

The Linacre Quarterly

Volume 11 | Number 3

Article 8

July 1943

By "Planned Parenthood" the People May Perish

Nathaniel W. Hicks

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

Recommended Citation

Hicks, Nathaniel W. (1943) "By "Planned Parenthood" the People May Perish," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 11: No. 3, Article 8.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol11/iss3/8>

BY "PLANNED PARENTHOOD" THE PEOPLE MAY PERISH

By NATHANIEL W. HICKS

Facing the greatest crisis in its history, this nation finds itself straining every resource to solve the gigantic problem of man-shortage without serious upset to family life and the whole pattern of American living. While the vacuum of need in our armed forces and in essential war occupations must now siphon millions of husbands and fathers, and may draw up to 6,000,000 women from their present jobs or their homes into war industries, there thrives in our midst a well organized, strongly entrenched and shrewdly guided movement which, under the guise of science, patriotism and social welfare, will—if left unchecked—depopulate and destroy our country—unwittingly, we grant, but more surely than any war against us from sky and sea and land.

The planned-parenthood movement for birth prevention and birth spacing, which can only lead to birth-rate depression, may clothe a very old evil in the habiliments of sociology, but it must stand condemned as furthering, not a wisely planned, high-quality population, but the ultimate destruction of this nation, to preserve which the parents of today are offering the lives of their sons.

In establishing a case for our nation against the Planned Parenthood Federation and its affiliates, let us return to the problem of manpower, not for the present

emergency, but for like ones which may arise in the future. Strong as may be our faith and hopes in the Atlantic Charter, it is a demand of intelligent patriotism and practical foresight that even the most optimistic give due regard to the worst propensities of human nature, the fallibility of the best inclined nations and races, and to the strife-filled history of mankind.

The month the Japs struck Pearl Harbor, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., then less deceptively named the Birth Control Federation of America, published in its pseudo-scientific bi-monthly organ the following statement:

The United States is overpopulated rather than underpopulated, in the sense that her resources will permit a higher standard of living in the future for a somewhat smaller population than for a larger one, regardless of the technological progress which may occur.

It appeared in an article in *Human Fertility* (formerly the *Journal of Contraception*).

An obvious comment on this unfounded and unprovable assertion, which indicates the position of the birth controllers on the matter of population, is to recall that this vast, rich country's population density is only 44.2 per-

sons for each square mile. Germany proper has a density of 381.5 or, if we include Austria and the Sudetenland, of 352.3. England's average square-mile inhabitation is 742.2 persons. We still find in these United States tremendous possibilities for growth without sacrifice either of our self-sufficiency or our constantly rising peacetime standard of living. Since 1880 our density has increased by only 27.3 persons. Meanwhile, our living standard has ascended with giant strides. In no way is it our problem to provide a higher standard for a lower number of people, but rather to raise the lower half of our nation to a just participation in what we now can offer and to raise the standard, as national progress requires, for all the people and for more people.

However improbable another great war in our times may be, we may well ask ourselves, nevertheless, how much better would our manpower status be for a World War III in, say, 1960? Assuming a Selective Service pool confined to the ages 20 to 34 inclusive, we can compute some significant figures from future population estimates used by the National Resources Planning Committee and based upon statistics of the U. S. Bureau of the Census. Such a pool, in 1940, would have numbered 16,303,000 men, married and single, native and foreign born, out of a total population of 131,669,275. For comparison, 16,316,908 men between

the ages of 21 and 36 *did* register under Selective Service on October 16, 1940.

By 1960, our total population will, according to estimates, have increased by more than 15,000,000. This figure is attained with the assumption of medium birth and death rates and no net immigration; incidentally, it marks a thirty-three and one-third per cent drop in population gains by birth as compared with the twenty years, 1920-40. The 20-34-year-old pool of men for the armed forces would be a mere 163,000 men more than in 1940.

A war in 1980 would find the same age-group pool totaling 562,000 fewer men than in 1960. Besides an alarming decrease for a twenty-year period, this shows a frightening trend. The entire estimated population of 153,022,000 means a tremendous drop of 9,000,000 in over-all population growth in comparison with the 1940-60 period with its own startling depression in child-bearing. These decreases are reminiscent of the 8,100,000 drop in growth for 1930-40, when birth control notably came into its own in the first great inroads against our national population. Speaking then of the sharp decline for the youngest age groups, the usually calm measured tone of the statistician broke and his pithy warning was—*The same trend is shown in France.*

Any possible war in the year 2,000, but fifty-seven years from now, may find our country with its

source of fighting men and war-industry workers in the considered manpower pool cut by more than 1,200,000 since 1980, or by approximately 1,784,000 since 1960!

Despite the significance of the population estimates on which these figures are based, they were made before the 1940 census and were in that year proven to be *underestimates*. With their assumption of medium fertility (birth production) and medium mortality, our 1940 population should have been about 132,600,000. It was really almost a million less. In fact, it was well below the estimate of 131,902,000 (Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems) made on the basis of a possible *low* fertility and medium mortality. The net immigration gains in the 1930's were negligible.

The low fertility thereby indicated will continue and certainly go lower if birth control makes advances in the future comparable with those of the past twenty years, as evidenced by our vital statistics. The 1980 population is, therefore, not truly indicated by the previously cited and generally accepted estimate of 153,022,000. According to the Scripps Foundation's *low fertility* estimate (one of many estimates it prepared), the actual census figures in that year may be merely about 134,381,000 — not even three million more than in 1940. The *ratio* of growth would, of course, have continued to drop

until we hit our population peak of 140,000,000 in 1960. From then on, the downward trend would no longer be one in ratio of growth, but in the *real numerical decrease* of population that must eventually lead to national disaster. The decline and fall of every great nation in history was heralded by a falling birth-rate, such as we already have in the United States, and by the steady decrease of population we shall most certainly have *unless we start to do something* about the decline in child-bearing.

Calculations of my own, carried forward from the officially accepted estimates up to 1980, provide a picture of what the following years will bring even with stationary birth and mortality rates. Not to take any advantage of the probable low fertility and the now practically assured downward movement in birth-rates, I have used the same *medium* fertility rates which gave the National Resources Committee the population estimate of 153,022,000 for 1980, and showed a gain of slightly less than 9,000,000 over the 1955 estimate. I also assume the same medium mortality and no net immigration.

Going five years past the turn of the next century, we find that in 2,005 the total population of the United States will be about 145,540,000, nearly a million and a half less than the prediction for 1960. In other words, assuming medium stationary rates and figuring for twenty-five-year periods,

this would be the first great numerical decrease of our population—a drop of 7,482,000 from the 1980 estimate. The ever-receding gains of the previous intracensal periods will have given way to the inevitable era of repeated loss. The United States will be treading much the same road the great Roman nation trod toward oblivion and absorption nearly 2,000 years earlier. By 2,030, our people will number 134,581,000—only about three millions more than in 1940. By 2,055 our nation will be 130,408,000—more than a million drop below our 1940 census total. Twenty-five years later we will have dwindled to an approximate 124,780,000, which is roughly but two million more than we were in 1930. In the year 2,105, our population will have fallen to more than 6,000,000 below the 1930 level. The ebb tide of our nation (unless we are preserved or rescued by immigration) will be falling fast. It will be our national penalty for the original sin against nature.

Lest any of the foregoing considerations be branded as statistical sleight-of-hand, I cite some findings by an outspoken advocate of birth control. My authority is P. K. Whelpton, of the Scripps Foundation, who favors a gradually slowing-up decline in the birth-rate until we can maintain a stationary population. Writing in the Planned Parenthood Federation's publication, *Human Fertility*, in December, 1941, he admitted that even if the continually

falling birth-rates of white women (particular subject of his article) in the United States should remain at the 1935-1939 level "the white population will gradually cease to grow, and begin to decrease, perhaps within thirty or forty years."

This he ascribed to the fact that each one hundred women of one generation would be contributing only ninety-five daughters to the childbearing period of the next generation. This would mean a constant drop of five per cent from the number of women necessary to keep the population stationary. Mr. Whelpton further admitted that the birth-rate for white women "during the next twenty or thirty years" must produce an increase of more than fifteen per cent, or a total of 110 girl babies for every hundred white women, in order to "achieve" the "gradual slowing up of population growth followed by the maintenance of a stationary population." Even in that estimate, he generously allows the possibility of a death rate twenty per cent lower than the average for 1930-1939.

In my opinion, however, [he wrote] it is unrealistic to expect the birth rate to continue dropping at the rapid pace of 1923-33 [From 22.2 to 16.5 per 1,000 population]; much more probable is a slowing up of the declines which will result in the population peak occurring some

time between 1950 and 1970.

[Reaching the peak in those years would mean, not medium, but *low* fertility.]

Whether we will then have a stationary population *or one diminishing in numbers* (unless maintained by immigration) *will depend on how soon the decline in fertility is arrested and whether or not some increase from the low point can be obtained.* (Brackets and italics mine.)

It is sincerely regrettable, and rather difficult to understand, that one of America's most capable students of population problems should, despite the powerful arguments of his statistical data against the contraceptionists, remain in their camp. He could render inestimable service to the cause of national morality and secure a future for our country. Unfortunately, the facts cited from his article in the official organ of the birth controllers were followed by his suggestion that the "population program" should provide more "fertility" clinics for birth-control information and services. "This will tend to depress the birth-rate, it is true," he wrote, in a weak attempt to explain what must be for him a scarcely tenable position:

... but to attempt to *raise fertility to the maintenance level* by withholding from the poorer and less educated classes the contraceptive information which is readily

available to the well-to-do and more educated classes is highly undemocratic, extremely selfish . . . and perhaps even dangerous from the standpoint of the quality of tomorrow's children, and hence of our future population.

The latest efforts of the contraceptionists are strongly pronounced attempts to *lower* the already dangerous fertility rate by false appeals to the patriotism of women in war plants and by dire propaganda for general consumption, that childbearing is unhealthy and unsocial in these "emotional" and unstable times.

Eradication of the nationally destructive evil on the family front is not less a patriotic duty to the future of our country than is that solemn duty to the present which our people face so well and bravely today with "blood, toil, sweat and tears" on the industrial and fighting fronts of this arsenal and defender of democracy and civilization. We Catholics and all right-thinking Americans *must* be well organized, vociferous and ceaseless in action, both privately and jointly, in unmasking to the entire public and to our representative official bodies the threat of the "planned parenthood" forces and the already serious inroads upon the potential human resources of our nation for the future.—Reprinted from *America*, Vol. LXVIII, No. 26.