violating an unjust law. Yet the years have justified her actions. She launched a movement which is obeying a higher law to preserve human life under humane conditions. Margaret Sanger had to commit what was then called a crime in order to enrich humanity, and today we honor her courage and vision; for without them there would have been no beginning. Our sure beginning in the struggle for equality by nonviolent direct action may not have been so resolute without the tradition established by Margaret Sanger and people like her. Negroes have no mere academic nor ordinary interest in family planning. They have a special and urgent concern.⁵⁵

Here, King said he owed a profound debt to the “tradition established by Margaret Sanger and people like her.” In other words, King and Sanger shared the same revolutionary “tradition.” The birth control movement and the civil rights movement are separate fronts of the same social revolution. The same “people” (progressives) who organized Sanger’s crusade helped organize his.

Naturally, some proliferers still object to my line of argument, regardless of the facts about the civil rights movement. They claim there’s a “good” civil rights movement and a “bad” civil rights movement. Furthermore, they claim that racial arguments, like that Georgia billboard, are necessary in order to broaden the pro-life constituency. Right now, pro-life is a white conservative movement, they say. To be successful at the ballot box, we must attract more minorities. They point to opinion polls suggesting that a majority of blacks and Hispanics are pro-life. Who knows what would happen if we geared our message more toward minorities. Enlist Alveda King, invoke Dr. King’s legacy, call people “racists,” and maybe minorities will start to vote for pro-life politicians, they claim.

Think about what they’re really saying. As noted earlier, racial preferences are manifestly unjust. Since the late 1960s, racial preferences have become an integral plank in the Democratic Party’s platform. Sadly the vast majority of non-whites in this country vote Democratic precisely because they benefit from racial preferences. So naturally, any appeal to win over that constituency would have to be put in similar terms, i.e., that Georgia billboard. Here’s the pitch: You black folks ought to oppose abortion because it kills an awful lot of your racial brothers and sisters. But of course, those other abortions don’t count. Proliferers might as well send out flyers to the Ku Klux Klan pointing to the large number of “Aryan” babies killed by abortionists.

In any event, their racial pandering likely won’t pay off at the ballot box. Despite their “pro-life” convictions, as expressed in opinion polls, minorities do not vote pro-life. In the 2012 election, minorities overwhelmingly supported Barack Obama, probably the most pro-abortion president in U.S. history: 93 percent of blacks voted for Obama; 71 percent of Hispanics; 69 percent of Jewish voters; 74 percent of Asians.⁵⁶ Apparently, the lives of millions of unborn Americans take second place to the prospect of having a black president and the preferences doled out by the Democratic Party.

Institutional racism theory is a Marxist lie, a polemical weapon used to accomplish social revolution. This raises the larger question: why sully the purity of the pro-life message with Marxist lies?

Especially when the truth is the best defense against lies. Abortion is wrong because it kills a human being, regardless of race, sex, or class.

It's true that the liberal anti-racism agenda holds the political high ground today. For decades, liberals have used the racism cudgel to pummel their conservative enemies. Understandably, proliferers would like to turn the tables on the liberals and club them with their own weapon. But they've made a fundamental miscalculation.

The political high ground is not always the moral high ground. Millions of decent Americans oppose the institutional racism agenda but dare not speak up for fear of being branded a racist. They understand that the current civil rights leadership is not interested in equality before the law, but instead wants a fundamental redistribution of wealth and power, a shakedown that will last indefinitely. They look at professional race hustlers like Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton as nothing more than con men. They see the fundamental injustice of what has been called "affirmative action," and refuse to accept collective responsibility for things that happened a hundred years ago. These same Americans are the pro-life constituency.

Therein lies the danger: by using racial arguments, proliferers threaten to alienate their only supporters. The American people want leaders who will stand up to the race hustlers, not bow before their false idols and parrot Marxist lies. With courage in their convictions, proliferers will prevail because they have truth on their side.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, abortion is not part of a plot to exterminate people of color. Nor was Planned Parenthood “self-consciously organized ... to promote and enforce white supremacy,” George Grant’s claims notwithstanding. Two ideas have dominated the birth control movement, and neither one is white supremacy. Neo-Malthusianism and feminism have been the movement’s guiding ideas from the beginning. Believing that populations tend to outrun their food supply, Neo-Malthusians insist that artificial birth control will curtail over-population and lead to a better quality of life. Utopians among them believe birth control will eventually eliminate such perennial social problems as war, crime, and poverty. Feminists, on the other hand, see birth control as a strategic weapon in the ongoing class war between women and men. Originating in the anarchist-socialist tradition, radical feminists oppose traditional sex roles and institutions like marriage. They believe birth control neutralizes a woman’s “biological disadvantage” to man and allows her to finally escape the patriarchal oppression. The radicals among them advocate free love, rejecting all exclusive sexual relationships.

Although she paid lip service to the Neo-Malthusian gospel, Margaret Sanger was drawn toward anarcho-feminism from a very young age. She hated the Catholic Church, blaming its social doctrine for perpetuating the oppression of women. She abandoned her own husband and children in order to pursue the free-love lifestyle among the “Wantley Circle.” Under the tutelage of such cultural vandals as Havelock Ellis and H.G. Wells, she began her assault upon the world. To Sanger, as well as Ellis and Wells, birth control wasn’t just a tool for controlling over-population; it was the *sine qua non* of a New Republic, and the key to personal spiritual enlightenment.

But politics is the art of the possible. When Sanger began her birth control crusade in the decades after World War I, the American people weren’t exactly amenable to anarchism, socialism, free love, and contraceptives. Although popular among the Bohemians in Greenwich Village, such ideas were anathema in Peoria. To succeed in 1920s America, Sanger had to eschew radical politics and sell birth control under the label of middle class reform. Eugenics seemed like a convenient solution. At the time, eugenics was popular among America’s educated professional class. If Sanger could convince the eugenics establishment that birth control offered a cure to “dysgenic” population growth, the issue might bypass the democratic process entirely. In the hands of judges, doctors, and bureaucrats, birth control could be imposed on America by judicial fiat or bureaucratic decree.

Sanger embraced eugenics only so far as it upheld her socialist view of the world. Early on, she associated large families with poverty, unemployment, drunkenness, child and spousal abuse, and the Catholic Church. She blamed most of these social ills on the capitalist system, which itself rose from the family wherein the man was master, and women and children were his property. While Sanger did endorse negative eugenics to prevent child bearing among the diseased and afflicted, her true mission was to liberate women from patriarchal subjugation. Birth control and abortion were the means to this end. Freed from the bondage of motherhood, women would join the workforce, gain financial autonomy, and embrace their “love” nature separate from their maternal nature.

Among the eugenics movement were individuals like Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard, who espoused scientific racism. Even though Sanger opportunistically sought their political support, she never shared their beliefs. For ten years, Sanger courted Charles Davenport and Henry Fairfield Osborn, America’s leading eugenicists, but was consistently rebuffed. The bone of contention was differential birth rates.

Between 1880 and 1920, demographers started noticing a decline in population among America’s Anglo-Saxon upper and middle classes, even as birth rates among the lower classes remained high. During the same period, some 20 million immigrants arrived in the U.S. from eastern and southern

Europe. Eugenacists wanted to reverse this trend toward what they called “race suicide.” So they advocated differential birth rates: higher rates for those they deemed most “fit,” and lower rates for the “unfit.”

Sanger emphatically opposed differential birth rates, insisting instead that birth control be made available to *all* women. The leading eugenacists saw through Sanger’s game. Eugenics without differential birth rates is not eugenics at all. Davenport and Osborn recognized that if Sanger had her way, and contraceptives were made legal, educated upper and middle class women would use it most consistently, resulting in an even more precipitous population decline among the “fit.” Consequently, they used their power and influence to prevent any sort of an alliance with Sanger’s organization.

If her relationship with American eugenacists was tenuous, Sanger’s connection to Nazi eugenacists was non-existent. In the chaos following Germany’s defeat in World War I, the Socialist Party (SPD) came to power and subsequently dominated the period between the world wars known to history as the Weimar Republic. Part of its Marxist program included setting up Marriage Bureaus, whose task was to administer a national network of birth control clinics. For the first time in German history, birth control as well as abortion were made available to women of all classes. Margaret Sanger twice visited Weimar Germany during this period. She developed extensive contacts with the SPD and modeled her own organization in New York on the SPD’s Marriage Bureaus.

But when the Nazis took power in 1933, they closed the Marriage Bureaus, outlawed birth control, and eventually instituted the death penalty for doctors caught performing illegal abortions. Sanger expressed horror when the Nazis dismantled the existing birth control programs and enacted instead their own system of “racial hygiene.” Sanger later toured the Soviet Union’s abortion program in 1934, but she never visited Nazi Germany.

As it turned out, Sanger’s flirtation with eugenacists in the 1920s was unnecessary. She didn’t need their help. The election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 shifted politics to the left. Many of Sanger’s former comrades from the radical Greenwich Village days found key positions in the Roosevelt administration. Birth control was gradually introduced to American society through judicial fiat (*One Package*, 1936) and bureaucratic decree (Surgeon General Parran’s endorsement, 1942), as Sanger wanted.

Neo-Malthusianism was a powerful influence on the population control organizations created in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Nevertheless, feminism became the driving force behind birth control and abortion in the late 1960s. Feminists made legal abortion their single issue. Those feminists who pushed the abortion-centric movement now control the major population control organizations (Planned Parenthood) and women’s rights groups (NOW) responsible for keeping abortion legal. Their radical ideology evinces considerable insanity, but not white supremacy.

But I suppose the real proof is in the pudding. Birth control and abortion have been legal for almost half a century. If birth control-abortion were really part of a plot to eliminate “dysgenic” races, then we should see those results. But we see the opposite. Precisely what Davenport and Osborn predicted would happen has happened. Since the 1960s, when the “Pill” and legal abortion became widely available in the West, the white share of the world’s population has declined dramatically. Birth control and abortion have had their greatest impact on America’s and Europe’s upper and middle classes. The more money and education a woman has, the less likely she is to reproduce.

Meanwhile, the world’s non-white population has exploded. Every 15 months, the Third World adds another 100 million people to the planet, while the First World fills its rest homes and graveyards. Although black women in the U.S. have very high abortion rates, they also have very high birth rates, which makes up for any population loss due to abortion. As a result, the black share of the U.S.

population continues to grow, while the white share continues to shrink. Moreover, the high abortion rate among blacks is directly linked to fatherlessness and high illegitimacy rates, not to Planned Parenthood's targeting the black community.

These days, charges of racism have become all too common. With regard to abortion, it's a losing argument. An honest appraisal of George Grant's racial genocide argument reveals a conscious attempt to recast the pro-life message in the mold of the civil rights movement. For years, pro-life activists like Grant have fought abortion using the personhood of the unborn child to make their case. But despite their best efforts, they've largely been ignored. Meanwhile, the liberals get whatever they want. All they have to do is evoke the politically correct victim's narrative (black slavery or Jim Crow segregation, women's liberation or Nazi Germany), mouth the magic words – "racism," "sexism," "Holocaust" – and presto, they receive their heart's desire. Understandably, proliferers want to emulate the liberals' success. Grant and a growing number in the pro-life movement feel they must racialize their message in order to attract attention. Call Planned Parenthood "racist," and maybe people will listen. But to make their case they must tell lies, just like liberals. From start to finish, the racial genocide argument is based on shoddy research, quotes taken out of context, guilt-by-association journalism – all standard weapons in the liberal arsenal.

Prolifera who rely on the racial genocide argument are making fundamental mistakes. First, telling lies tarnishes the pro-life message. What distinguishes pro-life from "pro-choice" is moral integrity: One is the truth, the other a lie. Abortion is wrong not because it kills a disproportionate number of black babies; it's wrong because it kills human babies, regardless of race, sex, or color.

Defining abortion as reproductive health, proponents claim it as a human right – indeed, an imperative. This is a bold claim in light of the holocaust that unfolds daily inside our abortion clinics. Abortion is wholesale, equal opportunity, race-blind murder.

The innocent babies are easy targets. They have no power, no voice, and following *Roe v. Wade*, no basic human rights. The true argument for the pro-life movement begins with the answer to this question: is human life worth protecting?

Putting aside the immorality of lying, there are serious practical problems that proliferers need to consider. Using racial arguments can only backfire. Pro-life activists have no chance of driving a wedge between feminists and civil rights activists, as both are partners in the same social revolution. And liberals will never let proliferers ride the civil rights bus, not even in the back. Moreover, by adopting the political correctness pose, proliferers threaten to alienate their own supporters.

As noted in Section IV Racism, racial political correctness is a Marxist lie. The anti-racism agenda is nothing but a weapon used to intimidate political opponents. Today's civil rights establishment resembles George Orwell's Thought Police. Millions of Americans recognize this. They decry the politically correct stranglehold on our culture, but they don't dare say anything for fear of being called racist. These same folks are the pro-life supporters. Rather than risk alienating their supporters, pro-life leaders should stand up to the Thought Police as well as the abortionists.

Prolifera shouldn't lose hope. Although liberalism seems invincible at the moment, it's actually quite weak. Liberalism violates natural law in fundamental ways, and therefore it cannot form the basis of a viable culture. It poisons the culture, leaving the nation vulnerable to attack. If there's a "right side of history," it's that strength overcomes weakness, health replaces decay. Liberalism is rot. It will inevitably collapse. The only real question is who will replace it. Will liberalism collapse as a result of foreign attack? Or, will the healthy, conservative elements within Western Civilization reassert themselves, reclaiming their place as Charlemagne's rightful heirs.

GLOSSARY

ABCL

American Birth Control League. Margaret Sanger created this organization in 1921 as an alternative to the National Birth Control League (NBCL). The league promoted the founding of birth control clinics. Sanger resigned as president in 1928. The league eventually merged with another group to form the Birth Control Federation of America, which in 1942 was renamed Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

AES

American Eugenics Society, a big tent organization that gathered together the movement's various factions.

Birth Control Review

A periodical that Sanger began publishing in February of 1917. She initially entrusted its day-to-day operations to fellow socialist Frederick Blossom. She handed over control to Eleanor Dwight Jones in 1928.

Cold Spring Harbor

A research facility established by Charles Davenport on Long Island, funded by the Carnegie Foundation, to advance the field of eugenics. Cold Spring Harbor started publishing *Eugenical News* in 1916. In the early days, Davenport and his staff mostly bred plants and animals with the object of finding the basis for breeding humans. They later began to catalog human individuals and families emphasizing "the value of superior blood and the menace to society of inferior blood." Davenport was a negative eugenicist, with the ultimate goal of removing "unfit" carriers from the national gene pool.

disparate impact

Refers to the differences in social class metrics such as incarceration rates, abortion rates, life expectancy, and so forth. Disparate impact is said to be caused by the institutional structures of the social systems in place.

ERO

Eugenics Records Office, established by Charles Davenport to compile family records and to take a census of America's defective population. Davenport hired a lawyer Harry Laughlin to organize the ERO's field work.

Fabian socialism

A movement in Britain whose adherents believe that an "educated, scientifically-minded elite" could engineer a socialist society through gradual reform. In America, Fabian socialism became known as progressivism.

Family Limitation

A pamphlet written by Margaret Sanger in 1914, in which she urged working class women to stop populating the nation with children to be exploited by the capitalist system.

institutional racism

Refers to the social institutions that the privileged class (white men) allegedly designed to protect their status. Some claim that institutional racism is intrinsic to our capitalist system. Institutional racism theory evolved from Karl Marx's ideas that our social class determines our consciousness and therefore our actions.

IPPF

International Planned Parenthood Federation, formed in 1952 for the purpose of organizing family planning programs throughout the world and especially in the Third World.

IWW

Industrial Workers of the World, also known as the "Wobblies." The Wobblies believed that if workers organized one General Strike, capitalism will collapse overnight. They called on workers to immediately seize the means of production.

KPD

Communist Party of Germany (*Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands*). This group vied for control with the German socialists (SPD).

marriage bureaus

Agencies created by the SPD in Germany during the Weimar Republic. Marriage Bureaus opened dozens of birth control clinics.

NBCL

National Birth Control League, founded in 1915 by Mary Dennett. Dennett's supporters were mostly upper middle class club women, all progressives, but excluded far-left radicals. The organization's rival was the American Birth Control League, founded by Margaret Sanger.

Negro Project

An initiative by ABCL to open birth control clinics throughout the South. Some people claim the Negro Project's real purpose was racial genocide. No other aspect of Margaret Sanger's career has received as much attention among the pro-life movement as her Negro Project.

Neo-Malthusian

A movement based on the belief that contraceptives would not only control the population growth, but would create the conditions for a perfect society, eliminating war, hunger, crime, and poverty.

Planned Parenthood Federation of America

Originally named the Birth Control Federation of America, whose purpose was to organize a national network of birth control clinics. These clinics would later form the core of what became Planned Parenthood.

progressivism

In the United States, a broad reform movement that originated in the 1890s to address issues related to modernization, such as the growth of large corporations and railroads. Progressives want to transform government from a limited agency dedicated to securing individual liberty to one whose role ever expands to address all perceived social and economic injustices. Progressives are similar to socialists in their beliefs that government can and should engineer society toward its declared ideal, and that the

state supersedes all individual rights. The *New Republic* periodical became the main organ of progressive thought in the U.S., and is still one of the most important journals on the Left today.

scientific racism

The belief that mankind is divided into superior and inferior racial and ethnic groups.

Socialist Party

In America, the party originally led by the moderate socialist Eugene Debs. Other nations in Europe had their own version of the Socialist Party.

Society for the Suppression of Vice

Founded by Anthony Comstock, who succeeded in convincing Congress to pass the so-called Comstock Act in 1873.

SPD

Social Democratic Party of Germany (*Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands*), Europe's oldest Marxist party.

The Call

The official newsletter of the Socialist Party. After an initial run, the post office began seizing copies of *The Call* under the Comstock Act.

The New Republic

An essay written by H.G. Wells in 1901 in which he described his socialist utopia. Wells predicted that nations would eventually merge into a one-world state, making war, poverty, crime, and oppression things of the past. In 1915, a group of progressives started publishing a journal by the same name. The term "New Republic" also refers to a system of world governance.

The Woman Rebel

A newsletter created by Margaret Sanger in 1914.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

- ¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Surveillance Summaries, Vol. 62, No. 8 (Nov. 29, 2013) Abortion Surveillance – United States, 2010
- ² *USA Today* (May 3, 2010) 9A
- ³ George Grant, *Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth and Hyatt Publishers, Inc., 1988), 92
- ⁴ CDC, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Surveillance Summaries, Vol. 62, No. 8 (Nov. 29, 2013)
- ⁵ Margaret Sanger, *Woman and the New Race* (Lexington, KY: Hard Press, reprint 2010 from the 1920 edition), 96
- ⁶ Margaret Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization* (New York: Bretano's Publishing, 1922) 29
- ⁷ Grant, *Grand Illusions* 57
- ⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 93
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, 35

EUGENICS

- ¹ Francis J. Galton, quoted in Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race* (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003) 18
- ² Adam Smith, quoted in Robert L. Heilbroner, *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*, 7th ed. (New York: Touchstone, 1953, 1999) 20
- ³ Thomas Hobbes, *On Body* (1655), quoted in Richard H. Popkin, e.d. *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999) 350
- ⁴ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651), quoted in Popkin, e.d. *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy* 348
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ Thomas Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798), cited in Linda Gordon, *Woman's Body, Woman's Right: Birth Control in America*, 2nd ed. (New York: Penguin Books, 1976, 1990) 75
- ⁷ Thomas Malthus, quoted in Angela Franks, *Margaret Sanger's Eugenic Legacy: The Control of Female Fertility* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 2005) 130
- ⁸ Charles Darwin, quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 12
- ⁹ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe without Design* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1987) 126-127
- ¹⁰ Claude Helvétius, *De l'Esprit* (1758), quoted in Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990) 125-129
- ¹¹ Jeremy Bentham, *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789), quoted in Vernon J. Bouke, *History of Ethics Vol. II: Modern and Contemporary Ethics* (Mt. Jackson, Va: Axiom Press, 1968) 4
- ¹² Francis J. Galton, quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 28
- ¹³ Victoria Woodhull, *The Rapid Multiplication of the Unfit* (1891), quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 22

- ¹⁴ Charles Davenport, *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics* (1911), quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 74-76
- ¹⁵ Carl Linnaeus, quoted in Popkin, *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy* 510
- ¹⁶ David Hume, "Of National Characters," quoted in Popkin, *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy* 511
- ¹⁷ Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1784), quoted in Popkin, *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy* 513
- ¹⁸ Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920) 165
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 167
- ²⁰ Madison Grant, *Passing of the Great Race* (1916), quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 29-30
- ²¹ Letter, Harold Laski to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., quoted in Franks, *Margaret Sanger's Eugenic Legacy* 183
- ²² Letter, Charles Davenport to John S. Billings (May 3, 1903), quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 37-38
- ²³ Black, *War Against the Weak* 39
- ²⁴ Willet M. Hays, "Constructive Eugenics," *The American Breeders Magazine*, Vol. III, No. 1 (1912), quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 39-40
- ²⁵ Black, *War Against the Weak* 52-53
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 57-59
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 251
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 67
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 68
- ³⁰ Letter, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. to Sir Frederick Pollock (Feb. 1, 1920), quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 120
- ³¹ Letter, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. to Harold J. Laski, quoted in Black, *War Against the Weak* 120
- ³² *Buck v. Bell* 274 U.S. 200 (1927)

BIRTH CONTROL AND ABORTION

- ¹ Margaret Sanger, *My Fight for Birth Control* (1931), cited in Ellen Chesler, *Woman of Valor: Margaret Sanger and the Birth Control Movement In America* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 63
- ² *Ibid.*
- ³ *Ibid.*, 27
- ⁴ Miriam Reed, *Margaret Sanger: Her Life In Her Words* (Fort Lee, NC: Barricade Books, 2003), 333
- ⁵ Margaret Sanger, cited in Ellen Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 155
- ⁶ Margaret Sanger, *Woman and the New Race* (Lexington, KY: Hard Press, reprint 2010 from the 1920 edition), 53
- ⁷ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 300-302
- ⁸ Margaret Sanger, *My Fight for Birth Control* (1931), cited in Ellen Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 28
- ⁹ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 41
- ¹⁰ Margaret Sanger, "Memoir," cited in Miriam Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 6
- ¹¹ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 51

- ¹² Margaret Sanger, *The Autobiography of Margaret Sanger*, (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 1938, 2004), 69
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 70
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 75
- ¹⁵ Leszek Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism*, trans. and ed. P.S. Falla, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978, 2005), 202-206
- ¹⁶ Mikhail Bakunin, *Statehood and Anarchy*, cited in Kolakowski, *Main Currents*, 206
- ¹⁷ Georges Sorel in *Reflections on Violence* (1908), cited in Kolakowski, *Main Currents*, 475-495
- ¹⁸ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 162
- ¹⁹ Albert S. Lindemann, *A History of European Socialism*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983) 41
- ²⁰ Margaret Sanger, *The Call* (March 9, 1913), cited in Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 29-30
- ²¹ William Sanger, quoted in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 91
- ²² Margaret Sanger, *The Woman Rebel* (March 1914), cited in Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 44-46
- ²³ *Ibid.*
- ²⁴ Margaret Sanger, *The Woman Rebel* (July 1914), cited in Linda Gordon, *Woman's Body, Woman's Right: Birth Control in America*, 2nd ed. (New York: Penguin Books, 1976, 1990), 221
- ²⁵ Emma Goldman, quoted in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 86
- ²⁶ Frederick Engels, *The Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, trans. Ernest Untermann, reprint (Chicago: Theophania Publishing, 1884, 1902, 2013), 59
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 76
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 77
- ²⁹ Margaret Sanger, *Family Limitation* (1914), cited in Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 52
- ³⁰ Sanger, *Autobiography*, 207
- ³¹ Sanger, "A Defense of Assassination," *The Woman Rebel*, July 1914, cited in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 102
- ³² *Ibid.*, 102-103
- ³³ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 112-117
- ³⁴ Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, cited in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 112-117
- ³⁵ Sanger, *Autobiography*, 140-141
- ³⁶ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 135
- ³⁷ Margaret Sanger, quoted in Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 140-145
- ³⁸ Margaret Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization* (1922), cited in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 209
- ³⁹ Margaret Sanger, quoted in Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 140-145
- ⁴⁰ Margaret Sanger, quoted in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 186
- ⁴¹ *Proceedings of the Free Convention, Rutland, Vermont*, July 25-27, 1858 (Boston: J.B. Yermington, 1858), 9
- ⁴² Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 211
- ⁴³ Kolakowski, *Main Currents*, 830; "Ten Years of Legalized Abortion in the Soviet Union," *American Journal of Public Health*, (September 1931), p 1043

- ⁴⁴ Havelock Ellis, quoted in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 122
- ⁴⁵ H.G. Wells, *The New Republic* (1901), cited in Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006), 305-306
- ⁴⁶ Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 258
- ⁴⁷ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 144
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 320
- ⁴⁹ *Casti Connubii: Encyclical of Pope Pius XI on Christian Marriages*, (1930) sections 68-70
- ⁵⁰ Sanger, *Autobiography*, 211
- ⁵¹ Margaret Sanger, *My Fight for Birth Control* (1931), cited in Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 89
- ⁵² Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 258
- ⁵³ Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 95
- ⁵⁴ William A. Donohue, *The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988) 139
- ⁵⁵ Margaret Sanger, *Women and the New Race*, 4
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 8-9
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 18-23
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 30-31
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 41
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 53
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 71-72
- ⁶² *Ibid.*, 75-77
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*, 97
- ⁶⁴ Margaret Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization* (New York: Bretano's Publishing, 1922) 29
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 105
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 116-117
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 101-102
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*,
- ⁶⁹ Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization*, cited in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 209
- ⁷⁰ Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 139
- ⁷¹ Theodore Roosevelt, quoted in Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 136-142
- ⁷² "Eugenics vs. Birth Control," *Eugenical News*, Vol. II (1917), 73, cited in Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race* (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003) 135
- ⁷³ Letter, Charles Davenport to Margaret Sanger (November 1921), cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 136
- ⁷⁴ Letter, Charles Davenport to Margaret Sanger (February 13, 1925), cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 136
- ⁷⁵ "Johnson Resolution," Sixth International Neo-Malthusian and Birth Control Conference (1925), cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 136-137
- ⁷⁶ Margaret Sanger, "Editorial," *Birth Control Review*, Vol. IX, No. 6 (June 1925), 163-164, cited in Black, *War*

Against the Weak, 137

⁷⁷ Sanger, *Autobiography*, 386

⁷⁸ Letter, Paul Popenoe to Madison Grant, (April 13, 1928), cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 139

⁷⁹ Letter, Madison Grant to Leon Whitney, (April 5, 1928), cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 139-140

⁸⁰ Letter, Charles B. Davenport to Leon Whitney, (April 15, 1928), cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 140

⁸¹ Henry Fairfield Osborn, "Birth Control Peril to Race Says Osborn," *New York Times*, (August 25, 1932), cited in Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 306

⁸² George Grant, *Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth and Hyatt Publishers, Inc., 1988), 57

⁸³ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993), 255

⁸⁴ Lisa Pine, *Hitler's 'National Community': Society and Culture in Nazi Germany* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2007), 75

⁸⁵ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 261

⁸⁶ Sanger, *Autobiography*, 389

⁸⁷ Pine, *Hitler's 'National Community'*, 76

⁸⁸ "Point 21 of National Socialist Programme," cited in Pine, *Hitler's 'National Community'*, 76

⁸⁹ Josef Goebbels, quoted in Pine, *Hitler's 'National Community'*, 69

⁹⁰ U. Fevert, *Women in German History: From Bourgeois Emancipation to Sexual Liberation* (Oxford, 1987), 213

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 231

⁹² Sanger, *Autobiography*, 389

⁹³ Pine, *Hitler's 'National Community'*, 70

⁹⁴ Fevert, *Women in German History*, 231-233

⁹⁵ Niall Ferguson, *The War of the World: The Twentieth-Century Conflict and the Descent of the West* (London: Penguin Press, 2006), 264

⁹⁶ Pine, *Hitler's 'National Community'*, 89

⁹⁷ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 240-241

⁹⁸ Ernst Rüdin, "Eugenic Sterilization: An Urgent Need," *Birth Control Review* (April 1933), 103-104, cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 301-302

⁹⁹ Sanger, *Autobiography*, 433

¹⁰⁰ George Bernard Shaw, quoted in Ferguson, *The War of the World*, 198

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 198-199

¹⁰² Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (London, 1990), 130

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 472

¹⁰⁴ Sanger, *Autobiography*, 449

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 450

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 366-367

¹⁰⁷ Grant, *Grand Illusions*, 93

¹⁰⁸ W.E.B. Du Bois, quoted in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 296

- ¹⁰⁹ Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 221
- ¹¹⁰ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 296-297
- ¹¹¹ Letter, Margaret Sanger to Clarence J. Gamble, (December 10, 1939), cited in Reed, *Margaret Sanger*, 223
- ¹¹² Negro Project, "Proposal," cited in Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 388
- ¹¹³ W.E.B. Du Bois, "Black Folks and Birth Control," *Birth Control Review* (1932), Vol. 22 No. 8, cited in Angela Franks, *Margaret Sanger's Eugenic Legacy: The Control of Female Fertility* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 2005) 40-41
- ¹¹⁴ Letter, W.A. Plecker, M.D., State Registrar of Vital Statistics, Virginia State Board of Health, to Mrs. Anne Kennedy, ABCL (February 10, 1926), cited in Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 331
- ¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 351
- ¹¹⁶ Chesler, *Woman of Valor*, 343
- ¹¹⁷ Frederick Osborn, quoted in Franks, *Sanger's Eugenic Legacy*, 101
- ¹¹⁸ Frederick Osborn, "Eugenics and Modern Life: Retrospect and Prospect," *Eugenical News* (September 1946), Vol. XXXI, 33, cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 418
- ¹¹⁹ "Eugenics in England," *Eugenical News* (September 1945), Vol. XXX, 36, cited in Black, *War Against the Weak*, 418
- ¹²⁰ Franks, *Sanger's Eugenic Legacy*, 37
- ¹²¹ Grant, *Grand Illusions* 35
- ¹²² Ferguson, *The War of the World*, 641
- ¹²³ Patrick J. Buchanan, *The Death of the West* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002), 12
- ¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 12-14
- ¹²⁵ "World Population Prospects: The 2000 Revision Highlights" (February 28, 2000) United Nations Population Division, cited in Buchanan, *The Death of the West*, 11-13
- ¹²⁶ Pew Research Center, cited in *Newsweek* (October 19, 2009), 56
- ¹²⁷ Buchanan, *The Death of the West*, 14
- ¹²⁸ *Newsweek*, (October 19, 2009), 56
- ¹²⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Vital Statistics Report, Vol. 62, No. 9, Births: Final Data for 2012
- ¹³⁰ Center for Strategic and International Studies, "The Graying of the Great Powers," cited in *Newsweek* (January 26, 2009), 76
- ¹³¹ U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey (ACS), 2012, one-year estimates. Population estimates for 2012 based on unpublished tabulations.
- ¹³² *Ibid.*
- ¹³³ *Newsweek*, (January 26, 2009), 76
- ¹³⁴ Buchanan, *The Death of the West*, 22
- ¹³⁵ Gordon, *Woman's Body*, 403
- ¹³⁶ Kate Millet, *Sexual Politics* (New York, 1970), 42
- ¹³⁷ Catherine MacKinnon, "Roe v. Wade: A Study in Male Ideology," cited in Pojman and Beckwith, *The Abortion Controversy: Twenty-Five Years After Roe v. Wade* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1998), 398

¹³⁸ Andrea Dworkin, *Pornography: Men Possessing Women* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1981), 9

¹³⁹ Millet, *Sexual Politics*, 49

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 226

¹⁴¹ Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), 206-209

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

¹⁴³ Gordon, *Woman's Body*, xvii

¹⁴⁴ Sally Markowitz, "A Feminist Defense of Abortion," cited in Pojman and Beckwith, *The Abortion Controversy*, 394-398

¹⁴⁵ Time (January 14, 2013), 43

¹⁴⁶ Naomi Wolf, "Our Bodies, Our Souls," cited in *The New Republic*, (October 16, 1993)

RACISM

¹ Paula S. Rothenberg, *Racism and Sexism: An Integrated Study* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988) and David M. Wellman, *Portraits of White Racism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)

² Rothenberg, *Racism and Sexism* 6

³ *Ibid.*, 7

⁴ *National Review* (Oct. 17, 2011) 18

⁵ *National Review* (Nov. 11, 2013) 10

⁶ "See Baby Discriminate," *Newsweek* (Sept. 14, 2009)

⁷ Rothenberg, *Racism and Sexism* 350

⁸ *Ibid.*, 375

⁹ Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859), cited in Leszek Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism*, trans. and ed. P.S. Falla (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978, 2005) 275

¹⁰ Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), cited in Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism* 187

¹¹ Frederick Engels, cited in Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism* 284-285

¹² Paul Johnson, *Intellectuals: From Marx to Tolstoy to Sartre & Chomsky* (New York: Harper's Row, 1988) 60-61

¹³ Georg Lukács, "Tactics and Ethics" (1919) cited in Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism* 999

¹⁴ Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism* 1206

¹⁵ Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964) 166

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 5

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 7

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 256-257

¹⁹ Herbert Marcuse with P. Wolff and Barrington Moore, Jr., *A Critique of Pure Tolerance* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967) 102

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*, 114

- ²² *Ibid.*, 122-123
- ²³ Rothenberg, *Racism and Sexism* 348
- ²⁴ *National Review* (Dec. 3, 2007) 10
- ²⁵ *Fox News Channel* (Aug. 27, 2014)
- ²⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) *Crimes in the United States, 2012*; Table 43A
- ²⁷ *National Review* (Aug. 19, 2013)
- ²⁸ *National Review* (Aug. 19, 2013)
- ²⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Vital Statistics Report, Vol. 62, No. 9, Births: Final Data for 2012
- ³⁰ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Surveillance Summaries, Vol. 62, No. 8, Abortion Surveillance – United States, 2010
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Policy Planning and Research, *The Negro family: The Case for National Action* (1965) reprint (University of Michigan Library) 6
- ³³ Patrick J. Buchanan, *The Death of the West* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002) 128
- ³⁴ Cato Institute, *Policy Analysis*, No. 694 The American Welfare State (April 11, 2012)
- ³⁵ W.E.B. Du Bois, quoted in Juan Williams, *Thurgood Marshall: American Revolutionary* (New York: Random House, 1998) 168
- ³⁶ Martin Luther King, Jr., "I Have a Dream," quoted in James T. Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996) 484
- ³⁷ Senator Hubert Humphrey, quoted in Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges of America's National Identity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005) 147
- ³⁸ Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, quoted in Huntington, *Who Are We?* 147
- ³⁹ Martin Luther King, Jr., quoted in David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: Harper Collins, 1986) 545
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 504
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 195
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, 66
- ⁴³ Bayard Rustin, "From Protest to Politics: The Future of the Civil Rights Movement," *Commentary* (Feb. 1965), cited in *The Negro Family* 27
- ⁴⁴ Huntington, *Who Are We?* 148
- ⁴⁵ *Griggs v. Duke Power Company*, 401 U.S. 424 (1971)
- ⁴⁶ Huntington, *Who Are We?* 150
- ⁴⁷ Martin Luther King, Jr., interview with David Halberstam, quoted in Garrow, *Bearing the Cross* 562
- ⁴⁸ Martin Luther King, Jr., quoted in Garrow, *Bearing the Cross* 582
- ⁴⁹ Martin Luther King, Jr., quoted in Garrow, *Bearing the Cross* 579
- ⁵⁰ Martin Luther King, Jr., quoted in Garrow, *Bearing the Cross* 427

⁵¹ Martin Luther King, Jr., interview for *Stride Toward Freedom*, quoted in Taylor Branch, *At Canaan's Edge: America In the King Years 1965-68* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006) 395

⁵² Martin Luther King, Jr., speech (Feb. 25, 1967), quoted in Garrow, *Bearing the Cross* 545

⁵³ Garrow, *Bearing the Cross* 556-557

⁵⁴ *USA Today* (May 3, 2010) 9A

⁵⁵ Martin Luther King, Jr., "Family Planning – A Special and Urgent Concern," quoted in Miriam Reed, *Margaret Sanger: Her Life In Her Words* (Fort Lee, NJ: Barricade Books, 2003) 225

⁵⁶ NEP Exit Poll, Edison Research, *CNN* (Nov. 7, 2012)