

Abortion and the "Right-to-Life": facts, fallacies, and fraud

James W. Prescott

I Cross-Cultural Studies

The abortion issue has become volatile. Violence against abortion clinics to stop or interfere with abortions has been reported with some prominence in the press.^{1,2,3,4} This violence has included fire-bombing, throwing gasoline and other flammable liquids on clinic staff—one staff member was temporarily blinded—vandalism, including slashing of phone lines and upholstery and destruction of operating equipment, forcible entry into operating theaters which interrupted medical procedures and threatened the medical safety of patients—anti-abortionists chained themselves to the operating tables—bullets fired into clinics, and lesser forms of violence, including picket lines which harassed patients and prevented their entry into the abortion clinics.

These forms of violence were condoned and supported by the judicial actions of Judge Lewis Griffith of the General District Court in Fairfax, Virginia, who found the anti-abortionists not guilty of trespassing and violence because they acted in the belief that they were saving lives (October 19, 1977) and by Judge Mason Grove of the same court, who declared the Virginia statute legalizing first trimester abortions unconstitutional. Fortunately, judicial restraint was obtained from Judge Albert Bryan, U.S. District Court, who issued a restraining order prohibiting the anti-abortionists from going near or entering the abortion clinics (February 15, 1978). The National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL) has noted that twenty to thirty violent attempts to stop abortion clinic procedures have been reported throughout the country.³ (See figures 1 and 2.)

In an update on violence against abortion clinics, NARAL (April 1978 newsletter) has reported that the restraining order in Fairfax, Virginia has resulted in no further incidents. Also, courts in Anchorage, Alaska; Silver Springs and Baltimore, Maryland; New London, Connecticut; and Omaha, Nebraska; have convicted trespassers for attempting to interfere with clinic operations.

Opposition to abortion has also been reported as a factor in early reports on the phasing out of the birth-defect detection

program of the March of Dimes. Anti-abortion leaders are reported to have said that parents have no right to decide whether a deformed child can be born, and they were displeased with the "phase out" plans of the March of Dimes prenatal screening program, which they asserted should be abruptly terminated.⁵ An official announcement of the National Foundation of the March of Dimes (March 28, 1978), apparently in response to public protest, reaffirmed its support of genetic services, including amniocentesis, as a means to prevent birth defects.

An escalation of the abortion conflict has resulted from recent United States Supreme Court decisions and congressional actions that have exempted the states from being required to pay for abortions with medicaid funds. This has moved the conflict into each state where legislation is being vigorously debated on public funding of abortions.

Further polarization of this country by the abortion issue is seen on the religious front, where legal briefs are being prepared which assert that religious rights are being violated when the government uses an economic weapon to limit or deny the expression of religious convictions by a minority of poor citizens, for example, moral requirements of responsible parenthood, which includes the moral imperative to avoid bringing human life into an environment of abuse and neglect. The humanistic religious principles that provide moral justification for abortion are contained in the following resolution that was passed by vote of the membership of the American Humanist Association at its annual meeting on May 1, 1977, Los Angeles, California:

Resolution on Responsible Parenthood

The American Humanist Association reaffirms the ethical and moral responsibilities of all humanist parents to avoid bringing children into this world who are not wanted; to avoid bringing children into an environment of neglect and abuse; to assure that children are well-born; and to provide an affectionate, loving, and healthy environment for all children that they may enjoy an equal opportunity to realize the fullness and uniqueness of their own humanity.

We affirm the moral right of women to become pregnant by choice and to become mothers by choice. We affirm the moral right of women to freely choose a termination of unwanted pregnancies. We oppose actions by individuals, organizations, and governmental bodies that attempt to restrict and limit the woman's moral right and obligation of responsible parenthood.

We also affirm the right and moral responsibility of parents and future parents to be free from ignorance on matters of human sexuality and to have access to contraceptive methods in order to prevent unwanted pregnancies and abortions, and to avoid the spread of venereal disease.

We hold these moral rights of responsible parenthood as part of our humanistic religious heritage and consider infringements upon these moral rights as an infringement upon the free exercise of our humanistic religious principles as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.



James W. Prescott is a member of the board of directors of the American Humanist Association, a member of the Washington Ethical Society, an editorial associate of The Humanist, president of the Institute of Humanistic Science, and a developmental neuropsychologist with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, HEW. The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author.

The diversity of religious moral beliefs on the abortion issue must be recognized. Additional moral dilemmas are raised when adults bring new human life into an environment that compromises or prevents the moral development of that new life. It would appear helpful to suggest that the consequences of such environments upon moral development should be reexamined within the biblical context: "It would be better for that man if he had never been born." (Matt. 26:24) This quotation from Matthew is attributed to Jesus Christ, who directed this comment at Judas for his betrayal. If the prevention of human life is considered morally desirable in this context, would the prevention of human life in other contexts also be equally morally desirable? The religious view on abortion is divided, and the Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights has summarized excerpts from statements about abortion rights as expressed by many national religious organizations. It is evident that the Catholic hierarchy has failed to exercise its ecclesiastical authority over the Catholic people (83 percent of all practicing Catholics use some form of birth control and only 6 percent are using the approved rhythm method) and that they are now turning to civil law to accomplish what they could not accomplish through ecclesiastical law. Archbishop Joseph Bernardin, in August 1977, who was then president of the Catholic Conference of Bishops, announced expanded anti-abortion activities that would eliminate "the evil practice from our country."⁶ This attempt to impose a specific religious viewpoint on the American people through the use of civil and constitutional law is not limited to abortion. *The Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights* has also reported the following:

Father Paul Marx of the Human Life Center has written: "Pro-lifers who work toward the day when we shall no longer kill our unborn are only kidding themselves if they condone contraception—contraception is the chief cause of the present moral chaos. So-called contraception, in fact, often turns out to be silent (early) abortion induced by the Pill or the IUD."⁶

It is evident that these efforts involve a clear violation of and threat to the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment, which mandates the separation of church and state. Why should the fundamentalist religious minorities (Roman Catholicism is not alone in this anti-abortion movement, although it is the principal financial and political supporter) seek to impose their religious viewpoint on abortion upon the rest of the country? And why should the anti-abortion movement utilize violent methods to achieve their goal?

It is clear that differences of moral opinion concerning abortion are escalating confrontation in the religious and human rights domains. The anti-abortionists claim that the fertilized ovum, the embryo, and the fetus have the full and equal status of human *personhood*, the termination of whose life is equivalent to killing a person. The pro-abortionists deny this assertion and hold that the termination of unwanted pregnancies is a moral, responsible act to avoid the immorality of bringing unwanted children into existence with all the risks of abuse, neglect, or an early violent death.

It is equally clear that these moral differences cannot be resolved or clarified from religious/philosophical arguments since these arguments begin with assumptions that are the very source of contention. Consequently, it was thought that an examination of social-behavioral characteristics for these two groups might shed some light on the morality of abortion behaviors themselves. With this objective in mind several research activities were initiated. These involved:

- A. evaluation of the social-behavioral characteristics of pre-industrial ("primitive") cultures that support and punish abortion;
- B. relating abortion practices to infanticide practices in these preindustrial cultures;
- C. evaluating voting patterns in the U.S. Senate, specifically, relating votes on abortion to votes on bills that support human violence and reject human nurturance; and
- D. utilizing a psychometric instrument to evaluate attitudes on abortion to attitudes on other behaviors which carry clear social-moral values regarding respect and dignity for the quality of human life and its freedom of expression.

Some of these data have been briefly presented previously, but their summary and more extensive presentation here should assist the comprehensiveness of this report.^{7,8}

Cross-Cultural Studies: Abortion and Violence

The data for this analysis was obtained from R. B. Textor.⁹ This book provides statistical relationships among a number of coded scales of behaviors and societal characteristics for some four hundred preindustrial cultures that have been developed by a number of different cultural anthropologists. Consequently, these data become a universal resource to test hypotheses concerning how certain behaviors are interrelated. The coded scale on abortion was developed by Dr. Barbara Chartier Ayres, who provided information on twenty-three preindustrial cultures, where eleven cultures punished abortion severely and twelve cultures permitted abortion.

Table 1 summarizes the statistically significant social-behavioral characteristics associated with abortion practices. The value for the statistic "chi-square" (χ^2) is given with the level of statistical significance for each of the social-behavioral correlates. The data in table 1 clearly links the punishment of abortion with the practice of slavery and polygyny; repressive sexuality; killing; torturing, and mutilation of enemies captured in warfare; and being patrilineal rather than matrilineal. The converse relationships are found for those cultures which permit abortion; that is, they do not practice slavery or polygyny; they



Vandalism in a Cleveland abortion clinic.

Table 1
Social-Behavioral Correlates of Abortion Practices

1. 55% of Cultures Which Punish Abortion Practice Slavery
92% of Cultures Which Do Not Punish Abortion Do Not Practice Slavery
($\chi^2 = 3.81, P = .03, N = 23$)
2. 100% of Cultures Which Punish Abortion Practice Polygyny
58% of Cultures Which Do Not Punish Abortion Rarely Practice Polygyny
($\chi^2 = 3.66, P = .04, N = 23$)
3. 78% of Cultures Which Punish Abortion Restrict Youth Sexual Expression
67% of Cultures Which Do Not Punish Abortion Do Not Restrict Youth Sexual Expression. (Virginity Has a High or Low Value in These Cultures)
($\chi^2 = 2.49, P = .08, N = 21$)
4. 88% of Cultures Which Punish Abortion Punish Extramarital Sex
67% of Cultures Which Do Not Punish Abortion Do Not Punish Extramarital Sex
($\chi^2 = 3, P = .05, N = 17$)
5. 73% of Cultures Which Punish Abortion Also Kill, Torture, and Mutilate Enemies Captured in Warfare
80% of Cultures Which Do Not Punish Abortion Do Not Kill, Torture, and Mutilate Enemies Captured in Warfare
($\chi^2 = 3.92, P = .03, N = 21$)
6. 100% of Cultures Which Punish Abortion Are Patrilineal Rather Than Matrilineal
71% of Cultures Which Do Not Punish Abortion Are Matrilineal Rather Than Patrilineal
($\chi^2 = 4.98, P = .02, N = 14$)

Source: R. B. Textor, HRAF Press, New Haven, 1967.

are not sexually repressive; they do not engage in killing, torturing, and mutilation of enemies captured in warfare; they are matrilineal rather than patrilineal. These data provide no support for the anti-abortionists' claim that their position reflects a respect for the dignity and quality of human life. In fact, these data provide support for the converse, namely, that anti-abortion mentality is characterized by a lack of respect for the dignity, quality, and equality of human life. It is not surprising to find such values and social-behavioral patterns in patrilineal and not in matrilineal cultures.

Table 2 lists by name those twenty-three cultures which were punitive or supportive of abortion. In addition, those cultures which were rated as engaging or not engaging in killing, torturing, and mutilation of enemies captured in warfare are identified.

Table 3 lists by name those cultures which punish or permit abortion and which have also been identified as patrilineal or matrilineal. This information was available for fourteen of the twenty-three cultures, and two of the seven matrilineal cultures (29 percent) were found to punish abortion, whereas 100 percent of the patrilineal cultures were found to punish abortion.

Table 2
Distribution of Cultures by Abortion Practices

Cultures Where Severe Punishment for Abortion Is High	Cultures Where Severe Punishment For Abortion Is Low or Absent
Alorese	Ainu
Ashanti	Chagga
Azande	Dobuans
Balinese	Dusun*
Chir-Apache	Hano
Fon	Kurtatchi
Jivaro	Kwakiutl
Masai	Lesu
Sanpoil	Marshallese*
Venda	Papago
Wogeo	Pukapuka
	Tikopia

Killing, Torturing, Mutilation of Enemy is Low
Killing, Torturing, Mutilation of Enemy is High
**Information Lacking in Textor Code 421*

Table 3
Abortion Practices in Patrilineal and Matrilineal Cultures

Abortion Punished	Abortion Permitted
Patrilineal Cultures 100%	Matrilineal Cultures 71%
Alorese	Dobuans
Azande	Hano
Ashanti	Kurtatchi
Fon	Lesu
Masai	Marshallese
Venda	
Wogeo	

Chagga and Tikopia are Matrilineal Cultures Which Punish Abortion.

CHI-SQUARE = 4.98, P = 0.02, PHI = 0.60, N = 14

Abortion and Infanticide

Table 4 lists by name those cultures which punish or permit abortion and whether infanticide is present or absent in these cultures. The ratings on infanticide were also provided by Dr. Ayres where twenty-one of twenty-three cultures were so rated. The statistical analysis by Textor showed no significant statistical relationship between abortion and infanticide practices in these preindustrial cultures.⁹ An inspection of table 4 will indicate that infanticide is practiced by as many cultures that punish abortion (eight cultures) as those that do not punish abortion (seven cultures). With respect to the absence of infanticide, it is of interest to note that there are twice as many cultures which permit abortion and lack infanticide than cultures which oppose abortion and lack infanticide. Only two of twenty-one (10 percent) of the cultures fit the expectations demanded by the anti-abortion claim, that is, they are opposed to abortion and there is an absence of infanticide.

Table 4
Abortion and Infanticide

Abortion Punished Infanticide Present		Abortion Punished Infanticide Absent	
Azande Chir-Apache Fon Jivaro Masai Sanpoil Venda Wogeo		Ashanti Balinese	
N	8	N	2
Percent	38	Percent	10
Abortion Permitted Infanticide Present		Abortion Permitted Infanticide Absent	
Ainu Chagga Dobuans Dusun Kwakiutl Marshallese Tikopia		Hano Kurtatchi Papago Pukapuka	
N	7	N	4
Percent	33	Percent	19

The claim of the anti-abortionists that abortion is equivalent to killing a human person, that is, that feticide and infanticide are equivalent, is simply not supported by these data. Further, the social-behavioral characteristics that were related to the abortion variable did not relate to the infanticide variable. However, there was a tendency for patrilineal cultures to be linked with the practice of infanticide ($p = .08$); and significantly fewer infant/child support and nurturance measures were found in the infanticide cultures. It is emphasized, however, that the variables of slavery; polygyny; repressive sexuality; and killing, torturing, and mutilation of enemies captured in warfare, which are significantly linked to the abortion variable, are unrelated to the infanticide variable. Again, this analysis provides no support for the anti-abortionists' claim that terminating an unwanted pregnancy is equivalent to killing a human person—a newborn (infanticide). If the anti-abortionists' claim were correct, we would expect that anti-abortion cultures would be peaceful and humane, respect the quality, dignity, and equality of human life, and not practice infanticide. None of these conditions characterize the anti-abortion cultures.

In this context it should be noted that Nazi Germany was strongly opposed to abortion and provided the death penalty for both the woman who had the abortion and the abortionist. Hans Bleuel reported that the Reich Ministry of Justice sentenced women to hard labor for having an abortion and executed abortionists.¹⁰ Capital punishment was recommended for second offenders. Abortion was permissible solely on racial

grounds. When one parent was of impure blood, abortion was permissible in the public interest. In this context, it was previously reported that a French woman was executed in German-occupied France for obtaining an abortion.⁷

Voting Patterns in the United States Senate: Abortion, Violence and Nurturance

Since the cross-cultural data on preindustrial cultures characterized anti-abortion cultures as violent and dehumanizing, it was considered desirable to attempt to cross-validate these relationships in modern complex cultures. One such attempt involved the analysis of voting patterns in the United States Senate, where votes on abortion were related to votes on capital punishment, continuing funding of the war in Vietnam, abolition of the "no-knock" laws (they permitted police to break into homes without court orders), and hand-gun control legislation. Some of these data have been previously published in a synoptic form.^{7,8} This analysis will report in detail the voting characteristics of each senator, who will be identified by name. In addition, the voting characteristics of U.S. senators on human violence legislation will be compared with their voting characteristics on family nurturance legislation, as it is reflected in the ratings of the National Farmers Union (NFU) for each senator. The NFU voting reflects the degree to which senators support the farm family, poverty programs, food programs, and other welfare programs for children, the elderly, and other disadvantaged citizens. NFU ratings range from zero to one hundred, with low scores reflecting low family nurturance; and high scores reflecting high family nurturance.¹¹

Table 5 summarizes the statistics that relate votes against abortion to votes on a variety of bills that support human vio-

Table 5
Senators Opposed to Abortion: Bartlett Amendment 1974

Descriptor	χ^2	P	N	PHI	%
Support Capital Punishment ¹	10.98	.0009	75	.38	71
Support Vietnam War	14.05	.0002	65	.46	72
Support "No-Knock" Laws ³	10.72	.001	71	.39	65
Oppose Hand-Gun Control	11.68	.0006	74	.40	71

¹ S1401 Passed 54-33 March 13, 1974

² S2999 Passed 43-38 May 6, 1974 (Kennedy Amendment)

³ S3355 Passed 64-31 July 11, 1974 (Ervin Amendment)

⁴ S1401 Passed 58-31 January 13, 1974 (McClellan Amendment)

74% Who Support Capital Punishment Do Not Support Abortion

64% Who Do Not Support Capital Punishment Support Abortion

84% Who Support Vietnam War Do Not Support Abortion

62% Who Do Not Support Vietnam War Support Abortion

86% Who Support "No-Knock" Laws Do Not Support Abortion

55% Who Do Not Support "No-Knock" Laws Support Abortion

73% Who Support Hand Guns Do Not Support Abortion

70% Who Do Not Support Hand Guns Support Abortion

lence and oppose civil liberties. These data show that there are highly significant statistical relationships between voting against abortion and voting to continue supporting the war in Vietnam; supporting the "no-knock" laws, and opposing handgun control legislation. These voting records are from 1974 and they provide clear and unambiguous documentation that anti-abortion mentality in an advanced, "civilized" complex industrial society is no different from that observed in "primitive" preindustrial cultures where opposition to abortion is associated with authoritarian, fascist, violent, and dehumanizing non-nurturing behaviors.

The value of χ^2 is a statistic reflecting the relationship between two variables. The *P* value is the probability that the relationship could occur by chance—the probability that the relationship between votes on abortion and capital punishment could occur by chance is six out of 10,000; the *N* value is the number of senators involved in the analysis; the *PHI* value is a correlation coefficient reflecting the strength of the relationship; the percent value indicates the magnitude of correct classification of senators in the voting relationship—the number of senators voting against abortion and for capital punishment, plus those voting for abortion and against capital punishment. The sum is expressed as a percent of all senators voting.

Table 6 lists two groups of senators. Senators in *Group A* voted against the 1974 Bartlett Amendment to the fiscal 1975 Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations bill prohibiting Medicaid funds from being used to pay for, or encourage, abortion. A vote on a motion to table the amendment was

Table 6
Senate Record on Family Nurturance, Abortion,
and Capital Punishment - 1974 (Bartlett Amendment)

<i>Group A</i>		<i>Group B</i>			
High Family Nurturance		Low Family Nurturance			
Support Abortion		Against Abortion			
No Capital Punishment		For Capital Punishment			
Senator	NFU	Senator	NFU	Senator	NFU
Abourezk	88	Allen	35	Hansen	12
Aiken	82	Bartlett	18	Helms	6
Brooke	88	Bellman	20	Hruska	24
Burdick	100	Bible	82	Huddleston	82
Case	100	Brock	24	Johnston	63
Clark	100	Buckley	0	Long	73
Cranston	100	Byrd, H. F.	29	McClellan	41
Hart	100	Byrd, R. C.	76	McClure	18
Hathaway	100	Cannon	76	McGee	81
Humphrey	100	Church	88	Montoya	76
Inouye	100	Curtis	24	Nunn	38
Kennedy	100	Dole	35	Randolph	82
Mathias	94	Domenici	56	Roth	35
Pearson	88	Ervin	35	Schweiker	88
Pell	94	Fannin	6	Stennis	29
Stevenson	94	Goldwater	12	Thurmond	18
Weicker	92	Griffin	44	Young	75
Williams	100	Gurney	33		
Mean NFU	96	Mean NFU	44	$\chi^2 = 11.90$	
Percent	24	Percent	47	<i>P</i> = .0006	
<i>N</i>	18	<i>N</i>	35	<i>N</i> = 75	

defeated fifty to thirty-four on September 17, 1974. *Group A* Senators also voted against the capital punishment bill S1401, which established new standards and procedures for the imposition of the death penalty. S1401 was passed fifty-four to thirty-three on March 13, 1974. The NFU ratings for 1974 are listed next to the name of each senator. Senators in *Group B* supported the Bartlett Amendment and voted for capital punishment. Each senator's 1974 NFU rating is also listed next to his name.

An inspection of table 6 indicates that eighteen of seventy-five senators voting on both bills (24 percent of the total) supported abortion, opposed capital punishment, and had a mean (average) NFU rating of ninety-six. Eighteen of thirty senators (60 percent) voting for abortion voted against capital punishment. *Group A* senators are non-violent, have high family nurturance, and support abortion. *Group B* senators (thirty-five of seventy-five, or 47 percent of all senators voting on both bills) oppose abortion and support capital punishment. Thirty-five of forty-five senators (78 percent) voting against abortion voted for capital punishment. Their mean NFU rating is forty-four, which is less than half the family nurturance of those senators who support abortion. These relationships are statistically significant (*p* = .0006), which means that the probability of this relationship occurring by chance is six out of 10,000. These data confirm the relationships obtained in preindustrial cultures which link anti-abortion to human violence and low nurturance (slavery and punitive sexuality). It should be observed that some senators in *Group B* who oppose abortion and support capital punishment receive high NFU family nurturance scores (17 percent: six of thirty-five). The exceptions are evaluated in table 7, where it should be noted that senators who receive NFU scores from zero to seventy-nine fall in the approximate lower half of the distribution of scores, and senators who receive scores from eighty to one hundred fall in the upper half of the distribution of scores.

Table 7 lists those senators in *Group C* and *Group D*. *Group C* senators represent ten of seventy-five (13 percent) of the senators voting on both bills where they vote against abortion and against capital punishment. This represents the true "right-to-life" position, and it is not surprising to find these senators with very high family nurturance ratings where their mean NFU rating is ninety-three. This 13 percent is remarkably similar to the 10 percent of primitive cultures that reflected the "right-to-life" position described in table 4—both represent clear minority positions. With respect to only those senators voting against abortion this statistic becomes ten of forty-five (22 percent). *Group D* senators represent twelve of seventy-five (16 percent) of senators voting for both bills where these senators vote for abortion and for capital punishment. As a group they also have a mixed or highly variable NFU rating of family nurturance whose mean is seventy-eight, which falls below the median. This group of senators is the most difficult to interpret; however, any attempted interpretation should give close attention to each senator's NFU rating of family nurturance, which can serve as an important anchor point. *Group D* senators are clearly not a uniform group and are dichotomous with respect to their family nurturance.

In order to validate the relationships obtained in the 1974 voting records of the U.S. Senate, this analytic study was repeated for votes on abortion in 1977 involving the Helms Amendment to the Labor-HEW Appropriation Bill for 1978, which stated: "None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term." This

Table 7.
Senate Record on Family Nurturance, Abortion,
and Capital Punishment - 1974 (Bartlett Amendment)

<i>Group C</i>		<i>Group D</i>	
High Family Nurturance Against Abortion No Capital Punishment		Mixed Family Nurturance Support Abortion For Capital Punishment	
Senator	NFU	Senator	NFU
Biden	94	Baker	64
Eagleton	88	Chiles	65
Hartke	92	Haskell	100
Hughes	100	Jackson	100
McGovern	94	Magnuson	100
McIntyre	88	Moss	100
Metcalf	88	Scott, H.	67
Muskie	100	Scott, Wm.	19
Pastore	94	Stafford	100
Proxmire	88	Stevens	82
		Symington	94
		Taft	47
Mean NFU	93	Mean NFU	78
Percent	13	Percent	16
N	10	N	12

National Farmers Union Rating (1974)
0-79 = Low Family Nurturance

National Farmers Union Rating (1974)
80-100 = High Family Nurturance

Capital Punishment Senate Bill S1401 (v73)
Passed 54-33 (3/13/74)

Abortion Bill: Bartlett Amendment to Fiscal 1975
DHEW Appropriations Defeated 50-34, 9/17/74

Table 8
Senate Record on Family Nurturance and Abortion
Helms Amendment - June 29, 1977, N = 42

<i>Group A</i>	<i>Group B</i>	<i>Group C</i>	<i>Group D</i>
Very High Family Nurturance	Very Low Family Nurturance No Abortion	Very High Family Nurturance No Abortion	Very Low Family Nurturance
19/42 = 45%	15/42 = 36%	2/42 = 5%	7/42 = 14%
19/25 = 76%	15/17 = 88%	2/17 = 12%	6/25 = 24%
19/21 = 90%	15/21 = 71%	2/21 = 10%	6/21 = 29%
Abourezk	Allen	Ford	Baker
Bayh	Byrd, H. F.	Schweiker	Bellmon
Burdick	Curtis		Goldwater
Byrd, R. C.	Dole		Hansen
Clark	Domenici		Scott, Wm.
Cranston	Eastland		Tower
Culver	Garn		
Glenn	Griffin		
Gravel	Helms		
Haskell	Laxalt		
Humphrey	McClure		
Kennedy	Roth		
Leahy	Stennis		
Matsunaga	Thurmond		
McIntyre	Young		
McGovern			
Metcalf			
Nelson			
Riegle, Jr.			

$\chi^2 = 16.70$; $P = .00004$
 $\text{PHI} = .63$; $N = 42$

National Farmers Union Rating (1976)
0-39 = Very Low Family Nurturance
90-100 = Very High Family Nurturance
Abortion Rating = Senate Rollcall Vote No. 258,
Helms Amendment June 29, 1977.

amendment failed in a vote of sixty-five to thirty-three on June 29, 1977 (Rollcall Vote No. 258 Legislature).

For this analysis a more striking test of the relationship between abortion and family nurturance was conducted by first identifying those senators who received the lowest 25 percent of NFU scores on family nurturance and those who received the highest 25 percent of NFU scores on family nurturance. NFU ratings from 1976 were used for this analysis, and NFU scores from zero to thirty-nine represented the lowest 25 percent of senators on family nurturance; and NFU scores ninety to one hundred represented the highest 25 percent of senators on family nurturance. These two groups of senators were then compared on the basis of how they voted on the Helms Amendment described above. This resulted in a sample size of forty-two senators who represent the extremes of the NFU ratings on family nurturance and who voted on the Helms Amendment.

Table 8 identifies these two groups of senators and their exceptions. *Group A* senators represent nineteen of forty-two (45 percent) of the sample, and they voted for abortion and were all characterized by very high family nurturance scores of ninety to one hundred. They also represent 76 percent (nineteen of twenty-five) of senators voting for abortion. *Group B* senators represent fifteen of forty-two (36 percent) of the total sample,

and they voted against abortion and all had very low family nurturance scores (zero to thirty-nine). They also represent 88 percent (fifteen of seventeen) of the senators voting against abortion. *Group C* senators, the "right-to-life" senators, represent 5 percent (two of forty-two) of the total sample, and they voted against abortion and had very high family nurturance scores. They also represent 12 percent (two of seventeen) of the senators voting against abortion. *Group D* senators represent 14 percent (six of forty-two) of the total sample, and they voted for abortion but had very low family nurturance scores. They also represent 24 percent (six of twenty-five) of the senators voting for abortion.

The statistical significance of these relationships are extremely high; the probability of their occurring by chance is four out of 100,000. Again, these data strongly confirm that anti-abortion mentality is primarily a non-nurturant mentality and provide no support for the anti-abortionists' claim that their position reflects a respect for the quality, dignity, and equality of human life.

A converse analysis shows that 71 percent (fifteen of twenty-



Fire destroyed this Planned Parenthood abortion clinic in St. Paul.

one) of this sample who have very low family nurturance scores oppose abortion, and 90 percent (nineteen of twenty-one) who have very high family nurturance scores support abortion.

In summary, the voting patterns of the U.S. Senate on abortion and on several bills of human violence and civil liberties, with ratings of their family nurturance by the NFU, clearly and unequivocally link opposition to abortion with the support of human violence legislation, opposition to civil liberties, and the absence of family nurturance. For the 1974 Bartlett Amendment the incidence of the true "right-to-life" position for the total voting Senate (against abortion and against capital punishment) is 13 percent, and is 22 percent (ten of forty-five) of those opposed to abortion.

For the Helms Amendment, the "right-to-life" statistic (no abortion and high family nurturance) is 12 percent (two of seventeen). These data indicate that only a minority within the anti-abortion movement can be considered to respect the quality, dignity, and equality of human life (12 to 22 percent). The remainder (78 to 92 percent) can be characterized as authoritarian, dehumanizing, fascist, violent, and lacking in family nurturance. This conclusion is based upon the collective evidence summarized herein and individual exceptions to these categorizations would have to be demonstrated with additional data. Utilizing caution, these percentage values can be used as preliminary estimates of the true "right-to-life" position within the anti-abortion movement in the United States.

It is worth noting that an analysis of the relation between abortion and capital punishment was previously reported for the Canadian Parliament, where votes on bill C-168 to abolish capital punishment (1967-1968) were related to votes on bill C-150 to permit abortion (1968-1969). A highly significant relationship was obtained, with 59 percent voting for both reform bills, and 21 percent voting against both reform bills. Thus 80 percent supported the basic inverse relationship between capital punishment and abortion ($P = .00001$).^{7,8} Only 16 percent voted against capital punishment and abortion. The assistance of Frank F. Borowicz, professor of law, University of Windsor, in providing these roll call votes for analysis is appreciated.

The results from these analyses of voting records in the United States Senate are highly consistent with the relationships obtained in "primitive" cultures. Opposition to abortion is highly correlated with various forms of human violence, namely, the subjugation of women, the practice of slavery, punitive and restrictive sexuality, capital punishment, arbitrary human seizure, human torture, and support of warfare. It is perhaps worth em-

phasizing that compulsory motherhood is a form of slavery; therefore, it is not surprising to observe that these phenomena are highly interrelated in both "primitive" and modern cultures. For these reasons, it is of interest to note the historical tolerance, if not acceptance, of slavery in this country by the Roman Catholic hierarchy and other fundamentalist religious institutions. The subjugation and control of the people through religious orthodoxy is a form of human slavery. Questions must be raised as to why these religious institutions did not oppose the establishment of slavery in this nation with the vigor that they are opposing abortion today. If they had, we would not only have a different history but a different nation as well. Similar questions must also be raised with respect to capital punishment. The patrilineal structure of religious orthodox institutions, of primitive cultures that punish abortion, and of the male-dominated legislatures of this country that deny full and equal rights to women is a communality worthy of emphasis.

The roots of oppression, slavery, and fascism will be explored in the second part of this article. This will involve a formal evaluation of the interrelationships of (a) failure of nurturance; (b) repressive and punitive sexuality; and (c) religious orthodoxy. In the words of Wilhelm Reich: "Fascism is not a political party but a specific concept of life and attitude toward man, love, and work [P xxii]. . . . It is generally clear today that 'fascism' is not the act of a Hitler or a Mussolini, but that it is the expression of the irrational structure of mass man." (pxx, 1942).¹²

It is this universal property of the human mind—the reciprocal relationship between nurturance and violent oppression of thought and liberty—that will be examined with respect to abortion in Part II of this article.

This will conclude the theme of this article that the anti-abortion movement as a "right-to-life" movement, which purports to respect the dignity, quality, and equality of human life, is one of the greatest frauds ever perpetrated upon the American public.

Notes

1. *Washington Star*, March 6, 1976.
2. *MacNeill/Lehrer Report*, March 21, 1978; Moyer, "Abortion Politics," *CBS Reports*, April 22, 1978.
3. *NARAL Newsletter*, Jan./Feb./March 1978, Vol. 10, No. 1.
4. "Abortion Under Attack," *Newsweek*, June 5, 1978.
5. *Washington Star*, March 9, 1978.
6. "The Abortion Rights Crisis," *Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights*, Washington D.C., February 1978.
7. J. W. Prescott, "Abortion or the Unwanted Child: A Choice for a Humanistic Society," *The Humanist*, March/April 1975.
8. J. W. Prescott, "Abortion: 'The Controversy Continued,'" *APA Monitor*, Sept./Oct. 1975, American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
9. R. B. Textor, *A Cross-Cultural Summary*, HRAF Press, New Haven, 1957.
10. Hans Peter Bleuel, *Sex and Society in Nazi Germany* (trans.), Bantam Books, New York, 1974.
11. M. Barone, G. Ujifush, and D. Matthews: *The Almanac of American Politics*, 1978. E. P. Dutton, New York, 1977.
12. Wilhelm Reich, *The Mass Psychology of Fascism* (1933). Farrar, Straus, and Giroux (new trans., 1969) 5th printing, New York, 1973.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is gratefully extended to Mildred Beck, Washington Ethical Society, for her continued moral support in the preparation of this manuscript, and, particularly, to Bob McCoy for his critical reading of this manuscript and his many helpful suggestions for improvement, and to Executive Director Karen Muilhauser, NARAL, and staff for their assistance in providing some of the roll call votes used in this analysis and their observation that anti-abortion senators voted against "pro-life" legislation.