

August 1994

## Personhood, Contraception and Population Control

Mary Shivanandan

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>

---

### Recommended Citation

Shivanandan, Mary (1994) "Personhood, Contraception and Population Control," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 61: No. 3, Article 8.  
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol61/iss3/8>

# Personhood, Contraception and Population Control

by

Mary Shivanandan, MA, STL  
Adjunct Faculty

John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage & Family

---

There are two ways in which the contraceptive and population control movements devalue the person. First by destroying the integrity of the person and, as a result, the interpersonal relationship of marriage, and second, by their approach to the social problem of population. This paper will deal primarily with population control.

The paper is not designed to give a comprehensive account of the population control movement but to highlight certain key aspects to show how both the values publicly promoted and the methods adopted to achieve their goals have diminished the person. According to a Christian personalist view of man, the person is a whole in himself and as such can never be treated simply as a part of society. Jacques Maritain has applied the philosophic distinction made by St. Thomas between individuality and personality to evaluate contemporary materialist philosophies. A social philosophy that ignores man's spirit leaves him with only material individuality and not true personality. Either anarchy takes over or such a philosophy reduces the person to a mere number, an economic statistic or a racial or ethnic entity.<sup>1</sup>

John F. Crosby explains the difference in approach to the human being in terms of numbering. The quantitative relations of larger and smaller are so merely because of comparison with other numbers. For example, 5 can become larger by being compared to 3 and 6 becomes smaller when compared to 12. If a very large number is reduced by 1 nothing much seems to have changed quantitatively. But "persons are not subject to these laws of numerical quantity." In their material individuality, they are subject to numerical quantity but in the transcendence of their personhood they are not. No single human being can be relativized in the presence of another human being. Both are of equal worth. Crosby says that if we are to speak of persons in terms of numbers, it is more fitting to speak of them in terms of infinity so that one numerical infinity is added to another infinity. Paradoxically to add one infinity to another both adds infinitely more and yet adds nothing because each person has a certain "absoluteness" of being. Because of the transcendent nature of the human being, to subject persons to the laws of finite

numerical quantity, is to relativize them.<sup>2</sup>

Amos H. Hawley, in an essay on the relationship of population and society, notes that "to get at the substance of population in its purest form it is necessary to strip away from a community of mankind its institutional clothing, its accumulation of knowledge and opinion and its technological hardware — all that is subsumed under culture, thereby exposing it as merely an assemblage of biological creatures."<sup>3</sup> He further makes the point that population change is basically a biological process while changes in society are a "matter of communication." In attempting to examine the relationship between population and society, Hawley finds a root of the difficulty in conceptualization. Population is conceptualized solely in terms of numbers yet the significance of population does not stem simply from numbers but from diversification of activities, distribution of goods and where the society's energies are applied.<sup>4</sup> In other words there is a basic distinction between thinking about man in terms of numbers and in terms of his personhood.

### Malthusianism and Eugenics

Two movements developed in the 18th and 19th centuries which treat persons as numbers, Malthusianism and Eugenics. They differ in that the Malthusians desire to decrease the total number of people born while the eugenists desire to limit mainly the fertility of the poor and the unfit. Eugenics, however, grew out of the Malthusian movement. Darwin, for example, was influenced by Malthus in forming his evolutionary theory of the "survival of the fittest." At the end of the 19th century, the Malthusians sought to apply evolutionary principles to the improvement of the human species and Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton, coined the term "eugenics."<sup>5</sup> According to the definition given in the *Eugenics Review*, "Eugenics is the study of agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations, whether physically or mentally."<sup>6</sup>

Francis Galton published *Hereditary Genius* in 1869 in which he made the transition from anthropology to anthropometry.<sup>7</sup> He insisted on "a multitude of exact measurements relating to every measurable faculty of body or mind," and declared that "until the phenomena of any branch of knowledge have been submitted to measurement and number it cannot assume the status and dignity of a science."<sup>8</sup> He invented the correlation coefficient which became the base of the modern mathematical theory of statistics. Galton's biographer, Karl Pearson evaluated the importance of this innovation by saying: "Formerly the quantitative scientist could only think in terms of causation; now he can also think in terms of correlation. This has not only enormously widened the field to which quantitative and therefore mathematical methods can be applied, but it has at the same time modified our philosophy of science and even of life itself."<sup>9</sup> The key principle of Galton's thought, according to his biographer was that "the course of human evolution can be guided by the intelligent action of the human will." When mass contraception became available it was seen to open "a new perspective in eugenics."<sup>10</sup>

Margaret Sanger and Marie Stopes, birth control pioneers, were both eugenists



in their thinking and allied themselves with the eugenic movement.<sup>11</sup> From early in the 20th century there was an alliance between the feminists, the Malthusians and the sexual radicals (in practice sexual anarchists). The sexologist, Havelock Ellis was a disciple of Francis Galton as well as a mentor for Margaret Sanger. British feminist, Stella Browne, owed her sexual radicalism to the writings of Havelock Ellis on the psychology of sex. She was involved in divorce law reform in 1914 and in 1936 was one of the founders of the Abortion Law Reform Association. Throughout the 1920s she assisted the Malthusian League in South London to make contraceptive methods known to workers. Stella Browne retained her socialist ties while advocating contraception. The communists were initially suspicious of contraception for fear it would distract the workers from social revolution. Lacking a Marxist or socialist theory to clarify the relationship between class exploitation and the sexual division of labor, eugenic ideas of preventing the unfit from reproducing prevailed. At the same time fear of being overrun by "inferior" races motivated the ultra right.<sup>12</sup> While retaining some values in common, there was a divergence of short-term goals between the feminists and the population control movement. Feminists, on the one hand, favored family planning clinics to assist poor women to "take control of their reproductive lives" and on the other, the Malthusians were more interested in overall reduction of population.<sup>13</sup>

Demographic research became the tool of the eugenicists. Francis Galton proposed to make eugenics a recognized subject, and by 1913 courses flourished at Columbia, Wisconsin, Brown and Northwestern University.<sup>14</sup> Francis Amasa Walker, the director of the 1870 census was increasingly disturbed by the findings which showed differential fertility rates between the immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe and native American women. He complained that the foreigners had "shocked" the native-born into infertility.<sup>15</sup> In the early 20th century, several research institutes were founded to study population problems, among them the Office of Population Research at Princeton University, and the research division of Milbank Memorial Fund. The first project of the latter was to analyze the differential fertility in the 1910 census by social class. It was this nativist fear that fueled the American eugenics movement, led by Charles B. Davenport, Harry Laughlin and Paul Popenoe.<sup>16</sup>

There were, however, dissenting voices in the 1930s concerning the "solution" to the population problem. Raymond Pearl, Johns Hopkins geneticist, attributed the fertility differential to contraceptive use, not to any innate biological differences. He referred to birth control as "biological dynamite, fraught with potential for good or evil." Later Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish sociologist, warned that birth control "had become a truly serious peril, threatening the survival of Western society." In 1946 a French committee on population concluded that parental instincts are not powerful enough in human beings to ensure survival of the species *after contraception has severed them from their sexual precursors.* Members of the committee feared that "universal knowledge of contraception might be followed by race suicide."<sup>17</sup>

It is also important to note here the different view of the "population problem" taken by the anthropologists. Susan C.M. Scrimshaw cites an impressive list of



anthropologists who dispute the idea that "human population growth has been influenced by a random series of events." Most societies have regulated births by various cultural means as well as by abortion and infanticide and warfare. Few societies procreate to their maximum potential and it is erroneous to single out only one demographic transition, that from the preindustrial to the industrial era. Such transitions have occurred throughout history.<sup>18</sup> Anthropologists, as the name implies, treat of society and culture as a whole and man in his transcendent as well as his biological dimension.

### **Population and Contraceptive Programs**

Kurt Back, a demographer and sociologist himself, states that a demographic study in Indianapolis was motivated by fear of the decline of the Protestant population in the face of immigration from Southern Europe. A survey question on contraception was considered too private but a question on the number of desired children was included. This study stimulated interest in fertility research by a group of demographers and sociologists skilled in survey techniques. Social psychologists were also recruited.<sup>19</sup>

Following World War II, concern over overpopulation in Asia and the Caribbean led to new demographic studies and attempts to influence the rate of increase. Kurt Back candidly states that the data collection studies initiated by the Population Council (the first such organization established by the Rockefeller Foundation to concentrate exclusively on the population question) later were used as arguments for population control.<sup>20</sup> The Population Council had two arms, a biomedical which pioneered studies of the reproductive system as well as research into new contraceptives and a population arm which concentrated on statistical data collection methods and promotion of family planning. Once overpopulation had become a valid political issue, contraception became socially acceptable. The population controllers envisaged a "kind of social engineering" to meet the global peril of overpopulation "By making population stabilization a public concern, they were inviting unprecedented change," says Back, "and they knew it."<sup>21</sup>

When it was seen that merely making contraceptives available was not going to solve the problem, the aim changed from providing contraception on an individual basis to spreading the use of contraception "for the common good of society."<sup>22</sup> A new contribution from the social and behavioral sciences was needed to meet this goal "to induce people to change their desires to have children."<sup>23</sup> Puerto Rico and Jamaica became "laboratories" for the first large-scale attempts to change fertility patterns.<sup>24</sup> They were made the subjects of a deliberate social experiment that was to drastically change their family life in order to achieve a goal they themselves had not chosen. Kurt Back, who was part of the research team in Puerto Rico with Rueben Hill and J.M. Stycos, commented on the relationship between ideology and research. "With more funds available for research on family planning and population control, the choice of topics for study and major support for it became more than a neutral theoretical question." Research was not limited to simple data collection but expanded to include "theories and methods of influence, group pressure, mass



media effects, learning and attitude change." All of which led to "appropriate action."<sup>25</sup>

In fact the initial study in Puerto Rico "included features of possible programs promoting family planning."<sup>26</sup> A pivotal study, it encouraged others to undertake large-scale research projects in family planning. Back admits that the results enabled policy-makers to promote family planning.<sup>27</sup> It is pertinent here to quote the statement of a United Nations working group convened in Singapore in 1967 to consider aspects of family planning:

For family planning programs to succeed (people) must change values and behavior deeply rooted in biological nature and strongly supported by social sanctions . . . . (Family planning administrators) must provide the knowledge on which new practices can be based, and they must stimulate the creation of new social norms to institutionalize the innovative behaviors they introduce and promote. To achieve their purposes family planning programs must communicate — both widely and well.<sup>28</sup>

The Puerto Rican study identified the three components necessary for an individual to practice family planning successfully, a desire to limit or space births, a family structure conducive to family planning and contraceptive information. Armed with this knowledge, research moved towards establishing and evaluating effective programs. "From this," writes Back, "it was only a small step to active promotion of family planning and the search for effective incentives for compliance."<sup>29</sup>

The 1960s and 1970s saw a new generation of Malthusians. Paul Erlich, a biologist, coined the term "*population bomb*" and another biologist, Garrett Hardin "*spaceship earth*." (These views were countered in 1981 by an economist, Julian Simon). A revival of feminism and its campaign for the legalization of abortion represented both an opportunity and a danger for the contraceptive movement, according to Back, because of the controversy it aroused. Margaret Sanger had already incorporated abortion referral into her birth control clinic in New York and Malcolm Potts, international population expert, had frankly acknowledged that no country had reduced its population without recourse to abortion.<sup>30</sup> Teenage pregnancy has also provided a challenge for the movement. As a result of the Puerto Rican experiment it was recommended that contraceptive education be taught in the schools as the most effective place to introduce an innovative behavior. Back notes the contradictions such a policy generated, including a re-labeling of yesterday's sexual delinquent as today's "sexually active teenager." In order to keep pregnancy rates down, contraceptive use among teenagers must be promoted since "any direct attack on adolescent sex will be strongly opposed." Back concludes his study by claiming (somewhat in contradiction to earlier statements) no larger social goals for the movement than to provide contraceptive services. He concedes that many of the larger social and personal goals by some sponsors of the movement have not been fulfilled. Among these aims are "personal self-expression, improved personal relations between the sexes, joyous family life, and maintaining the optimum population level." However he claims overall success for the movement.<sup>31</sup>



## Goals and Methods

From this brief account it is possible to identify a number of goals of the contraceptive and population control movements and the values associated with them. The eugenists and Malthusians appeal to the existential value of the survival of society. They see such survival not in traditional terms of promoting fertility but in terms of drastically limiting fertility and, in the case of the eugenists, of preventing altogether the fertility of the so-called unfit.<sup>32</sup> The methods they adopt are first of all to reduce the human being to a number and then by devaluing the child and promising increased sexual satisfaction in marriage to manipulate the individual voluntarily to avoid child-bearing.<sup>33</sup> Neither the existential value of concern for irresponsible population increase nor the desire to space children and improve marital relationships are *per se* disvalues. They become disvalues when they are pursued at the expense of the person and the *communio personarum*. In the same way the tools of demography and social science are not in themselves detrimental to personhood but they become destructive when they are put at the service of an ideology that does not respect the human person. The mere fact that these disciplines are based so heavily on mathematical formulas leads them in a direction of such a devaluation.<sup>34</sup>

Demography has consciously been used as a tool by the Malthusians and eugenists to influence public policy in the direction of population control and by sexual liberals and feminists to alter through contraception, sterilization and abortion traditional patterns of marriage and family life.<sup>35</sup> Their choice of demography as a tool has influenced the manner in which the discipline has developed. For example, a vocabulary that is inimical to a Christian anthropology has been institutionalized. In dealing with the effectiveness rates for various contraceptive methods, the term "failure" is used for an unplanned pregnancy. (By contrast, natural family planning practitioners refer to a "surprise pregnancy" since no child conceived can be considered a "failure.") Terms such as premarital, and extramarital have replaced biblical terms such as fornication and adultery.<sup>36</sup> Although natural family planning is based on the same scientific information as hormonal contraception, it has frequently been classified among the "folk" or traditional methods as opposed to "modern" methods.<sup>37</sup> The studies of American sexual practices undertaken by Alfred Kinsey and published in 1948 and 1953 lent the aura of science to the sexual practices he allegedly uncovered so that what was normal and abnormal in sexual behavior came to be redefined without any reference to morality or concepts of the perfectibility of man.<sup>38</sup>

The value that all these social movements attack is the value of the unborn child. The Malthusians work to limit the size of a family. The eugenists want to eliminate all children that do not meet certain physical or mental standard. The feminists seek to prevent or abort children who might interfere with their autonomy and sexual liberals desire sexual pleasure without fear of pregnancy.<sup>39</sup> The expressed aim of the contraceptive movement is maternal and child welfare, yet in the name of that welfare, children are aborted and chemicals and devices are given to the mother that impair her health as well as her fertility. Serious as the



physiological effects of contraceptives are, the psychological and spiritual are far more serious. In attacking the unborn child and the procreative capacity, the integrity of the woman and of the *communio personarum* are also damaged, for the person is a substantial unity of body and soul as Thomists, including John Paul II have sought to show in their philosophical and theological anthropology. The very tools of the contraceptive movement, social science studies, inimical as they have been to a Christian anthropology, are beginning to show that spirituality and marital communication and intimacy are diminished in contraceptive intercourse and enhanced by the use of natural family planning.<sup>40</sup>

Karol Wojtyla (John Paul II) in *Love and Responsibility* has pointed out that it is never valid to treat another human person as a mere means to an end. This is the personalist principle. To exclude the possibility of acting selfishly in marriage and using each other for mere enjoyment, the couple seek a common end in procreation. To deliberately interfere with the procreative end of marriage, whether by contraception or abortion, is to make each spouse a mere object of enjoyment for the other no matter how noble the motives may be for using contraception. To act in such a way is to employ the utilitarian principle. To promote contraception and abortion as public policy is to attack the integrity of the human person. On the other hand to offer education in natural family planning, which remains open to the procreative marriage, is to respect the integrity of the human person.

The church does not endorse "procreation at any cost." The "utmost responsibility" must be exercised in the conception and education of children. "What the Church opposes is the imposition of demographic policies and the promotion of methods for limiting births which are contrary to the objective moral order and to the liberty, dignity and conscience of the human being."<sup>41</sup> The Church also charges that population programs financed by the affluent North and aimed at reducing population in the poorer South "become a substitute for justice and development." The Church opposes "quantitative population targets or goals, which involve the violation of human dignity and rights." Such programs directed at the poor tend towards "a form of racism or the promotion of equally racist forms of eugenics."<sup>42</sup> In all questions of population and development "[t]he ultimate determining factor is the human person."<sup>43</sup>

#### REFERENCES

1. Jacques Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, trans. John J. Fitzgerald, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947, 80.
2. John F. Crosby, "The Incommunicability of Human Persons," *The Thomist*, 57 (3) July 1993, 403-442.
3. There is a chilling application of this concept to the Jews under Hitler who were stripped of everything and reduced to a mere "assemblage of biological creatures" in order to be eliminated.
4. Amos H. Hawley, "Population and Society: An Essay on Growth," in *Fertility and Family Planning: A World View*, Ed. S.J. Behrman, Leslie Corsa and Ronald Freedman, Ann Arbor, Michigan, The University of Michigan Press, 1970, 189-209.
5. C.P. Blacker, *Eugenics, Galton and After*, Westport, Connecticut, Hyperion Press, Inc. 1987 (first published in 1952 by Harvard University Press), 125.
6. Cited by Germaine Greer, in *Sex and Destiny*, London: Secker and Warburg, 1984, 259.
7. Blacker, *Eugenics, Galton and After*, 37.



8. Ibid. 37,38,39 Galton set up an anthropometric laboratory at the International Health Exhibition in 1884. He recommended that the public be taught to judge not by isolated examples but "to think in statistical terms sufficiently large samples — probability being the foundation of eugenics." 125.

9. Ibid. 54,55. In a letter to Darwin he asserted that the *Origin of Species* had delivered him from superstition. "I used to be wretched under the weight of the old-fashioned argument from design, of which I felt, though I was unable to prove to myself, the worthlessness." Galton also rejected the doctrine of original sin and believed that man was progressing morally with his morality shaped by natural selection.

10. Ibid. 320,313.

11. Ibid. 78-81, Margaret Sanger, *The Pivot of Civilization*, Elmsford, NY: Maxwell Reprint Co., 1969, 265, and *Women and the New Race*. Elmsford, NY: Maxwell Reprint Co., 1969, 207 "[T]he ever increasing tide of the unfit is overwhelming all that these agencies are doing for society."

12. Sheila Rowbotham: (*A New World for Women*)? *Stella Browne: Socialist Feminist*, London, UK: Pluto Press Ltd. 1977, 12, 13, 18. German socialists made the link between feminism and homosexual liberation. See also Greeg, *Sex and Destiny*, 305.

13. Back, *Family Planning*, 81. Some feminists are critical of the influences of eugenics on the birth control movement. See Greer, *Sex and Destiny*. The two chapters on "The Population Lobby" and "Governments as Family Planners." This ambivalence can be seen in two 1993 back-to-back articles in *The New York Times Magazine*, Feb. 6, 1994: "Finally Control Population" by Princeton demographer and sociologist, Charles Westoff and "Stop Coercing Women" by Ellen Chesler, biographer of Margaret Sanger and director of the International Women's Health Coalition.

14. Greer, *Sex and Destiny*, 259-264. James Reed, *From Private Vice to Public Virtue: The Birth Control Movement and American Society Since 1830*, New York: Basic Books Inc., 1978, 197., Blacker, (*Eugenics, Galton and After*) compares population increase and decrease to the Nile River. "The demographer is a watchman at the river's source." He can forecast future trends.

15. Reed, *From Private Vice*, 198, 199. Walker, president of MIT, advocated better social surveys and statistical techniques. "He sought to replace the rigid political economy of ante-bellum moralists with an analytical social based upon empirical fact."

16. Ibid. 203-208. The Milbank Memorial Fund gave Margaret Sanger \$600 to help found the Population Association of America.

17. Blacker, *Galton, Eugenics*, 284, Reed, *From Private Vice*, 206, 209.

18. Susan C.M. Scrimshaw, "Cultural Values and Behaviors Related to Population Change," Paper prepared for Project on Cultural Values and Population Policy of the Institute of Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences, CA, Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences, 1977.

19. Back, *Family Planning*, 81, 82. Back is cited extensively in this section because not only was he engaged in the first social science research on family planning in Puerto Rico but his book provides an in-depth analysis of the movement from "inside."

20. The Proctor and Gamble heir became involved in birth control research for eugenic reasons, sponsored Planned Parenthood clinics and started the Pathfinder Fund to promote a national population policy. Other foundations, for example the Moore fund and the Ford Foundation, joined later. Back *Family Planning*, 71-73, 92, 104.

21. Back, *Family Planning*, 84-90. Greer, *Sex and Destiny* summed up the process. "The cooperation of the eugenists was essential to the development of institutional birth-control because they alone had the unique combination of statistical skills together with the basic assumptions which underlay the whole attempt. 318.

22. M. Brewster in a paper, "A Social-Psychological View of Fertility," (*Psychological Perspectives on Population*, ed. James T. Fawcett, New York: Basic Books, 1973, accepted the "Population Bomb" as a given and wrote: "In the sphere of fertility the "Unseen Hand" that Adam Smith imagined as guiding individual self-interested economic actions so that they cumulate to the common good is clearly not working . . . Insofar as decisional processes are involved, an engineering of incentives and constraints would seem to be called for, in which deliberate social policy replaces the mythical "Unseen Hand." 3-18.



23. R. Freedman summed up the rewards for the social scientist in the following words: "Where else can a young social scientist find a research site where all these are present: (1) the possibility for experimentally creating or selecting the most important variables (2) a problem area in which a wide range of important social theories can be put to the test and (3) the probability that successful results will contribute in some measure to the solution of several of the most pressing social problems of our time," quoted in James T. Fawcett, *Population and Population Behavioral Research Issues in Fertility and Family Planning*, New York: Population Council, 1970.

24. Back, *Family Planning*, 89, 92, 97. "Puerto Rico can be seen as a miniature laboratory for the family planning movement." 68.

25. *Ibid.* 95, 104. The following quote gives some sense of the bias in the research effort. "From the standpoint of the scientist, you do research only where you don't know the answer, you want the answer, and you'll accept the answer whatever it is. That's what research ought to be. Once you have stated the question and have gone through the inquiry with proper methods, you are committed as a scientist to accepting the results however they turn out, whether you like them or not. In this field, I think there is one result that research can give that will never be acceptable, certainly not to the administrator and not even to the scientist and that is a negative answer. No amount of research showing family planning cannot be done is going to stop the effort going forward. There is just too much investment in doing it — economic, social, psychological. But research can never give a fully negative answer anyway." Bernard Berelson, "On Family Planning Communication," in *Mass Communication and Motivation for Birth Control*, ed. Donald J. Bogue, Chicago, IL: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, 1967, 55. See also page 50 for the role of surveys in persuading government leaders. Berelson, a social scientist, was president of the Population Council from 1966-74. Back *Family Planning*, 145.

26. Back, *Family Planning*, 98.

27. *Ibid.* 98-99, 102-103. See also Reuben Hill, "Putting 'the Family' First in Family Planning," in *Mass Communication and Motivation for Birth Control*, ed. Donald J. Bogue, Chicago, IL: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, 1977, 203.

28. In *Husband-Wife Communication and the Practice of Family Planning*, Asian Population Series, No. 16, Bangkok, Thailand: Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) United Nations, 1974, 1.

29. Back, *Family Planning*, 102, 103.

30. *Ibid.* 120-123. In footnote 72 Back states that "[t]here are few other topics where the design of survey questions makes so much difference in the outcome of public opinion research."

31. *Ibid.* 156-159. The "success" of the movement can be gauged from its penetration of the medical field on a worldwide scale which was initiated by such programs funded by the Population Council as the "Population Awareness Corps at Emory University School of Medicine" in the late Sixties and Seventies. The corps had three major goals, to (1) "interest students in the implications of over-population on the quality of life." (2) make students aware of the potential of *voluntary* family planning and (3) encourage students to take up careers in family planning. Additional funds for the program came from the US Children's Bureau, the Harvard work-study program and a comparable program at Dartmouth, various Planned Parenthood organizations, the Population Reference Bureau, and the Kennedy Foundation. Student projects ranged from clinical and contraceptive research to contraceptive and abortion promotion, patient recruitment, adolescent care and overseas assignments. Robert A. Hatcher and Constance C. Conrad, "The Population Awareness Corps at Emory University School of Medicine," *Macy Conference on Family Planning, Demography and Human Sexuality in Medical Education*, New York: Josiah Macy JR. Foundation, 1971, 36-43. In the 1960s the Harvard School of Public Health set up a Center for Population Studies to solve the problem of "rising population density (which) threatens to vitiate the gains made by civilization." A new department was set up, "Demography and Human Ecology," and a new professorship was funded by the Searle drug company. Loretta McLaughlin, *The Pill, John Rock, and the Church: The Biography of a Revolution*, Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1982, 182-183.

32. Back acknowledges that owing to "the prochild attitude implicit in human culture and government policy" it is difficult to initiate and sustain programs that promote decreased childbearing. Disincentive policies have had the effect of encouraging the upper classes mainly to limit childbearing. *Ibid.* 140.



33. In the ESCAP study in 1974, one of the summary implications was that "[o]ne of the strongest motives for practicing family planning, therefore, should be the immediate benefit of being able to enjoy sex without unwanted pregnancy." *Husband-Wife Communication and the Practice of Family Planning*, Asian Population Studies Series, No. 16, Economic and Social Commission for Asia, Bangkok, Thailand, United Nations, 1974.

34. It would be pertinent here to turn to Scripture for a biblical perspective. It was recognized in the Old Testament that to take a census of the people was fraught with danger. Both 1 Chronicles 21: 1-7 and 2 Samuel 24: 1-17 tell of the punishment meted out on David for taking such a census. The biblical commentaries explain that: "It was known to readers that, according to the conscience of Israel, to number the people was to trespass on the supreme rights of God (See also Ex 30:12). The sin may be the pride of David or perhaps his intrusion into a realm that is specifically the realm of Yahweh." Reginald C. Fuller, et al., *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, Nashville, TN, Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984. 365-367.

35. See Margaret Sanger, *Woman and the New Race*, Elmsford, NY: Maxwell Reprint Co., 1940 for extensive use of statistics, 29ff.

36. Mary Shivanandan, "The Role of Social Science in Shaping Sexual Practices," in *Life and Learning: Proceedings of the Second University Faculty for Life Conference*, ed. J.W. Koterski, Washington, DC: University Faculty for Life, 1993 73. Premarital sex is further subdivided into "permissiveness with affection" and "permissiveness without affection." Traditional standards are called rigid and restrictive.

37. The ESCAP Asian study considers only "modern" or "reliable" those methods endorsed by family planning programs: "spermicides, the condom, the oral pill, intra-uterine devices, and sterilization (both male and female). It excludes the so-called 'folk methods' of rhythm, withdrawal, abstinence and breastfeeding which have a high failure rate in general public use." Later in this same study the authors note with surprise the high use of 'folk' methods — mainly rhythm — by upper class couples in Singapore and the Philippines, *Husbans-Wife Communication*, ESCAP, 45, 132.

38. See Ira L. Reiss, *The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness*, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967, 67. Also Judith Reisman, and Edward W. Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People*, Lafayette, La: Huntington House Publishers, 1990, 2, 3. Reisman quotes from Kinsey himself who advocated all types of sexual activity and freedom from artificial social distinctions such as "right and wrong, licit and illicit, normal and abnormal, acceptable and unacceptable in our social organization."

39. G.K. Chesterton calls eugenics "a disastrous alliance between abnormal innocence and abnormal sin." Its moral basis consists in declaring that "the baby for whom we are primarily and directly responsible is the babe unborn," and that the unborn baby can be considered even before the wife who is born. G.K. Chesterton, *Eugenics and Other Evils*, New York, Dodd Mead & Co., 1927, 4,6.

40. Mary Shivanandan, "Communication and Family Planning: a Literature Review." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Natural Family Planning, Omaha NE, July 24, 1993.

41. "All Human Needs Must be Respected," Intervention of Archbishop Martino at the UN Conference on Environment and Development, *L'Osservatore Romano*, Weekly Edition, N. 24, 17 June 1992.

42. "Earth Summit: Environment, Development and Population." Vatican Position Paper, *Origins*, 22 (5) June 11, 1992.

43. "All Human Needs. . .," *L'Osservatore Romano*, N. 24, 17 June, 1992.