

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF

NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING

Analysis of an "Australian NFP Survey"

Thomas W. Hilgers

Masturbation: A Sin against Faithful and Life-giving Love

John F. Harvey

Sterilization for Contraceptive Purposes

Anthony Zimmerman

Margaret Sanger: Founder of Modern Society

Elasah Drogin

Volume III, Number 2

Summer 1979

\$5.00 a copy

Published by
THE HUMAN LIFE CENTER

SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA

Margaret Sanger: Founder of Modern Society

Elasah Drogin

MARGARET SANGER devoted her entire life to “her cause,”¹ the international birth control movement. She coined the term “birth control” and successfully fought the American judicial system and Christian tradition in her effort to strike down the laws forbidding distribution of contraceptive devices and information. As president of the American Birth Control League, she edited its publication, the *Birth Control Review*. She founded Planned Parenthood of America and became honorary president of International Planned Parenthood. She established the Margaret Sanger Research Bureau, which financed and engineered the immigration of Germany’s Dr. Ernst Graefenberg, one of the pioneers of the IUD.² These are a few of her best-known accomplishments, but the lesser-known ones complete the explanation of her great influence on our society.

Margaret Higgins was born in 1883 to Irish immigrant parents in a small town in New York. Her father, a freethinker, prevented Margaret’s mother from attending the Catholic Church or sending their eleven children to Catholic schools. Margaret never expressed any regret about having come from a large, poor family; on the contrary, she stated that it had never been a disadvantage and that she and all of her brothers and sisters were healthy and strong. Because of her belief in the innate physical superiority of her heredity, she never applied to her own family her later theories about the undesirable effects of “too many children.”³

According to the eugenicist philosophy, which Margaret learned from both her father and the famous sexologist Havelock Ellis, man’s social and economic situation is determined by one thing, the inherited ability to survive; this ability covers a wide spectrum, from the “very fit” to the “absolutely

Elasah Drogin is a young Jewish convert to Catholicism who lives in a Dominican Third Order lay community in California. As president of Catholics United for Life she has made many public appearances to talk about her abortion and the genocidal aspects of abortion and sterilization. Elasah and her husband, Mark, also work for an organization called Remnant of Israel, whose mission is to bring Jesus to the Jewish people.

unfit." Her father, Michael Higgins, was a sculptor of gravestone angels who became interested in the pseudo-science of phrenology, the study of the shape of the skull as a supposed indication of a person's mental faculties and character. Phrenology was an offshoot of a whole school of thought generally called "eugenics," which academicians of that era took quite seriously. As early as 1904 a chair of eugenics was established at the University College of London;⁴ eugenics very quickly became acceptable in the university communities throughout the world, especially in Germany, England, and the United States. Eugenicists applied to humankind Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest, theorizing that society's benevolence had thrown nature out of balance by keeping alive many people who otherwise would long ago have been eliminated by natural selection. Eugenicists further believed that slum dwellers, because they bred like rabbits, would soon overrun the boundaries of their slum or country, contaminating the better elements of society with their diseases and inferior genes.⁵

The social engineers, however, noting that the typical Harvard graduate (class of 1900) had only one child or none at all,⁶ were afraid that the "wrong" people would use birth control. Some early slogans coined by Margaret Sanger were: "More children from the fit, less from the unfit—that is the chief aim of birth control"⁷ and "Birth Control: to create a race of thorough-breds."⁸ From the very beginning, the social elitists used birth control as a mechanism to control the population of the lower echelons.

These two quotes are not isolated examples. In the 1920s and 1930s there was nothing subtle about the connection between the birth control movement and eugenics. The *Birth Control Review*, which Sanger edited from 1917 to 1938, was filled with elitist writings by the world's renowned and most respected eugenicists, including scientists, physicians, and psychologists.

The connection between Dr. Lothrop Stoddard and the birth control movement is particularly revealing. Stoddard, a director of the American Birth Control League who held a doctorate from Harvard, wrote books that contained blatant racist statements about blacks and other minorities.⁹ In 1940 he wrote *Into the Darkness: Nazi Germany Today*, in which he expressed admiration for Germany's method of cleaning up its race problems by sterilizing those who were unfit to produce children; having sat in on a session of the Eugenics Supreme Court, he observed: "The sterilization law is weeding out the worst strains in the Germanic stock in a scientific and truly humanitarian way."¹⁰

As a participant in the round-table discussions of the American Eugenics Society in 1936, Sanger heard Dr. Marie Kopp read her paper on eugenic sterilization in Germany, where she had studied under a grant. Kopp had found that "aside from religious scruples, there were few objections to 'com-

pulsory' sterilization laws." She also reported that the Germans had enacted their sterilization law only after carefully studying the sterilization program carried out in California by the Human Betterment Foundation, today known as the Voluntary Sterilization Association. Kopp stated that the Germans had considered it "impossible to undertake such a venture involving some one million people without drawing heavily upon previous experience elsewhere."¹¹

The evolution of Sanger's philosophy can be traced through the events of her life. The generous cooperation and support of her two older sisters made it possible for her to attend a private school on the Hudson River. There she met the children of families that lived on a higher socioeconomic level than her own. Through the help of a friend she was accepted at the White Plains Hospital, where she was trained as a nurse in 1899. There she met her future husband, William Sanger, an aspiring architect and artist from a wealthy family. Together they designed their beautiful home in the Columbia Colony on the Hudson River, a sophisticated suburb of professionals and artists. Margaret had climbed safely away from the poverty of her youth to the life style that she had always envied, including private schooling for her three children. William Sanger was a husband who would do anything for his wife, and when Margaret grew restless after ten years as a housewife, they moved into Greenwich Village's Bohemia in New York.

There Margaret returned to professional nursing, as a midwife in New York's lower East Side, where the poor immigrants lived. In great personal and philosophical turmoil she threw herself into "The Rebellion" that had captivated the imagination of the intellectuals who gathered in the village to compare their heterodoxies.¹² At the Liberal Club or Mabel Dodge's Salon she listened to Eugene Debs, the famed socialist leader, and Emma Goldman, anarchist, militant feminist, and outspoken advocate of "voluntary motherhood." Margaret committed herself to the socialists by joining Local No. 5 and becoming a women's organizer for New York.¹³ Full of ideals and visions for a better world for everyone and hoping to find a remedy for the squalor and misery of the slums, she moved quickly from socialism to the anarchistic ideas of revolution.¹⁴ In classes at the Francisco Ferrer School, she heard Will Durant (recently separated from a Jesuit seminary), Emma Goldman, Clarence Darrow, and many others. Here she discovered the ideas of Ellen Key, a Swedish feminist who had written *The Woman Movement* (1912). From this woman Sanger acquired enduring notions about the nature of womanhood and marriage. Key's book presented Nietzsche's system of subjective morality—today's situation ethics. In Key's view, the "inner self should be allowed full freedom of expression and development," and only individual sexual satisfaction, not law or tradition, could make marriage holy; marriages that were not sexually satisfying for the woman should end

in divorce, since physical love was a higher imperative than mere law.¹⁵ Sanger struck a deadly blow at the institution of marriage: "The marriage bed is the most degenerating influence in the social order."¹⁶ She advocated a "voluntary association" between sexual partners, thus successfully changing the lowest common denominator of society from the family unit to individual sexual gratification.

All of these prewar utopians sympathized with the underdog. Many were anarchists who believed that if law and order were suppressed, individual freedom would automatically move people to help their less fortunate brothers. They demanded a more equitable distribution of wealth to relieve the suffering of the poor. They held varying opinions on birth control. Most classical Marxists firmly opposed it for the working forces, claiming that the proletariat needed numbers to strengthen their bargaining demands. For a while Sanger adopted this view, looking upon birth control as a weapon in the class struggle. Other socialists demanded a "birth strike" so that limiting the number of workers might improve their wages.

Within a period of eight years, however, Sanger turned completely about and no longer sided with the poor; she began to direct the birth control movement against the very people she had earlier set out to help. As the movement gained strength her sympathy turned to disdain, her generosity to tyrannical control. Through birth control Sanger saw a way to control the people whom she now labeled "human weeds" and to preserve the freedom of those whom she judged a superior stock, capable of ruling. The socially elite, she believed, must be guarded from democratic and majoritarian reforms based on a "mere number" political philosophy.¹⁷

In 1922 she introduced her new philosophy to the general public in *The Pivot of Civilization*, which contains such statements as "[The philanthropists who give free maternity care] encourage the healthier and more normal sections of the world to shoulder the burden of unthinking and indiscriminate fecundity of others; which brings with it, as I think the reader must agree, a dead weight of human waste. Instead of decreasing and aiming to eliminate the stocks that are most detrimental to the future of the race and the world, it tends to render them to a menacing degree dominant."¹⁸

In 1920 Sanger made some ardently nativistic statements decrying the rising number of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe (Jews and Italians) and expressing deep concern about their fertility. She gained an increasing amount of support from the most bigoted quarters of the American social system.¹⁹ She had now joined the camp of the eugenicists, who were attempting to peddle birth control to the slumdweller ("Slavs, Latins, and Hebrews") whose numerical superiority was believed to threaten Anglo-Saxon political and economic power. It is, perhaps, no coincidence that Sanger set up her first birth control clinic in the Brownsville section of New

York City—heavily populated by newly immigrated Slavs, Latins, and Hebrews—and that it was funded by friends Sanger had made in England.²⁰

Sanger's trip to England in the fall of 1914 significantly influenced her social philosophy and drastically changed her personal life. Shortly after her arrival she met Dr. Havelock Ellis, famous author and sexologist. Ellis, whom Sanger came to regard as a saint, introduced her to eugenic ideas and to the workings of the American Oneida Community. This community, founded in 1841 by John Humphrey Noyes, opposed random procreation, which he believed was unavoidable in the traditional marriage system, and advocated "complex marriage," which, under stringent regulations, selected the prospective parents judged most capable of producing genetically superior children.²¹ This proposal is identical to that of the Lebensborn breeding houses under the Nazi regime.²²

By the time Sanger met Ellis, his own eugenic solutions to social problems were already highly developed. In 1911 he had written *The Problems of Race Regeneration*, in which he advocated that paupers not be given Poor Law relief unless they submitted "voluntarily" to surgical sterilization.²³ His writings appeared monthly for years in Sanger's *Birth Control Review*. All of his books about sex and sexual abnormalities promoted the idea that any nonviolent sexual behavior was normal.²⁴ Since he believed that man through science should hold the keys to life and death, he was an ardent euthanasian.²⁵ Ellis used mescaline (an hallucinogenic drug), which certainly contributed to his belief in a strange type of impersonal, pantheistic deity.²⁶

Ellis was taken with Sanger's charm and quickly established a sexual relationship with her. His wife, Edith, was in the United States at the time on a lecture tour that the Ellises hoped would bring them out of debt. Edith Ellis's intense love for her husband was frustrated by his sexual inadequacies towards her; his affairs with other women often drove her to lesbian relationships.²⁷ Havelock Ellis, at first secretive about his affair with Margaret, finally wrote his wife to tell her about it. Edith was heartbroken. Later, back in England, she attempted suicide in the belief that she had lost her husband.²⁸

Margaret, in her propagandist *Autobiography*, claimed that the hours she dedicated to her "cause" were responsible for the collapse of her marriage to William Sanger, but probably her relationship with Havelock Ellis and the ideas he introduced to her about marriage caused the collapse.²⁹ In 1922, when she married J. Noah Slee, president of the Three-in-One Oil Company, the Ellis marriage became a model of her own. She and her new husband maintained separate domiciles and arranged to see one another through their personal secretaries. Many observers attributed Sanger's choice of Slee to her uniqueness, because marriage to a church-going Episcopalian seemed out of character for a woman who was a Rosicrucian with a strong affinity to Indian mysticism.³⁰ Slee was content with this arrangement and

became a principal source of funds for the birth control movement.³¹

Marriage to Slee changed the social atmosphere of Sanger's life and the thrust of the birth control movement. She no longer nursed the slum mothers of the lower East Side but ruled a movement that by 1926 was made up typically of white, native-born, Protestant Americans with better-than-average incomes and education.³²

Margaret Higgins Sanger, the daughter of poverty-stricken Irish immigrant parents, married to an extremely wealthy, socially elite Episcopalian, now had the personal and philosophical confidence to present to the American public her plans for social control through birth control.

The eugenics movement was stimulated by the advent of the Stanford-Binet I.Q. (intelligence quotient) tests. In the 1920s it was considered absolute dogma that the I.Q. was congenital, inherited, and thus unchanging.³³ During World War I, I.Q. tests that were administered to American soldiers according to ethnic groups showed that the average soldier was nearly a moron and that groups such as Negroes and Southern Europeans were mentally inferior to native-born white Americans.³⁴ Sanger said in *Pivot of Civilization* that these tests had revealed that some people who were "glib, bright looking, and attractive" had "a mental vision of seven, eight, or nine years." They would lower the whole level of intelligence in a school or a society as church and state encouraged them to increase and multiply until they "gave the prevailing 'color'—culturally speaking—to an entire community."³⁵

Sanger believed that 70 percent of America's population had an intellect at a level of less than fifteen years.³⁶ These "feebleminded" people she called a "menace to the race." She was terrified that they would organize a revolution and victimize the more intelligent sector of society in their "wild panic for instant action."³⁷ She repeatedly attacked the Southern European Italian Catholic immigrants who, in her view, ignorantly obeyed the dictates of their Church by propagating feebleminded children at the expense of the refined. In the *Birth Control Review*, April 1932, an article stated that the Catholic "race" had degenerated terribly through the celibacy of its priests and nuns—its more intelligent and "splendid types."³⁸

What a hopelessly bleak world Sanger had created for herself! Seven out of ten people she saw walking down the street were "feebleminded," irresponsible breeders whose fecundity she sought to control before they staged a revolution. What a mighty task she set before herself! She courageously outlined in her "Plan for Peace" a clever plan for peaceful genocide:

- A. To keep the doors of immigration closed to the entrance of certain aliens whose condition is known to be detrimental to the stamina of the race, such as the feebleminded [as determined by Stanford-Binet I.Q. tests].
- B. To apply a stern and rigid policy of sterilization and segregation to that grade of population whose progeny is already tainted, or whose inheritance

- is such that objectionable traits may be transmitted to offspring.
- C. To insure the country against future burdens of maintenance for numerous offspring as may be born of feebleminded parents by pensioning all persons with transmissible diseases who voluntarily consent to sterilization.
 - D. To give dysgenic groups in our population their choice of segregation or sterilization.
 - E. To apportion farm lands and homesteads for these segregated persons where they would be taught to work under competent instructors for a period of their entire lives. [Practically speaking, a concentration camp]
 - F. [To] take an inventory of the secondary group such as illiterates, paupers, unemployables, criminals, prostitutes, dope-fiends; classify them in special departments under government medical protection, and segregate them on farms and open spaces as long as necessary for the strengthening and development of moral conduct.

Having corralled this enormous part of our population and placed it [i.e., segregated it] on a basis of health instead of punishment, it is safe to say that fifteen or twenty millions of our population would then be organized into soldiers of defense defending the unborn against their own disabilities. [Put another way, to enforce the dismantling of the reproductive powers of all people with inferior genes or subnormal behavior patterns]³⁹

In April 1933 the *Birth Control Review* devoted an entire edition to eugenic sterilization. It included an article by Professor Dr. Ernst Rudin, curator of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics, and Eugenics during Hitler's Reich.⁴⁰ In this article, "Eugenic Sterilization: An Urgent Need," Rudin made perfectly clear his message to the American birth controllers:

My experience has led me to the conclusion that systematic and careful propaganda should be undertaken where sterilization is advisable. Such propaganda should, of course, be gradual and should be directed in the first instance at the medical directors.⁴¹

Rudin also stated that since birth control would not prevent procreation in the groups where it was most needed, "we should act without delay. Not only is it our task to prevent the multiplication of bad stocks; it is also to preserve the well-endowed stocks and to increase the birth-rate of the sound average population."⁴²

Little distinction was made between eugenic and Nazi goals by many leading American eugenicists such as Paul Popenoe, Lothrop Stoddard, Leon F. Whitney, Harry H. Laughlin, C. C. Little, and Guy Irving Burch, who were all deeply involved in the American Birth Control League. Paul Popenoe, in that same edition of the *Birth Control Review*, called for the sterilization of 10,000,000 Americans,⁴³ while praising the Germans who were "proceeding toward a policy that will accord with the best thought of eugenicists in all civilized countries."⁴⁴ Leon F. Whitney, a major defender of eugenic

sterilization, had written: "American Jewry is naturally suspecting that the German chancellor had the law enacted for the specific purpose of sterilizing the German Jews, but I believe nothing to be further from the truth."⁴⁵ In the special sterilization edition he wrote:

It has been said that the success of democracy depends upon the quality of its individual elements. This being true it behooves America to do two things. First to encourage the fecundity of those physically and mentally equipped for our civilization, and secondly to restrict the propagation of those physically, mentally, and socially inadequate.⁴⁶

He suggested restrictive marriage laws, eugenic education, and birth control to improve the American gene pool.

Adolf Hitler, it should be noted, used birth control for the same purposes, outlawing contraception and abortion for Aryans and setting up a system of rewards to the "superior" stocks for producing children. At the same time, he spread birth control information and abortion propaganda in the Eastern territories outside Germany, where he wished to stifle any further population growth. There he billed abortion as safe and childbirth as a health hazard. Hitler said:

In view of the large families of the native population, it could only suit us if girls and women there had as many abortions as possible. Active trade in contraceptives ought to be actually encouraged in the Eastern territories, as we could not possibly have the slightest interest in increasing the non-German population.⁴⁷

Harry H. Laughlin, as part of his contribution to the special sterilization edition of the *Birth Control Review*, stated that although 15,000 sterilizations had been performed in the United States up to December 1931 under several sterilization laws in different states, no one had suggested that there had been any eugenic errors; that is, no one whose offspring would have been a "credit to the state" was known to have been sterilized.⁴⁸ His model eugenic sterilization law, which Hitler directly adopted, led Laughlin in 1936 to an honorary M.D. degree from the University of Heidelberg.⁴⁹

By this time Sanger, with an army of biologists, sociologists, eugenicists, and psychologists at her side, had exposed her plans for well-organized, "polite" genocide. But how would she go about getting the approval of the American public? She would appeal to their sense of thriftiness! Eugenic sterilization would lower the taxes of the very people who should produce more children. Sanger made that very clear when she stated, "There is only one reply to a request for a higher birth rate among the intelligent, and that is to ask the government to first take the burden of the insane and feebleminded from your back. Sterilization for these is the solution."⁵⁰ However, her value system was much more utilitarian than the legislators of the United States were willing to accept at the time.

Sanger held bitter opinions of the American democratic process. A “pessimistic observer,” she believed that America’s legislative leaders held office because of “their shrewd ability to catch the votes” of a racially indiscriminate mob. She even believed that the legislators themselves were “apparently mentally and constitutionally unfit.”⁵¹ Sanger detested the democratic process of according one vote to each citizen, writing in the *Birth Control Review* of April 1925, “We can all vote, even the mentally arrested. And so it is no surprise to find the moron’s vote as good as the vote of the genius. The outlook is not a cheerful one.” In Sanger’s vision of the ideal American government the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy would rule. Her thinking is identical to that of Hitler, who personally examined the pedigrees of all applicants for such government service as the SS and the Elite Guard.⁵²

The economic system of the Third Reich, in fact, was not dissimilar to Sanger’s dream. Dr. Hermann Paull, one of Hitler’s experts on racial hygiene, expressed the Fuehrer’s economic sense very well in 1934:

Thanks to public welfare, a broad strata of people no longer need to concern themselves with the material upbringing of their children. When money for the vital necessities cannot be procured by the parents, the welfare agency takes over this task. This happens especially in the case of children whose parents have no reason to be proud of their biological heritage and who therefore, in a biological sense, are unsuitable for producing children. It is well known that the greatest lack of scruples with regard to producing children prevails among inferior-grade families.⁵³

That could have been a word-for-word quote from “The Cruelty of Charity,” a well-named chapter in Sanger’s *Pivot of Civilization*:

Everywhere we see poverty and large families going hand in hand. Those least fit to carry on the race are increasing most rapidly. People who cannot support their own offspring are encouraged by the Church and state to produce large families. Many of the children thus begotten are diseased or feebleminded; many become criminals. The burden of supporting these unwanted types has to be borne by the healthy elements of the nation. Funds that should be used to raise the standard of our civilization are diverted to maintenance of those who should never have been born.⁵⁴

To many readers, whose social consciences have shown them that poverty is more often born of prejudice than of inherited genetic inferiority, these statements seem passé. But have Sanger’s philosophical children who now operate the international birth control movement abandoned her ideology?

When the world realized the logical consequences of Hitler’s eugenic policies, Sanger’s birth control movement had to abandon its overt eugenic language. Eugenics in Germany under the Nazis, in justifying massive sterilization and euthanasia for the allegedly unfit, had undoubtedly provided the rationale for the slaughter of six million Jews.⁵⁵ The social engineers of the American Birth Control League, sensing the horror and panic in the air,

saw that they would have to bill birth control in a more subtle, democratic manner. We may ask whether the soft-sell techniques of today's Planned Parenthood, the successor of the American Birth Control League, have not successfully carried out Sanger's well-laid plans.

Statistics prove that Sanger's dreams are today a reality. The Census Bureau reported in 1974 that the decline in fertility in the United States was most pronounced among blacks, American Indians, and Mexican Americans.⁵⁶ It is easy to see how the Sangerian social engineers achieved this decline. According to the latest findings 25 percent of native American women have been sterilized with money that was earmarked by treaty agreements for medical needs.⁵⁷ Planned Parenthood has revealed that women on welfare are twice as likely as other women to be sterilized.⁵⁸ These women have been threatened with discontinuation of their aid if they refused sterilization. Norma Jean Serena, in a suit based on a claim of racial prejudice, has testified that her social workers plotted to have her sterilized without her knowledge, that she had been labeled unfit because she was a native American living with a black man, and that she had been sterilized for a year before discovering the nature of the surgery performed.⁵⁹ Many such cases have been reported. Samuel Yette, a former employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has charged that sterilization and birth control programs have been aimed against blacks under the name of hunger relief.⁶⁰ Erma Clardy Craven, a black social worker with thirty-four years of experience, has stated that while some Southern states had relaxed their abortion statutes before the 1973 Supreme Court abortion decision, the South as a whole has not been willing to give blacks one piece of truly progressive social legislation.⁶¹

The Proceedings of the International Tribunal on Crimes against Women, a militant women's liberation organization, reports:

Puerto Rico has the highest rate of sterilization in the world. The demographer Vascos Calzada demonstrated in a study in 1968 that 35% of Puerto Rican women of childbearing age have been sterilized. This compares with 5% in India and 3% in Pakistan—both countries that also have public sterilization programs. Nineteen clinics for sterilization in Puerto Rico are working at maximum capacity performing up to 1,000 sterilizations a month. Two-thirds of the sterilized women are between 20 and 49 years of age and 92% of them are under 35 years of age. This was the result of intensive political propaganda which led people to believe that the economic crisis and unemployment was due to the increase in people.⁶²

Ninety percent of these sterilizations of brown-skinned women were paid for by the United States government. In many cases they were performed without the woman's written consent.

The Tribunal went on to denounce this sterilization as genocidal and racist because it manipulated Puerto Rican women in order to carry out imperialist

plans against the Third World.⁶³ In the United States the rate of sterilization is 30 percent higher among Spanish-American women than among white American women.⁶⁴ Sanger would have been well pleased.

Some shocking statistics prove that abortion, too, is an effective genocidal tool:

Exhibit A: Christopher Tietze has shown that between 1972 and 1974 one fourth of non-white babies but only one sixth of white babies were aborted, and that non-white women have more than twice as many abortions per capita as white women.⁶⁵

Exhibit B: Although non-whites represent only 22 percent of the population of the State of Maryland,⁶⁶ 40 percent of the abortions in that state were performed on blacks during 1976.⁶⁷

Exhibit C: During 1976, approximately 33 percent of all abortions were performed on non-white Americans,⁶⁸ although non-whites constitute only 13.2 percent of the population.⁶⁹

Exhibit D: On January 16, 1978, the *Los Angeles Times* carried ten column inches of classified ads for abortions. The same day, *Los Angeles Opinion*, the Spanish daily, carried thirty-eight column inches.

Exhibit E: From 1970 to 1974, over half the abortions on New York City residents were performed on non-whites and Puerto Ricans,⁷⁰ although these groups represented less than 32 percent of the city's population.⁷¹

Exhibit F: In 1974 a case was brought before the federal district judge in the District of Columbia on behalf of many of the poor who had been involuntarily sterilized in hospitals and clinics with tax-supported "family planning" facilities. It was brought out that "over the last few years, an estimated 100,000 to 150,000 low-income persons have been sterilized annually."⁷²

Sanger realized very early in her campaign against "inferior races" that she must keep open every avenue to "polite" racial manipulation. Her first pamphlet on contraception, *Family Limitation*, which was circulated in 1914, presented information on not only contraceptives but also abortifacients.⁷³ While promising that contraception would make it unnecessary, she did believe in a woman's right to abortion.⁷⁴

Sanger explained her plan to stop the growth of the blacks in the United States in a personal letter to Clarence Gamble dated October 19, 1939. In one project "three or four colored ministers, preferably with social-service backgrounds, and with engaging personalities" would be hired to travel through the South, propagandizing for birth control.

The most successful educational approach to the Negro is through a religious appeal. We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population, and the minister is the man who can straighten out that idea if it occurs to any of their more rebellious members.⁷⁵

A steering committee from Sanger's group would supervise the project while appearing to give control to hand-picked local blacks.⁷⁶

Sanger would have been encouraged to see William Shockley's signature on a full-page advertisement ("War on Poverty") placed in the *New York Times* by the Hugh Moore Fund,⁷⁷ a population-control organization that had given her money to begin the International Planned Parenthood Federation. Shockley, a Nobel Prize-winning physicist who is a persistent agitator on black genetic inferiority, asked: "Can it be that our humanitarian welfare programs have already selectively emphasized high and irresponsible rates of reproduction to produce a socially unadaptable human strain?"⁷⁸

Many people mistakenly think that racism based on eugenics ended with the Second World War and the exposure of the Nazi war criminals. Racial genocide, however, is very much a modern-world tradition. Coerced by propaganda and economic necessity, minority races are "choosing" the abortion and sterilization which ultimately would remove them from the face of the earth.

Sanger's eugenic specialists, many of whom are still active and influential, have been enlisted into the Hugh Moore Fund movement: C. C. Little, William Shockley, Fairfield Osborn, and Guy Irving Burch, to name a few.⁷⁹ Garrett Hardin, a University of California professor who campaigned for permissive abortion, also advocates compulsory birth control, claiming: "Coercion is a dirty word to most liberals now, but it need not forever be so. As with the four-letter words, its dirtiness can be cleansed away by exposure to the light, by saying it over and over without apology or embarrassment."⁸⁰

Abortion proponents openly appeal to taxpayers for continued abortion funding by pointing out how much more expensive a live welfare baby is than a dead one. In California, utilitarian researchers calculate that it could cost \$464 million to provide one year's care for welfare children compared to \$27 million for killing those children before birth.⁸¹ The Alan Guttmacher Institute, in reporting that 274,000 abortions were performed in 1976 at a cost of \$61 million, claimed that if only one third as many poverty-level women had given birth instead, the annual cost to the taxpayer would be \$200 million.⁸² This outrageous appeal to utilitarian economics has been heard in nearly every state legislature as justification for continuing the flow of government blood-money to the abortion mills. "Abort, Not Support" is a new battle cry for the "pro-choice" elitists who carry on the Sanger tradition.

We live in a culture that was planned, packaged, and expertly sold to us by Margaret Sanger, who, more than any other human being, deserves the title "Founder of the Modern World." As H. G. Wells aptly put it: "Margaret Sanger made currents and circumstances. When the history of our civilization

is written, it will be a biological history, and Margaret Sanger will be its heroine."⁸³

Notes

- 1 Margaret Sanger, *An Autobiography* (New York: Dover Pub., 1971), p. 194. Originally published in 1938.
- 2 Hans Leffeldt, *Ernst Graefenberg and His Ring*, p. 345.
- 3 Sanger, *An Autobiography*, p. 29.
- 4 Bernhard Schreiber, *The Men behind Hitler: A German Warning to the World* (La Haye-Mureaux, France: 1971), p. 15.
- 5 Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization* (New York: Brentano's, 1922), pp. 80, 179. Also see Donald Pickens, *Eugenics and the Progressives* (Vanderbilt University Press, 1968), p. 195.
- 6 David M. Kennedy, *Birth Control in America: The Career of Margaret Sanger* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), p. 44.
- 7 *Birth Control Review*, vol. 3, no. 5 (May 1919), p. 12.
- 8 *Birth Control Review*, vol. 5, no. 11 (November 1921), p. 2.
- 9 Kenneth M. Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Society* (Baltimore and New York: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. 25.
- 10 Lothrop Stoddard, *Into the Darkness: Nazi Germany Today* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1940), p. 196.
- 11 Marie E. Kopp, "Legal and Medical Aspects of Eugenic Sterilization in Germany," a talk delivered at the Annual Meeting and Round Table Conferences of the American Eugenics Society, 7 May 1936.
- 12 David M. Kennedy, p. 8.
- 13 Sanger, *An Autobiography*, p. 75.
- 14 Kennedy, p. 11.
- 15 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 23.
- 17 Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization*, p. 177.
- 18 *Ibid.*
- 19 Kennedy, pp. 113-117.
- 20 *Ibid.*, p. 118.
- 21 Hilda Herrick Noyes and George Wallingford Noyes, "The Oneida Community Experiment in Stirpiculture," *Eugenics Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 4 (December 1967).
- 22 Marc Hillel and Clarissa Henry, *Of Pure Blood* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1976).
- 23 Havelock Ellis, *The Problem of Race Regeneration* (New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1911), p. 65.
- 24 Arthur Calder-Marshall, *The Sage of Sex: A Life of Havelock Ellis* (New York: Putnam's, 1959), p. 88.
- 25 *Ibid.*, p. 275.
- 26 Havelock Ellis, *My Life* (Boston: Mufflin Co., 1939), p. 67.
- 27 Arthur Calder-Marshall, p. 207.
- 28 *Ibid.*
- 29 Kennedy.
- 30 Lawrence Lader, *The Margaret Sanger Story* (New York: Doubleday, 1955), p. 79.
- 31 Kennedy, p. 99.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 100.

- 33 Donald K. Pickens, *Eugenics and the Progressives*, p. 151.
- 34 Ibid., p. 152.
- 35 Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization*, p. 91.
- 36 Kennedy, p. 116.
- 37 Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization*, p. 90.
- 38 *Birth Control Review*, vol. 16, no. 4 (April 1932). Also see Kenneth C. McArthur, *Eugenics and the Church* (Eugenics Society of Northern California, 1945). Eugenics Pamphlet no. 42.
- 39 Sanger, "Plan for Peace," *Birth Control Review*, vol. 16, no. 4 (April 1932), p. 107.
- 40 Schreiber, *The Men behind Hitler*, p. 35.
- 41 Ernst Rubin, "Eugenic Sterilization: An Urgent Need," *Birth Control Review*, vol. 17, no. 4 (April 1933), p. 102.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Paul Popenoe, "Eugenic Sterilization," *Birth Control Review*, vol. 17, no. 4 (April 1933), p. 82.
- 44 Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Society*, p. 117.
- 45 Ibid., p. 118.
- 46 Leon F. Whitney, "Selective Sterilization," *Birth Control Review*, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 85.
- 47 Hillel and Henry, *Of Pure Blood*, p. 148.
- 48 Harry H. Laughlin, "Eugenical Aspects of Legal Sterilization," *Birth Control Review*, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 87.
- 49 Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Society*, p. 118.
- 50 Sanger, *Birth Control Review*, October 1926.
- 51 Sanger, "Intelligence Tests for Legislators," *Birth Control Review*, vol. 7, no. 5 (May 1923), p. 1.
- 52 George Mosse, *Nazi Culture: Intellectual, Cultural and Social Life in the Third Reich* (London: W. H. Allen, 1966), p. 307.
- 53 Ibid., p. 38. Quoted from Hermann Paull, *Deutsche Rassenhygiene: Ein gemeinverstandliches Gesprach ueber Vererbungslehre, Eugenik, Familie, Sippe, Rasse und Volkstum*, Part 2: *Erbgesundheitspflege (Eugenik), Rassenpflege* (Gorlitz: Verlag fur Sippenforschung und Wappenkunde, C. A. Starke, 1934), pp. 17-21.
- 54 Sanger, *Pivot of Civilization*, p. 279. Taken from the first statement of the "Principles and Aims of the American Birth Control League."
- 55 Mark H. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1963), p. 20.
- 56 Michael C. Schwartz, "Bringing the Sexual Revolution Home: Planned Parenthood's 'Five-Year Plan,'" *America*, 18 February 1978.
- 57 According to a statistical investigation done by Indian Women United for Social Justice, headed by Dr. Constance Uri.
- 58 Sparer, "Ethnic Group and Welfare Status of Women Sterilized in Federally Funded Family Planning Programs," *Family Planning Perspectives*, vol. 6, no. 4 (fall 1974).
- 59 *National Catholic Reporter*, 19 Jan. 1979.
- 60 Erma Clardy Craven, "Abortion, Poverty and Black Genocide," in *Abortion and Social Justice*, ed. Thomas W. Hilgers and Dennis J. Horan (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1972), p. 233.
- 61 Ibid., p. 234.
- 62 Diana E. H. Russell and Nicole Van de Ven, *Crimes against Women: Proceedings of the International Tribunal* (Millbrae, Cal.: Les Femmes, 1976), pp. 27-28.

- 63 Ibid., p. 29.
- 64 *Family Planning Perspectives*, vol. 7, no. 3 (May/June 1975).
- 65 Christopher Tietze, "Legal Abortions in the United States: Rates and Ratios by Race and Age, 1972-74," *Family Planning Perspectives*, vol. 9, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 1977).
- 66 U.S. Census Bureau.
- 67 Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.
- 68 Based on CDC 1975 data and trends from 1971 to 1975.
- 69 U.S. Census Bureau.
- 70 New York City Department of Health Statistics.
- 71 U. S. Census Bureau.
- 72 Allan Chase, *Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), p. 16. His footnote reads: "U.S. District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell, Opinion in *Relf. v. Weinberger et al.*: Civil actions nos. 73-1557, 74-243, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, March 15, 1974."
- 73 Linda Gordon, *Woman's Body, Woman's Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America* (New York: Grossman Publ., 1976), p. 223.
- 74 Ibid.
- 75 Ibid., p. 333.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 Lawrence Lader, *Breeding Ourselves to Death* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1971), p. 22.
- 78 William Shockley, "Possible Transfer of Metallurgical and Astronomical Approaches to the Problem of Environment versus Heredity," *Science and the Concept of Race*, 1968.
- 79 Lader, *Breeding Ourselves to Death*, pp. 22, 35.
- 80 Garrett Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons," in *Population, Evolution, and Birth Control: A Collage of Controversial Ideas* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1969), p. 378.
- 81 *Newsweek*, 5 June 1978.
- 82 *Washington Post*, 17 Nov. 1978, p. A-3.
- 83 Lawrence Lader and Milton Meltzer, *Margaret Sanger, Pioneer of Birth Control* (New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1969), p. 163.