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ABSTRACT

Family Planning, Socio-Political Ideology, and Black Americans:
A Comparative Study of Leaders and a General Population Sample

February 1980

William Gerald Harris, B.A., University of Rochester
M.S., University of Massachusetts
Ph.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Castellano B. Turner

One of the most common lines of demarcation of proponents and opponents of black birth control and family planning has been whether or not it is a threat to blacks. The present investigation explored this issue both historically as well as empirically. The empirical examination was a secondary analysis, comparing two samples of blacks—leaders and general population respondents. The study examined their attitudes and beliefs on five socio-political dimensions of black ideology—Pro Birth Control, Separatism, Black Alienation, Fears of Genocide, and Optimism—and found leaders and the general population differed on several dimensions. The general population sample was more inclined to support separatist ideology and to be less accepting of birth control than black leaders. These and other findings, based on the control variables of the study (i.e., region, sex, age, and education attainment), supported the "direct linear formulation" of Turner and Wilson (1976) that the attitudes and beliefs of respondents are to a large degree a function of their socio-economic status.

In showing differences in the attitudes of leaders and of the general black population sample on these dimensions of black ideology, the
findings suggest that leaders may not always speak for the general black populace. Consequently, a sample of the spectrum of black views is a requisite for developing an empathic understanding of the needs of blacks. This implies that family planning and birth control policies must incorporate creatively the variability and similarity of attitudes and beliefs of Afro-Americans. Moreover, these attitudinal data must be understood in relationship to salient demographic characteristics such as region, sex, age, and education. In the final analysis, however, the nature and quality of the relationship between black leaders and the general black population may very well hold the key to the survival and social progress of Black Americans.
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CHAPTER I

THE MANIPULATION OF THE BLACK POPULATION: ITS LEGACY

Introduction

In the last two decades population growth and birth control have commanded considerable attention from all sectors of American society. Advocates of birth control have offered an array of reasons for containing the rate of population growth. Some have claimed that stabilizing the population by controlling the number of births would eliminate such social nemeses as poverty and violent crimes (e.g., U.S. Commission on Population and the American Future, 1972). Others have pointed out that controlling fertility could resolve the high rate of unemployment. The logic of this argument is simple—fewer births, fewer unemployed. Although all of these viewpoints have stressed slightly different reasons for supporting population control, the underlying assumption is the same—stabilization of the population leads to a better, more rewarding life for every American.

Opposition to the population stabilization premise has come predominantly from blacks and other non-white Americans. In expressing their objection, they have contested the institution of methods for curbing the growth rate because such measures undermined a major bargaining weapon in the American system—their numbers. Population reduction among some ethnic or racial groups would have the adverse effect of raising the potential for extinction or amalgamation. Other oppon-
ents of the enactment of strict population regulations have called for wider dissemination of the population and for a concerted attempt to achieve racial parity. Coale (1968) noted that overcrowding in metropolitan areas has been used to misrepresent a population explosion. The present overcrowding in the country's urban communities, he surmised, cannot be tied solely to the excessive fertility rates. Past migratory patterns of the American people caused certain areas to be densely settled while other areas remain only sparsely populated (e.g., mass movement from rural to industrial urban centers, from the South to the North, from the East to the West). Distributing the population of the country more evenly would enable the nation to endure continual growth for some time.

In questioning whether the United States should campaign for fewer births, Coale has suggested that true racial equality would check the growth rate. Available statistical evidence has confirmed this hypothesis. As Coale remarked,

The fact is that Negroes with a northern urban background have no higher fertility than whites with equivalent education and income. Negro women married to men with college education, with professional or related occupations, and with incomes of about the $7000 level have lower fertility than comparable whites groups (1968, p. 4).

Beside weakening the persistent myth that blacks reproduce excessively, Coale's conclusions have suggested that pertinent social parameters (e.g., civil rights, employment and educational status) may influence family size preference and fertility rate. Perhaps the most encompassing view of Coale's argument is the implicit notion that inequality in
a highly technological society breeds problems which must be resolved without disturbing appreciably the existing social order. It is this built-in maintenance mechanism that safeguards the status quo and therefore increases the likelihood of nationwide issues such as population control becoming the undue burden in many instances of blacks and other poor people.

Though Coale only doubts the strategy for stabilizing the population, other opponents are poignantly critical of most proposals to control the growth rate artificially. Many critics who question the purpose of these population proposals suggest that the severity of the growth problem is exaggerated and insist that the benefits for all Americans are overstated. While the crux of these arguments, both for and against population controls, appears quite contemporary, the heart of the debate has smoldered, with occasional eruptions, since the beginning of recorded history. In the following section a brief discussion of some of the principal and historical contributors to the present-day thinking on population and birth control is considered.

Natural Selection or Survival of the Fittest

The promulgation of population restriction and the manipulation of society's growth rate have occurred in varying forms since mankind's beginning (Himes, 1936). A number of early anthropological studies have unearthed many of the contraceptive practices, medical recipes and treatises of ancient societies (Himes, 1936; Carr-Saunders, 1922; Westermarck, 1901). The method of preventing or aborting a pregnancy, though not widespread, appeared socially acceptable. Indeed, in some
societies the practice of religiously sacrificing newborns (or infanticide) became a "way of life."

Nevertheless, the most common method of checking growth in these early cultures relied largely on nature "running its course." Plagues, diseases and epidemics tended to desolate entire communities. Wars, famine, floods, earthquakes and other catastrophes also deterred population expansion. These "death-producing" incidents provided the societies of antiquity with adequate means of limiting growth. However, during the Greco-Roman epoch, some philosophers saw such growth restraints as insufficient. Himes has written that:

Aristotle, Plato, Hesiod, Polybius and many other writers of antiquity discussed various general aspects of the population problem, including limitation. . . . Hesiod, Xenocrates, Lycurgus, for example, were partisans of the one-child family. Plato and Aristotle favored a stationary population for the Greek city state. We [also] know Polybius complained eloquently of depopulation in his time (Himes, 1936, p. 79).

Although all of these writers of Greek and Roman societies have contributed, either directly or indirectly, to the current views of population regulation, the two most noted and influential writers of this period, Plato and Aristotle, saw the applications of population constraints as socially imperative. Both prominent philosophers called for population reduction as a mode of enhancing the quality of people. Plato recommended pairing males of inferior social status with females of like rank while matching those of superior intellect and excellence with one another. Members of these two large social classes would live in segregated communities to minimize the likelihood of undesirable reproductive contact. Plato's proposal sanctioned, even encouraged, the
implementation of infanticide whenever infants of the lower class demonstrated imperfections of the mind, or body, or both (Malthus, 1803; McCleary, 1953). In The Republic, Plato offered a radical perspective on the question of superiority/inferiority when he stated bluntly that

if we are to keep our flock at the highest pitch of excellence, there should be as many unions of the best of both sexes, and as few of the inferior, as possible, and that only the offspring of the better should be kept (First American Edition, 1945, p. 159).

Plato compared the breeding process of humans as merely an extension of the system employed by farmers to produce a superior product. For instance, Plato envisioned a marriage lottery which had the outward appearance of being unbiased, but actually was manipulated to pair socially inferior individuals with one another and superior persons with each other. In his population treatise Plato specified the periods when marriage and procreation were to occur and placed strict prohibitions on those who violated the ordinance:

We said that children should be born from parents in the prime of life. Do you agree that this lasts about twenty years for a woman and thirty for a man? A woman should bear children for the commonwealth from her twentieth to her fortieth year; a man should begin to beget them when he has passed "the racer's prime in swiftness," and continue till he is fifty-five. Those are certainly the years in which both the bodily and the mental powers of man and woman are at their best. If a man either above or below this age meddles with the begetting of children for the commonwealth, we shall hold it an offense against divine and human law. He will be begetting for his country a child conceived in darkness and dire incontinence (First American Edition, 1945, p. 161).

Births outside the prescribed period and births prior to nuptial cere-
monies were viewed in "a criminal and profane light" (Malthus. 1803, p. 113). In either case the "illegitimate" infants became victims of infanticide. Aristotle's proposal for restraining population growth mirrored the recommendations of Plato. Like Plato, Aristotle wanted the establishment of unions between males and females that supposedly produced a "superior" breed of people. The major difference between the population programs of these two philosophers was primarily one of severity. Aristotle propounded harsher population regulations than Plato and criticized Plato for not attending sufficiently to the issue of population limitation.

Under Aristotle's proposal eligibility for marriage required females to be at least 18 years and male 37 years, with procreation for males terminating at age 55. The lateness assigned to this period functioned to limit family size. Another dimension entailed specifying the number of children per family, with additional pregnancies aborted "before the fetus has life" (Malthus, 1803, p. 114).

Aristotle's and Plato's basic objective for urging the limitation of population growth stemmed from a concern that unchecked population expansion fostered poverty. Both writers argued that unregulated child birth would eventually outstrip the ability of the family to support adequately its members. In other words, large families caused the division of family wealth into smaller portions, thereby driving more people to a destitute state. As the ranks of poor people swelled, social disorder and discontent would become more widespread. Presumably, limiting population growth eradicated poverty and diminished drastically the number of indigent and inferior people. The apprehension typified by Plato
and Aristotle has reverberated, often noisily, through the ages.

Malthus, Malthusianism and Neo-Malthusianism

The work of ancient writers, especially Plato and Aristotle, influenced the noted and highly polemical nineteenth-century population control advocate, Thomas Malthus. Malthus, one of England's earliest political economists, regarded by some of the founding father of scientific racism (Chase, 1977), detailed in his text, Essay on the Principle of Population (1803), the supposed causes of poverty. For him, living in poverty and despair was the natural inheritance of some and consequently was unavoidable and inescapable destiny. By referring to poverty as an indelible stain, Malthus rationalized the maintenance of a peasant labor class as mere adherence to the "great law of Nature." He criticized benevolent and ameliorative efforts as unproductive, contrary and a peril to the natural order. Malthus held that "nature brings into existence many more individuals than there is subsistence for, thereby ordaining a struggle for life, resulting through intermediate suffering, in premature deaths of the weakest, and the survival of the strongest or fittest" (Finch, 1904, p. 17). To further explicate

1 Malthus's book was originally published in 1798 and titled, Essay on Population. Critics of Malthus (Smith, 1951; Boner, 1955, 1966; Glass, 1953; Albrecht, 1950) have insisted that subsequent editions lacked the poignant, elucidating quality of the first version. They also described succeeding editions as primarily rejoinders to Malthus's critics. Kenneth Smith asserts that Malthus's mainpoints have been brought forward earlier by other writers. "The completeness with which he had been anticipated by Robert Wallace (1753, 1761) and Joseph Townsend (1786) is astonishing; yet Malthus took these ideas in 1798, wove them into an Essay, and captured the minds of a generation (Smith, 1951, p. 33)."
his view of the integral relation among population growth, food supply and poverty, Malthus proposed a theory of population predicated on three allegedly natural and unalterable principles. He stated,

a. that the increase of population is contained by the means of subsistence (i.e., the food supply);

b. that population does expand predictably when the means of subsistence increase; and

c. that the tendency of population to spiral upward is repressed by misery and vice which keeps the actual population equal to the means of subsistence (Malthus, 1803).

The former two principles comprised the foundation of his contention that population, void of restraints, increases in a geometrical ratio while subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio. Although Malthus's supposition that the population increases as a function of the food supply appeared plausible, his opponents have dismissed such statements as grossly misleading and highly inconsistent with certain historical periods (Smith, 1951). Nonetheless, the basic idea of the first two principles that the population multiplies more rapidly than its ability to produce subsistence established an argument which is advanced by the third principle. Essentially, the third principle of Malthus's population theory answered the question: how does the population keep from outstripping its means of subsistence? Malthus surmised that this seemingly disproportionate effect between population and the means of subsistence was checked by misery and vice. For Malthus, there existed two general categories of population checks: positive and preventive. Misery and vice constituted the chief "positive" or "corrective" checks which operated naturally on the population. In this sense positive
checks acted on the death rate and included also war, pestilence, and famine. On the other hand, preventive checks operated on the birth rate and entailed birth control, abortion and infanticide. Nassua William Senior (1828), a contemporary and critic of Malthus, succinctly categorized checks as follows:

Preventive checks are those which limit fecundity, the positive checks are those which decrease longevity. The first diminishes the number of births, the second increases that of death (Smith, 1951, p. 243).

Nonetheless, the common denominator of all checks are that they function to prevent the population from exceeding the limit of the food supply (Blaug, 1963).

In Malthus's first edition of The Essay, he stressed the role of misery and vice in suppressing the population. Malthus observed that misery consisted of checks that were humanly unavoidable, natural phenomena (e.g., famine and pestilence). Incidence such as war, promiscuous intercourse, unnatural passions and violations of the marriage bed were humanly avoidable and considered vices, with misery as their eventual consequence (Malthus, 1803). Although Malthus saw famine as the "ultimate" positive check, his critics (Albrechet, 1950; Hazlitt, 1807; Senior, 1828; Smith, 1951) questioned the general import of this pronouncement because world-wide indicators have shown that famine, though not universally eliminated, had declined significantly in the last several centuries. With the decline of famines as a global threat, his opponents accused him of incorporating emotionally frightening suggestions of possible holocaust to support his thesis of the necessity of popula-
tion limitation.  

More importantly, a critical point which separated Malthus and his critics centered on whether nature dominated man or vice versa. One of Malthus's underlying premises rested on the hierarchically ordered relation between nature and man. That is, nature inevitably dictated to man. The ever-present specter of resignation, even fatalism, which imbues the Malthusian model of population earned it the infamous distinction as the "dismal science" (Chamberlain, 1970). Critics of Malthus's treatment of the relationship between nature and man included his contemporaries William Godwin and Edwin Chadwick, and later, Karl Marx. Generally speaking, these men saw nature in a less dictatorial manner and credited man as having greater mastery of his destiny. Godwin contended that the technological progress of man in the areas of production and social organization was the key to providing the means of subsistence and accommodations for an expanding population. Godwin rejected the capitalistic, private property paradigm and subsequently suggested a more communally oriented society as allowing man to assert greater control over nature. Edwin Chadwick (1842), England's sanitary reform proponent, urged greater attention to preventive measures (e.g., sewage system, adequate refuse collecting, better housing) as a means of

---

2The uproar caused by Malthus's Essay has a contemporary equivalent in the work of Paul R. Ehrlich (1968) who blended very convincingly myths and facts into a choice between population control or unrestricted growth and its consequences.

3While Marx took issue with Malthus's treatment of the relationship of man and nature, he did share with Malthus a contempt for the severely downtrodden (Chase, 1977).
disarming nature of its ruthless qualities. Chadwick attacked the pseudo-scientific argument of Malthus as prejudicial and for directing attention away from prevention. Likewise, Karl Marx pointed to the technological and scientific achievements of man as providing the edge in man's on-going struggle with nature. For Marx, technology and science placed in the appropriate social organizational structure (e.g., socialism) was more than capable of blunting the often cruel, catastrophic instincts of nature. Broadly speaking, Chadwick, Godwin and Marx believed that social organization and technology would overcome problems arising from population growth (e.g., food shortage, high mortality).

The barrage of criticism leveled at Malthus and his population principles led him to introduce, beginning with the second edition, another type of corrective check which he defined as "moral restraint." Moral restraint meant delaying marriage while adhering to strict sexual continence. Malthus viewed moral restraint as more than a prudential check because it required total abstinence from "irregular gratifications" (Smith, 1951).

Moral restraint made marriage less contingent upon an individual's desires and emotions, and more a function of the economic ability of the person to support a family. Other options such as instituting a legal minimum age requirement for marriage was discarded as not enhancing the quality of society. Improving "one's lot" had a direct impact on the eradication of poverty whereas designating when marriage may occur did not attack economic instability, a chief cause of poverty. The effectiveness of postponing marriage depended entirely on the strict adher-
ence to a moral code of abstinence and prudence. Opponents and supporters alike scorned this aspect of his proposal and forecasted increased sexual activity and greater illegitimacy. Postponing marriage jeopardized the institution of marriage and family since these proposed arrangements invited sexual intimacy to supercede the establishment of traditional familial conventions.

The suggested delay of marriage made those of meager financial resources, namely the poor, the target population. The poor seldom accumulated ample resources to climb above their economic quagmire and thus became destined to live in a state of celibacy. Using financial solvency as a criterion meant that not only would the size of the indigent group shrink enormously but only a chosen few would secure adequate funds to manage a family. Those "chosen few" apparently succeeded because they were the strongest and the most industrious of the poor. Such rationalizations stood harmoniously with Malthus's indictment of the poor for their wretched condition. Malthus exhorted that the poor ought to be taught "that they are themselves the cause of their own poverty; that the means of redress are in their own hands, and in the hands of no other person" (McCleary, 1953, p. 76).

Though Malthus expressed a desire to eliminate poverty, his locus of interest lay with improving the quality of mankind by restricting its numbers. Convinced that having fewer poor people was required for the

---

4Malthus's resentment of the indigent is apparent when he describes in animal husbandry terms their sexual behavior. Malthus viewed the poor as licentious and incontinent whose unrestricted sexual habits encouraged overbreeding. For Malthus the crux of poverty was overbreeding.
development of a superior human breed, he proceeded to formulate a grandiose design for breeding a superior human animal that went beyond urging the poor to practice marriage postponement and celibacy. These tactics merely complemented the more definite corrective measures inculcated in his perception of the great laws of Nature. The suggested ameliorative effects of reducing the number of poor depended on Nature being able to run its unobstructed "natural course." Efforts designed to assist the indigent population simply impaired the laws of nature from conducting their prescribed function while retarding the development of a stronger breed. Simply put, neither society nor the affluent has a social obligation to the underprivileged and thus is absolved from the responsibility of uplifting them.

Throughout his work Malthus continually depicted the poor's condition as bleak and irremediable. Though he insisted that they, and only they, had the responsibility to modify their undesirable situation, still he was pessimistic about the poor rectifying their difficulty since the practice of moral restraint was at odds with their so-called animal instincts. He preached that the plight of the down-trodden was their natural destiny. Attempts to overturn preordained consequences were futile, even blasphemous; besides, such interference yielded only momentary changes since nature returns everyone eventually to their pre-determined life path. In propagating this message of the inevitability of poverty, Malthus attempted to discourage the affluent from undertaking or supporting schemes of benevolency.

Malthus's denunciation of the Poor Laws of England, the forerunner of today's welfare legislation, stems from more than an over-zealous
concern in navigating Nature through the perils of legislative roadblocks. Though he accuses the Poor Laws as being impractical, anti-Christian and unnatural, he declares with even greater convictions that public provisions were ruinous to the affluent, degrading to the poor and useless to society. In promulgating the abolition of the Poor Laws Malthus maintained that the cost of public welfare weighed inordinately on the landowner class. Albrecht (1950) summarizes the Malthusian viewpoint precisely when he states that "'benevolent,' narrowed in meaning public or even private support of the poor, was deprecated as interfering with free competition and therefore as being 'unjust'" (p. 21).

Malthus, "the apostle of private property," inferred that poor laws did little to relieve the poor; instead these social policies infringed upon the natural rights of the rich, causing undue hardship such as excessive taxation and resource consumption,

...any measures that eased the lot of the greatest numbers of people...from sanitary reform and medical care to birth control and, above all else, higher wages...were not only immoral and unpatriotic but also against the laws of God and Nature (Chase, 1977, p. 6).

As the spokesperson for England's bourgeoisie class, Malthus saw all social legislation which aimed to improve the living conditions of the individual and family as threatening because it tended "to remove necessary stimulus to industry." According to Malthus, the "necessary stimulus to industry," poverty, provided a sizeable pool of cheap help and child labor to fuel developing industry and to feed the demands of the landed gentry.

To Malthus, a clergyman, the discrepancies between the living con-
ditions of the poor and rich stood as a necessary inequity prescribed by nature and the system of private property. Like many of his proselytized followers, Malthus believed that the divine mandate of the poor was simply to serve diligently and obediently those of the property class. Malthus geared his theologically influenced philosophy of political economy to the continual maintenance of the "status quo." His deep, driving commitment to spur the betterment of society developed basically from a self-centered passion to increase the profit and wealth of the landowners while holding down labor cost and eliminating various tax burdens, especially those derived from charitable social policy. In accordance with this philosophy Malthus exempted the property owners from following reverently the procedures inherent in the moral restraint check. He rationalized that the rich were financially capable of supporting themselves and therefore were not impelled stringently to adhere to guidelines recommended for those with lesser resources. However, he warned the affluent to refrain from excessive fertility since such activity would compel the division of family wealth into smaller portions. Moreover, he vindicated the rich for their indolence and luxurious habits. Leisure and luxury were undeniable rights bestowed by Nature and consequently above any mitigation. Malthus's incessant insistence that it was sinful to block the path of Nature, makes it abundantly clear that all efforts to upgrade the status of the poor were wholly iniquitous and damnable.

Beside inducing an unfair burden for the rich, the Poor Laws or any other act of benevolence, reasoned Malthus, lowered the poor deeper into their deprivation. Malthus claimed that the Poor Laws "created
the poor which they maintained." Public assistance fostered improvident and early marriage while disencouraging thrift. In condemning the very existence of the Poor Laws, Malthus speculated that if they had never existed, the common people would evince less suffering and despair. To return such virtues to the poor as thriftiness and responsibility, Malthus called for the abolition of the Poor Laws and the implementation of the Malthusian Plan. His plan urged the complete abstinence from childbirth for one year which would follow immediately upon the legislative acceptance of the plan. Beside disallowing the married poor to bear children for one year, illegitimate children for the first two years of the plan's enactment would not be allowed public assistance. Care for illegitimate children depended solely on private charities, with the state withholding all support.

Malthus surmised that maintaining the indigent in a perpetual state of crisis by abolishing public welfare assistance would decrease the number of poor people. Without assistance families choosing to expand beyond their financial capabilities suffered inordinately more hardships and premature deaths. Removing relief created among the common people a further deterioration of already inadequate medical service and heightened the likelihood of starvation. The elimination of public assistance, Malthus further speculated, would compel the poor to assume their supposedly rightful and inherited social position. Fortunately, the Malthusian plan never became law. The reformed Poor Law Act of 1834 inculcated the spirit of his proposal. As Allan Chase (1977) exclaimed recently, "Malthus and his disciples in and out of Parliament perverted the Poor Law Act of 1834 from a law to bring relief to serfdom upon them"
(Chase, 1977, p. 7). Malthus predicated his strategy of exacerbating
the plight of the poor on the notion that it would prompt them to turn
abruptly and sincerely to the practice of moral restraint.

Unquestionably, the heart of Malthus's population treatise was op-
pressively discriminatory and condemning of the underprivileged. His
urging of sexual abstinence, celibacy and the abolition of benevolent
programs was aimed at the common people because they comprised, he
thought, a depressed and deficient class which was inclined to seek
gratification by unleashing their uncontrollable sexual impulses. Mal-
thus's formula for the betterment of society relied heavily on undermin-
ing the growth rate of the poor. He spurned efforts to upgrade the poor
as socially non-productive both because they tend to increase falsely
the hope of the poor while consuming financial resources. His presenta-
tion of the plight of the underprivileged as hopelessly irremediable and
his insistence that only the poor could rectify their sordid situation
laid the contemporary foundation for approaching social decadence by
"blaming the victim."

Quite frankly, the issues which encapsulated Malthus and his fol-
lowers' population policy have remained polemical and ongoing topics of
debate. Exponents of Malthusianism have stressed that the affluent mem-
ers of society do not have the responsibility to oversee or facilitate
the progress of the less fortunate, particularly since the poor were seen as unable, often unwilling, to help themselves. Both Malthus and
his supporters abused the notion of self-help. Asking the indigents who
were barely eking out an existence to take the major responsibility for
directing their improvement seemed profoundly absurd. Yet Malthus pos-
tulated that leaving the poor to determine their social fate would result in the demise of the weak and the survival of the strong while concurrently limiting the poor's population. This procedure of partial obliteration of the poor, though seemingly avoidable, consolidated Malthus's primary concern--his apprehension of the poor's number and his unwavering intention to enhance the landowners' economic strength. Appropriately, social betterment in its elementary form meant for Malthus raising the profits and gains of business and industry while minimizing losses such as taxes to support benevolent social reforms.

The Malthusian ideology of the nineteenth century was pervasive. A number of countries including Ireland, Scotland, Wales, many of the German states, Austria and to some extent Switzerland accepted either explicitly or implicitly the doctrine's logic (Glass, 1953). Though Malthus often protested that the exportation of his population theory deviated, at times radically, from his original thesis, some of his critics have seen many of these eco-political population proposals as simply more stringent and elaborate prescriptions of Malthusian thought, rather than perversions of Malthusian principles. An example of an excessively harsh and oppressive social strategy was spelled out in 1807 by the German scientist, C. A. Weinhold, shortly after the first published translation of Malthus's Essay. His Malthusian scheme entailed fitting unmarried men without ample resources to sustain a family with a chastity type belt to hinder intercourse (Glass, 1953). "Mass infibulation" for Weinhold was a viable means of preventing rapid and certainly undesirable population growth. He targeted beggars, domestic servants, journey men, apprentices, the infirmed, those receiving relief and those of low
military rank as the primary groups for forced abstinence. Though many German advocates of Malthusianism joined in ridiculing Weinhold's plan, his concept of a quality society based predominantly on social class ranking and achieved through rigid regulation of the population, contained many elements similar to Malthus's teaching. Both theorists held that the continual growth of the lower classes threatened the stability of the privileged classes. Also, in the Malthus tradition Weinhold presumed that low social status made an individual both expendable and immune to degrading treatment. In both instances, the primary objective was the preservation of the existing social arrangement. However, Weinhold questioned the reliability of the moral restraint check, but such skepticism was apparent in some of the more ardent followers of Malthus and certainly does not demonstrate a major digression from Malthusianism (Finch, 1904; Glass, 1953). Whether Malthusian followers worked for the full implementation of Malthus's policy or some derivation seems of little argumentative value, the real importance of this infamous policy has been its impact on the formulation and development of social legislation.

Nevertheless, to avoid creating a myopic view of Malthus's population control plan, several additional points must be highlighted. Though eager to reduce and control the number of poor people, Malthus never campaigned for their total obliteration. A pragmatist, he realized that the poor remained a functional and important component of society. The poor was "a necessary stimulus to industry." The landless rural peasants, artisans and yeomen were a "source of cheap adult labor" and an "ever-replenishing reservoir of even more inexpensive and docile
child labor." While apprehensive about the growing number of poor, Malthus also expressed concern over the effects of eradicating poverty entirely. Improving the poor's plight appreciably meant, besides added taxes for the affluent, the possibility of increase in the poor's wages which Malthus perceived as another drain on the wealth of the non-poor. In arguing against wage increments for the disadvantaged mass, Malthus rationalized that additional money in the hands of the poor would promote greater fecundity, thus returning the poor to their original level of poverty. Chase (1977) summarized these points nicely in the following passage:

Much as Malthus ranted against "overpopulation," he feared even more a low birth rate that would permit the working poor to demand and get higher wages and shorter working hours, as well as to earn enough money to protect their children from the normal prospect of working the usual dawn-to-dusk shifts in mines and factories. To end low wages and child labor was to deprive industry of valuable stimuli and therefore to trifle with Natural Law (Chase, 1977, p. 82).

Accordingly, the economic incentives woven into the poor's deprivation and wretchedness made efforts to extricate their condition unthinkable. Reform legislation in such areas as education, welfare and health were transformed readily into ineffective, abortive endeavors. Even during Malthus's lifetime the shallow success of tenuous reform programs compelled the deputies of government and business to draw "inescapable" conclusions of the poor's inferiority.

Though Malthus addressed the needs of the nonpoor with the bulk of his population statement, several of his contemporaries, Robert Owen and
Thomas Paine, urged greater attention for the needs of the downtrodden. Both men wrote sympathetically on the topic of relieving poverty and on such related issues as the rights of man and the responsibility of government. Owen, for instance, criticized the inadequate wages of the poor and denounced "the principle of individual gains" for limiting the amount of food made available to the workers (Albrecht, 1950). His interest in vanquishing poverty was not an endorsement of the poor relief system; instead Owen proposed "villages of cooperation" as alternative to poor relief programs. Owen saw these villages as "limited communities of individuals" based on "the principles of united labor and expenditure, having their basis in agriculture" (cf. Albrecht, 1950). Albrecht further explained that "the laborers would raise food and manufacture goods primarily for their own use, and sell only surplus products in the open markets, their supply of food would no longer be limited by the speculation of capitalists" (1950, p. 38). Owen's idea of equality and communism was attacked acrimoniously as an eminent threat to the present system of property and wages.

Yet Owen in some ways mirrored the thinking of Malthus and certainly was not advocating the toppling of the existing ruling class of England. Owen felt that the rank of the poor needed to be thinned out and presumed that such a reduction would have an ameliorating effect on their condition. Unlike Malthus who viewed the use of "artificial"

---

5 Himes (1963) reports that Robert Owen's eldest son, Robert Dale Owen, along with Charles Knowlton, initiated in American between 1828-32 the American birth control movement. R. D. Owen is remembered as one of the earliest pioneers of American Neo-Malthusianism (Himes, 1930).
means to prevent conception as unnatural and therefore sinful (McCleary, 1953), Owen hailed its usage. While Malthus held that contraceptives spurred vice and debauchery, Owen insisted the opposite—that preventing unwanted pregnancies and thus the elimination of misery was the inherent value of contraceptives. Owen's commitment to contraception devices was displayed vividly in the New Lanark experiment. While in Lanark, France, Owen devised a simple contraceptive aide for the employees of the town's cotton mills. The device was comprised of a "piece of soft sponge, tied by a bobbin or a penny ribbon, and inserted before the sexual intercourse takes place" (Chase, 1977, p. 81). Besides limiting the number of children, the practicing of such prevention, it was felt, would improve the working situation of the laborers (both adults and children) and enhance family cohesion by allowing more time for familial activities. Robert Owen's advocacy of contraceptive techniques and his polemical battles with Malthus has presented a unique twist to present-day comprehension of their ideological separation and Owen's contribution to the issue of population control. James Bonar (1966) has offered a telling commentary on this topic when he stated: "It is probable that the neo-Malthusians are the children not of Robert Malthus, but of Robert Owen" (p. 24). The important element of this statement, "it is probable," has been the focal point of attacks by zealous supporters of Malthus as the legitimate forebearer of their ideology. Though Owen and Malthus carried on a celebrated debate, both sought some form of population control and both were particularly concerned with affecting a reduction in the poor's population. In essence, the discussion was over methodology, not objectives.
Malthusianism in the United States

The arrival of Malthusian thought in America in the form of Neo-Malthusianism was unique for two related reasons. First, the Neo-Malthusian position, though in concert with most Malthusian tenets, differed sharply on the application of artificial methods (such as contraception) to control the population. As mentioned, Malthus denounced birth control and contraception methods as immoral and unnatural. A primary English opponent of his on this issue, Francis Place, advocated in his work, *Illustrations and Proofs of the Principle of Population* 1822, the usage of birth control measures over moral restraint and Place's discipline, Richard Carlile (1825) in *Every Woman's Book* discussed provocatively the "economic, social and medical aspects of birth control." They along with the elder Robert Owen formed the core of England's Neo-Malthusian movement. In fact the circulation of Carlile's publication in American laid a somewhat turbulent, but nevertheless firm foundation for Neo-Malthusianism in the New World (Himes, 1967).

The distinction as one of the pioneers of American Neo-Malthusianism has belonged to Robert Owen's eldest son Robert Dale Owen (Hines, 1967). Seemingly prompted by efforts of Carlile and the influence of his father, Robert Owen, Robert Dale Owen composed in 1830 a pamphlet entitled, *Moral Physiology*, in which he encouraged the regulation of

---

6 Besides being a major opponent of Malthus's remedy of long delayed marriage, Francis Place is considered the father of the modern birth control movement by Neo-Malthusians since he was fearful about the population growing too rapidly (Himes, 1967).

7 Richard Carlile's, *Every Woman's Book* was originally published in 1825 under the title *What Is Love?* (Himes, 1966).
population and family size by the practice of contraception. Owen's primary method of birth control was "coitus interruptus" (Himes, 1930). He rejected the partial withdrawal recommendation of Place as grossly ineffective and the sponge method of Carlile as "physically awkward and uncomfortable." Owen considered the practice of "coitus interruptus" initially difficult, but significantly less of a sacrifice than the one suggested by the check of celibacy and moral restraint. Moreover, coitus interruptus was relatively successful in France and was enforceable, if public opinion supported its adoption. In other words, Owen saw the application of contraception both as a corrective measure against the woes of overpopulation and a benefit to mankind.

In general, sentiment of opprobrium met this first American treatise on population and birth control. However, this meager beginning inspired Charles Knowlton, a physician, to write in 1832 the pamphlet, Fruits of Philosophy. Like Owen Sr., Carlile and Place, Knowlton agreed that birth control was the correct pathway to mankind's betterment. In

---

8The coitus interruptus birth control method has strong biblical roots which may account for its acceptance and support as a fertility control practice (Himes, 1963).

9Himes argues in his article "Robert Dale Owen, the pioneer of American neo-Malthusianism" [The American Journal of Sociology, 1930, 35(4), 529-547] that the work of Francis Place, Richard Carlile and the elder Robert Owen had little, if any effect on his outlook on the practicality of birth control. Moreover, Himes (1930) contends that "it is perhaps more accurate to say that American neo-Malthusianism had an independent origin" (p. 531). Nonetheless, it seems unlikely that Robert Dale Owen was totally unaware of Place and Carlile's views on birth control, or that he had not received word of the elder Owen's birth control experiment at New Lanark, France, in which female cotton mill workers were fitted with simple contraceptive devices to prevent pregnancy. Rapid emersion into this issue upon his arrival in America suggests that his views on birth control methods were beyond the embryonic stage.
his book Knowlton recommended the douching technique and listed various douching recipes. The douching process, cited by Knowlton, had several virtues which were not collectively available in existing contraceptives. Douching as prescribed in one of his medical recipes, was inexpensive, harmless and entailed no sacrifice during coitus (Himes, 1966). This approach was also appealing to women because it allowed them to determine when to become pregnant. Knowlton's publication on how to prevent conception was met with an outpouring of invective comments. The public's outrage led to the sentencing of Knowlton, in December 1832, at Cambridge, Massachusetts, to "three months hard labor in the House of Correction, which time he served" (Himes, 1930b, p. 47).

The revilement of the public over recommendations to limit fertility initially slowed the trend toward birth control in America. This troubled beginning nevertheless gave the neo-Malthusian movement, the birth control movement of America, its foothold. In fact Owen and Knowlton have the distinction of being the founding fathers of neo-Malthusian-

---

10 Robert Dale Owen's most severe critic was probably Thomas Skidmore, a land reformer and agrarian egalitarian. Skidmore declared that Owen's population policy would shrink the family size, the labor force and the wages of laborers; thus, producing no measurable social benefit (Himes, 1930a). In England, neo-Malthusian advocates welcomed the work of their American colleagues. Both Moral Physiology and Fruits of Philosophy had a greater influence on their English audience than on those in America. In fact, Norman E. Himes (1929) cited Knowlton's work as a major factor in England's declining birth rate, beginning in the period 1876-1880. However, considerable risk was attached to the publication and distribution of these particular pamphlets. Two of three English publishers of Fruits of Philosophy, Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant, were tried for printing obscene material. Their trial ended with their exoneration. Less fortunate was Edward Truelone whose issuing of an edition of Moral Physiology brought him four months prison term and fine (Himes, 1966).
ism as well as eugenics in America (Himes, 1929). The multi-racial and ethnic composition of America was seen to pose a potential danger. This eugenical perception of the need to restrict population of undesirable races and ethnic groups by regulating fecundity aroused the early American birth control proponents' attention more than their English colleagues' (e.g., Francis Place, Richard Carlile).

A brief examination of several passages in their writings attests to Owen's and Knowlton's concern with racial improvement and control. In his text Owen uses the animal breeding analogy to illustrate the probable eugenic or dysgenic racial outcomes associated with the practice or non-practice of birth control. He writes that

There is not greater physical disparity between the dullest, shaggiest race of dwarf draught horses, and the fiery-spirited and silken-haired Arabian, than between man degenerate as he is, and man perfected as he might be: and though mental cultivation in this counts for much, yet organic melioration is an influential—an indispensable accessory (Moral Physiology, Truelove (ed.), pp. 27-28).

For Owen the issue seemingly centered on the importance of race refinement with overpopulation a concern, but to a lesser extent since it posed no immediate danger. However, Owen spoke emphatically about restraining proliferation of society's degenerative element. Apparently

---

11 Indeed, the use of this animal breeding analogy, as a valid case in point for the necessity to regulate breeding patterns abounded in the early twentieth century eugenic literature (as well as genetic publications). A casual perusal of eugenic publications (e.g., Eugenics, also known as The Journal of Racial Betterment, Eugenic Review, Journal of Social Biology, etc.) produce numerous articles exhorting the adoption of a breeding mechanism similar to procedures used in animal husbandry because these proven techniques are allegedly capable of creating superior racial strains.
tight restriction of this segment of the population along with the judi-
cious application of birth control by society's more fortunate members
represented at the very least a partial answer to overpopulation and the
building of a strong race.

Though Owen and Knowlton both insisted that birth control was not a
panacea, Knowlton still saw an array of benefits deriving from its act-
ive usage. Besides preventing overpopulation, it curbed poverty, re-
strained prostitution, checked hereditary disease, decreased the number
of abortions, improved the health circumstances of the mother and al-
lowed for the spacing of children. Knowlton's crusade for greater rec-
ognition of birth control has been summarized vividly in the passage
from The Fruits of Philosophy:

If a nation should ever be aroused to the importance of this
subject (i.e., birth control) and any general attempt should
be made to improve the species by attending to the laws of
hereditary descent, of what vast utility in furthering this
attempt would physiological checks to conception then be seen
to be! None would need be debarred from gratifying their in-
stinct, while the species would be propagated only by the best
breeders! Improvement would progress from generation to gen-
eration, until there would again be 'giants in the land' both
physical and mental (1832, p. 26).

Though Knowlton tried to convince the public of the advantages of the
art of anti-conception in the building of an eugenically strong nation,
he won very little support. Consequently, the issue of fertility regu-
lation laid dormant for several decades, only to be reawakened vigor-
ously with the collapse of the southern economic system and the aboli-
tion of slavery.

The temporary shelving of the notion to limit the population oc-
curred because the political, economic and social climate of the time were not disposed to the promotion of depopulation ideas. A prosperous and stable economy simply preoccupied the American people, and besides vast tracts of land and immeasurable natural resources laid virgin. Such facts must have seemed indisputable and incentives for population expansion. The conspicuous revival of fertility control which had been attacked earlier as sacrilegious was certainly not coincidental. History has shown unequivocally that many of the arguments calling for population reduction have the uncanny propensity to appear when signs of economic uncertainty and social unrest drew near. The French Revolution which began in 1789 presented the necessary background for Malthus propagation of a restrictive population policy. The French Revolution, for instance, caused the overthrow of the absolute monarchy of the Bourbons and the system of aristocratic privileges. Analysis of the cause of the French Revolution cited such problems as widespread poverty, excessive number of landless peasants, inflation and related economic woes. These factors contributed to the downfall of France's established social order and singlehandedly stimulated in England interest in Malthus's population treatise. Similarly, when the United States emerged from the tumultuous social upheaval between the North and South, a sudden approbation for safeguarding the country from becoming overpeopled and from becoming mixed racially, especially with the newly freed Blacks moved to the foreground of social issues.

Prior to this period many people in the South welcomed a high fecundity rate among enslaved Afro-Americans. This rather consensual view of southern people centered on the fact that black slaves constituted
the bulk of the southern labor force. Consequently, the reproduction of Afro-Americans stood for some time as an economic index that the southern way of life was strong and flourishing. With the abolition of slavetrading, the task of resupplying this labor force became the responsibility of and a lucrative enterprise for slave holders. Herbert Gutman (1977) in his highly influential work, The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750-1925, described the intrinsic relation between the reproduction of the slave labor force and the economic needs of slave-owners.

Enslavement required more than that human chattel produce commodities: it also required—especially after the abolition of the overseas slave trade—that the slave labor force reproduce itself. Few realized this better than the slaveowners themselves. But it could hardly have been unknown to the slaves that the essential value of adult women rested on their capacity to reproduce the labor force. The system put a high premium on females who began early to bear children, inside or outside of marriage. That premium, however, was measured differently by the slaves and by their owners. The owner viewed the birth of a slave child primarily as an economic fact, but the slave viewed the same event primarily as a social and familial fact. Demonstrated early (and then high) fertility greatly increased a married or unmarried woman's value to her owner and therefore diminished the likelihood of her sale (Gutman, 1977, p. 75-76).

Furthermore, Gutman's following passage has explicated precisely the correlation between black fecundity and the meaning of economic success in ante-bellum South.

Slaveowners' economic calculations regularly mixed the production of wealth with the reproduction of labor, and efficient owners measured both in their entrepreneurial calculations. The former Georgia planter John C. Reed declared that the greatest profit of all was what the master thought of and talked of all the day long—the natural increase of his slavers as he called it. Reed believed that slave rearing was
the South's leading industry and that its profit lay in keeping slaves healthy and rapidly multiplying (Gutman, 1977, p. 76).

The ante-bellum period saw blacks in many instances either coerced or insidiously manipulated into increasing their number solely for the interest of the slaveholder. The cruel, brutalizing method of handling black procreation eliminated systematically much of the socio-cultural importance of childbirth and erased much of the inherently aesthetic qualities attached to childbearing and rearing during this era. Viewing black propagation as an industrial commodity left the indelible reminder for some blacks of the wanton disregard and exploitation of the Afro-American. The vividness of such historical memories has instilled in many Afro-Americans a "healthy" paranoia concerning social programs and social changes allegedly designed to improve the lot of Blacks. Moreover, the pseudo scientific trends which underlined the endorsement of slavery and which manifested themselves in the race theories and sociology of race relations in the late 19th and early 20th centuries have comprised a rather convincing body of evidence for greeting white America's campaign to stabilize the population with some hesitation.

Indeed the social and race philosophy which gave birth to the 20th century birth control movement requires some discussion. Without discussing the ideological background of the birth control movement, one is denied a perspective that shows why anti-fertility programming and the issue of black survival may be inimical and conflicting concerns. Therefore, the following section is an overview of American social thought before the turn of the century and its eventual role in the
contemporary birth control movement.

"The Curse of Ham"

Examining Black America's apprehension toward birth control rests partially with understanding the philosophical evolution of the racial thought in relation to the anti-fertility movement in the United States. For some Afro-Americans their uneasiness with the present population reduction trend lies with its conspicuous connection with the oppressive doctrine of racial determinism. Racial determinism gave the major social institutions and the scientific community unconditional approval to advance segregationist strategies, discriminatory practices and to condone the violent behavior of whites toward blacks (e.g., lynching and race riots). The rapid inclusion of racial policies into the stream of American thought was enhanced greatly by America's preoccupation during (and even after) slavery with depicting the black race as a subservient category of mankind.

These ante-bellum trends of racial determinism can be described most succinctly as a mixture of biblical misinterpretations and anthropological speculations. The basic tenet of this ideology assumed the Caucasian race's pre-eminence over the non-white races.¹² Such ethno-

¹²Anthropology and anatomical measurements (anthropometrical) were instrumental in the development of the 19th century scientific attitude of racial inferiority (J. Haller, 1970a; Stanton, 1960; Thomas & Sillen, 1972). Two of the more prominent early anthropologists who played important roles in the dichotomization of the races into superior-inferior classifications were Carl von Linnaeus (1707-1778) and Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1840). Linnaeus, the father of anthropology, "developed a taxonomic system based on a criterion of skin color" and thus laid the basis for the 19th century racial classification (J. Haller, 1970a, p. 4). Blumenbach "designated five races or varieties of man"
centric wisdom became instrumental in the articulation of pro-slavery sentiment and in the oppression of blacks. In an 1860 address to a Boston, Massachusetts, audience William L. Yancey, a southerner and a fervent defender of slavery, declared that

your fathers and my fathers built this government on two ideas: the first is that the white race is the citizen, and the master race and the white man is the equal of every other white man. The second idea is that the Negro is the inferior race (Fredrickson, 1971, p. 61).

Generally speaking, whites explained the subordinate status of blacks as invariable and inevitable. Yet even among the backers of slavery conflicting notions of black inferiority emerged. Many exponents of the enslavement of blacks, like Matthew Estes and Josiah Priest, referenced biblical scripture to justify the subjugation of Afro-Americans. On the other hand, the racist anthropology of Samuel Cartwright, Josiah C. Nott, George Glidden, Samuel G. Morton, Louis Agassiz and others comprised the alleged scientific explication of black turpitude. The conflict between the biblical and scientific interpretations of black inferiority was purely philosophical in nature and centered on the origin of mankind. Those of the biblical perspective saw all of mankind descending from a single pair of ancestors (i.e., Adam and Eve). From this monogenic point of view it was argued that the "curse of Ham" doomed all of his descendants "to be the servants of servants" (Thomas & Sillen, 1972, p. 1). The degradation of blacks was "a judgement of

and "considered a combination of color, hair, skull and facial characteristics as fundamental means for classifying the five varieties of man" (J. Haller, 1970b, p. 4).
God which placed the black man virtually beyond the pale of humanity" (Fredrickson, 1971, p. 60-61). The purported scientific perspective rejected the monolithic origin of man while concluding that the different races were products of different ancestral beginnings. Agassiz echoed the opinion of those believing in the plural origin of mankind when he declared that man, like the animal and plant kingdoms, was "founded upon different plans of structure, and for that very reason have embraced from the beginning representatives between which there could be no community of origin" (cf. Haller, 1971, p. 77). In demonstrating the constitutional differences among the races, polygenists gathered data from anatomical, neurological and endocrinological sources to buttress their claim that black physiological faculties have been arrested in the incipient stage of development. Much of the attack on black organic qualities centered on the evolution of their brain as well as skin color (Thomas & Sillen, 1972). John S. Haller in his book Outcast from Evolution (1975) cited William T. English (1903) for his assertion that "the Negro brain, some one thousand years 'behind that of the white man's brain in its evolutionary data,' existed within a visceral and organic structure that was physiologically juxtaposed to its intellectual capacity" (p. 51). Likewise, Samuel W. Cartwright claimed that the hue of the Afro-American was merely an external indicator of numerous internal

---

13 The distinction between the monogenists and the polygenists was never absolute since there were polygenists (e.g., Paul Broca, 1864) who attempted "to reconcile Scripture with polygenism." The works of George M. Fredrickson (1971) and John S. Haller (1970a, 1970b, 1975) include succinct discussion of the monogenism-polygenism debates of the 19th century.
deviations that affected "the membranes, the muscles, the tendons and . . . all the fluids and secretions. Even the negro's brain and nerves, the chyle and all the humors, are tinctured with a shade of the pervading darkness (Stampp, 1956, p. 8).

In corroborating the pro-slavery argument, these dubious pronouncements sanctioned the usage of religion and science to fabricate racially biased theories and hypotheses. The alliance of the scientific community with the exponents of slavery made the endorsers of slavery by the 1850's a formidable foe for the abolitionists (Fredrickson, 1971). While anthroposociologists provided premises of the origin of species on which to vindicate slavery, statistical evidence derived from the rather specious 1840 U.S. census was suggesting unequivocally that freedom and colder climates had adverse effects on blacks' mental and physical health (Fredrickson, 1971; Stanton, 1960; Thomas & Sillen, 1971). Although Edward Jarvis, a Massachusetts physician, proved the statistical information of the 1840 census was largely contrived data, the pro-slavery partisans concluded nonetheless that the census findings were conclusive and that the black race was innately unfit for the demanding pressures of freedom or the northern environment.

Josiah C. Nott (1954), the prominent apostle of slavery, provides a slightly different explanation of the census data and an argument for the preservation of slavery. In citing the polemical 1840 census data, Nott held that the interracial unions of whites and blacks produce a feeble, short-lived, degenerative "hybrid" breed. This hybridized race, the mulattos, presumably possesses greater intellect than full-blooded blacks but tends to be physically and constitutionally weaker and less
fertile than either the pure black or white races (Fredrickson, 1971; Haller, 1975; Stampp, 1956; Stanton, 1960). Nott's alarm over the potential destructiveness of cross-breeding of the races and the use of such a method to absorb the slave population becomes keenly apparent in his and George R. Glidden's work, *Types of Mankind* (1957). Nott writes

> it seems to me certain, however, in human physical history, that the superior race must inevitably become deteriorated by any intermixture with the inferior, and I have suggested elsewhere that, through the operation of the laws of hybridity alone, the human family might possibly become exterminated by a thorough amalgamation of all the various types of mankind now existing upon the earth (p. 407).

Charles L. Brace, an early American follower of Darwinism, echoes Nott's contention that cross-breeding was detrimental:

> if individuals of two very different races intermarried their mutual differences and varying constitutions would naturally render the surviving of the first offspring somewhat doubtful. . . . Each parent is adapted to different and peculiar conditions of temperature, soil, and climate. The offspring, if it shares these adaptation equally, must be in so far unadapted to its climate and circumstances. That is, a half-blood mulatto in our Northern States, in so far as he has a negro constitution, is unfitted for our climate. In the Southern he is equally unadapted from his white blood to the climate there and it may be centuries before he becomes suited to either (quoted in Fredrickson, 1971, p. 234).

Speculations that mulattoes would be eliminated eventually rested comfortably with the preconceived notion that freedom was contrary to the nature of blacks. Indeed, it had been well-advanced that emancipation doomed the existence of blacks in America. In promulgating the obliteration of blacks many pro-slavery apologists also seized upon the opportunity to forecast the downfall of white America once freedom was
granted to the black slave. This was predicated on the presumption that without slavery, "a natural social control," a negro problem was certain to arise (Stampp, 1956).

Essentially, the freeing of millions of enslaved Afro-Americans exacerbated the fears of whites to the inherent "evils of race mixing" (Fredrickson, 1971; J. Hall, 1975; Stampp, 1956; Stanton, 1960). While the perils of race mixing emerged as a cornerstone in the fight to preserve the system of slavery, it remained an emotionally charged issue, although chattel slavery in 1863 was abolished legally.

With the fall of the South, the ante-bellum slavocrats regrouped under the banner of preserving the "purity and moral integrity" of the Caucasian race. In many instances, abolitionists and pro-slavery apologists set aside their differences and condemned race mingling as jeopardizing the essence of American life—the superiority of the white race. In May 1864 the Freedmen's Inquiry Commission, often envisioned as a leading voice for the newly emancipated Black American, certified the existing racial doctrine when it stated that race amalgamation was "neither inevitable nor desirable" because "the mixed race is inferior, in physical power and in health, to the pure race black or white" (Fredrickson, 1971).

Resistance to amalgamation among whites in the post Civil War era stirred increased racial tension. The work of David Goodman Croly and George Wakeman, Miscegenation (19863), was a prime illustration of the importance attached to preventing the full absorption of blacks into the American social system and the pervasiveness of white America's fears of race conmingling. Croly and Wakeman's work, considered a theory of
blending of the race, was contrived originally as a dirty political trick to discredit the Republican party and Lincoln's re-election campaign. Under the guise of espousing the Republican platform the Miscegenation pamphlet attacked the prevailing philosophy of keeping the races separate while urging their amalgamation since such a mixture was allegedly superior and inevitable. Although this unscrupulous ploy failed to sway voters, it was nevertheless successful in stirring white emotions and stiffening opposition to greater black social advances.

For Black Americans the post Civil War period was akin to a mercurial rise and fall. Blacks during the Reconstruction epoch made encouraging gains; unfortunately such progressive movement was overtaken quickly as whites replaced favorable governmental policies with adverse, punitive legislation. By the 1880's the black codes (i.e., Jim Crow Laws) and other exclusionary devices pushed greater utilization of the American social system beyond the reach of most blacks. This disenfranchisement of blacks was due partially to white America's embrace of a more scientific sounding form of racial demogoguery.

The bases of this more convincing exposition of race determinism was Darwin's theory of race evolution which arrived in the United States in 1860. Though generally well-received, Darwin's Origin of Species was compelled to await vigorous discourse until the conclusion of the Civil War. Nonetheless, the introduction of Darwinian evolutionary princi-

14This does not imply that Darwin and his theory were without critics. Asa Gray, the most ardent American defender of Darwinism, painstakingly tried to disarm the argument that Darwinism was secular, atheistic and contrary to the laws of God. The polygenist, Louis Agassiz, was among Darwin's most severe critics and often referred sneering-
ples prompted the decline of the sometime fiery debate between the monogenists and the polygenists (Stocking, 1968). With the decline of these two competing schools of racial origin, many of their followers adopted this new superimposed view of the manifestation of racial types.

Such realignment was usually not seen as a blanket rejection of the monogenist or the polygenist perspectives since views of both frameworks were also contained in the racial interpretation of Darwinism. Darwinism attracted the monogenists because it re-affirmed the notion of a singular, monolithic beginning of human kind. Those who ascribed to the biblical story of Adam and Eve were able to accept the Darwinian presentation of race development without abandoning the unity of the homosapien species. In some ways the advent of Darwin's race theory revitalized the monogenist argument which had lost seemingly irretrievable ground by 1859 to polygenetic conceptualization of multiple human species. However, Darwin's Origin of Species rendered the polygenist's major hypothesis of "multiple centers of Creation" invalid (Stocking, 1968).

Nott, the foremost preceptor of the rather amorphous polygenist stance, conceded, though only partially, that Darwin's ratification of the singularity of man's ancestral origin undermined the tenets of polygenism. Still, Nott declined to dismiss in toto his supposition that

...ly and defiantly to Darwinism as a fad. While charges of atheism, anti-Christianity abound many of the early religious dissenters eventually acquiesced and concluded that Darwinism did not seek to replace nor to weaken the Christian fundamentals. For an excellent and cogent presentation of these earlier arguments see Hofstadter's Social Darwinism in American Thought (1967).
the variety of races demonstrated unalterable and lasting differences; instead Nott surmised that

the question then, as to the existence, and permanence of races, types, species, or permanent varieties...is no longer an open one. It is true, there is a school of Naturalists among whom are numbered the great names of Lamark, Geoffroy, Saint-Hilaire, Darwin, and others which advocates the development theory, and contend not only that one type may be transformed into another, but that man himself is nothing more than a developed worm, but this school requires millions of years to carry out the changes by infinitesimal steps of progression (J. Haller, Jr., 1975, p. 80).

Though Nott's and his colleagues' (e.g., Agazzi, Glidden) views were displaced as a leading paradigm in America's racial thought, it predecessor, the Darwinian model, nevertheless contained several pertinent remnants of this earlier perspective. This made the endorsement of Darwinism less than a holistic acknowledgement of his/her theory's inaptness (Stocking, 1968). George W. Stocking (1968) in his book, Race, Culture, and Evolution, provided a rather concise outline of several of these remaining influences of polygenism. Darwin contended that race formation had taken place in a "very remote epoch" and that gapping differences between the races had emerged during the early stages of race formation. Moreover, these racial variations continued unchanged. This viewpoint allowed the polygenists to set aside, albeit grudgingly, the multiple origin argument while remaining firm to the premise that the species of race developed unevenly, and with extreme variation. The Darwinian paradigm of race development provided racists a more sophisticated integration of social and biological sciences in the further advancement of the notion of white superiority.
Another area of considerable overlap was on the issue of human hybridization (Stocking, 1968). The polygenists, many of the monogenists and followers of Darwinism viewed negatively race intermingling. The polygenist, Joshua Nott, worried about the debilitation of the white race's superior status if crossbreeding of the races rose significantly. In doubting the quality of the hybrid offspring, Nott cited the high incidence of infertility and the greater prevalence for half-breeds (mulattoes) to possess mental, moral and physical handicaps than either parent group (Nott, 1857).

Even the followers of monogenism who theoretically were amicable to the cross-breeding of the races were inclined to denounce the breeding of whites with non-whites. The monogenist's reasoning on this issue mirrored the polygenist. The specific divergence lay in emphasis; polygenists stressed intrinsic differences while monogenists considered social and environmental discrepancies. Yet both theoretical camps agreed stalwartly that cross-breeding of white and black races yielded a "human mongrel" of questionable mental and physical integrity (Stocking, 1968).

While much attention centered on race amalgamation, the waves of European immigrants by the turn of the century brought yet another concern to the foreground for biologists, physical anthropologists and sociologists, namely the assimilation of this massive influx of immigrants. The fears of social scientists and politicians produced a number of proposals aimed at regulating the quality and type of immigrant admitted. Immigrants, for instance, whose "racial point of view was utterly different" from the majority of white Americans were sociologically and biologically categorized as non-assimilable. Increasing their
numbers was regarded as ill-advised. This line of thinking showed quite keenly the traces of polygenism continued to influence America's socio-biological considerations. The polygenist's obsession with preserving and maintaining the intactness of the white race's imperial dominion remained paramount and at the heart of most proponents of Darwinism. Essentially, Darwinism and its derivations—social Darwinism and Eugenics—were instrumental in framing policies of racial determinism based on controlling, even reducing the size of those racial groups presumed non-assimilable. As Stocking noted

one of the preconditions of race superiority was 'an uncompromising attitude toward the lower races in order to make sure that the higher culture should be kept pure as well as the higher blood' (Stocking, 1968, p. 50).

Darwin's race theory captured a country wrestling with progress and the inevitable confusion generated from rapid societal transformations. This lack of organizational structure and cohesion was apparent to those who coined such terms as nationalization, industrialization, mechanization, and urbanization (Wiebe, 1967). As Wiebe reported in The Search for Order (1877-1920),

to the people who created them, these themes meant only dislocation and bewilderment. America in the late nineteenth century was a society without a core. It lacked those national centers of authority and information which might have given order to such swift changes. American institutions were still oriented toward a community life where family and church, education and press, professions and government, all largely found their meaning by the way they fit one with another inside a town or a detached portion of a city (p. 12).

Submerged in this confusion and chaos were those calling for the
preservation of provincialism and individualism. Proponents of these ideals argued that such qualities contained the fundamentals of America's social structure. While lauding the virtues of these ideals they decried simultaneously big business (particularly the railroad industry which single-handedly caused the depression of the 1870s) and government. On the other hand advocates of monopolies and big business saw little benefit or use in the maintenance of autonomous, provincial pockets of people (i.e., communities). These designers of the American business empire considered provincialism and community self-determination as barriers to progress and profit.

Opponents of monopolistic enterprises, like the congressman John Reagan of Texas declared succinctly that "the time was when most were poor and none were rich." Highly critical of monopolies Reagan inferred that

there were no beggars till Vanderbilts and Stewarts and Goulds and Scotts and Huntingtons shaped the action of Congress and moulded the purposes of government. Then the few became fabulously rich, the many wretchedly poor...and the poorer we are the poorer they would make us (cf. Wiebe, 1967, p. 8).

Those denouncing monopolies, the credit system and other schemes of "extravagance" felt their once firm grip on democracy and individualism begin to slip from their grasp. Ironically, America's business magnates were trumpeting also the notion of democratic individualism. For them, however, this was simply a means, whether conscious or unconscious, of allowing the affluent to attribute their sizeable wealth and power to some supposed natural, immutable force. Social Darwinism, a perversion of Darwinism, furnished the American elite with the seemingly impeccable
argument that their elevated, lofty social status was exemplary of the "survival of the fittest" (in this case this meant the wealthiest and the most powerful). In the business world, this fitter organism concept became the guiding light of consolidation and monopolistic maneuvers. The railroad tycoon, James J. Hill, vindicated business monopolies when he announced that "the fortunes of railroad companies are determined by the laws of the survival of the fittest" (cf. Hofstadter, 1967; Chase, 1977).

Likewise, John D. Rockefeller, Sr. while speaking to a Sunday school class defended business consolidation activity and the vanquishing of smaller businesses by larger ones.

The growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest... The American beauty rose can be produced in the splendor and fragrance which bring cheer to its beholder only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it. This is not an evil tendency in business. It is merely the working-out of a law of nature and a law of God (Hofstadter, 1967, p. 45).

Still yet another zealot of social Darwinism (also a close personal friend of Spencer), Andrew Carnegie, confirmed his allegiance to its basic tenets as follows: "I had found the truth of evolution" (Hofstadter, 1967, p. 45).

Without question the pervasiveness of Darwinian influence in American thought made this dogma one of the most enduring. The country's magnetic attraction to this ideology allowed its application in areas other than the biological sciences. For many of the Darwinian-minded civic groups, ranging from community church groups to United States Presidents, issues in the social spectrum and the bio-social domain
(e.g., race improvement) became more important than strict biological concerns (which Darwin had intended). Manipulating the evolutionary process via selected breeding arrangements to guarantee the superior hereditary qualities of the race appealed to the leaders of America. Consequently, it was not surprising for a United States' President to volunteer his views on race manipulation for so-called racial betterment. Theodore Roosevelt, a fervent exponent of "rugged individualism," a euphemism for the survival of the fittest, courted the eugenic creed openly:

it is obvious that if the future racial qualities are to be improved, the improving must be wrought mainly by favoring the fecundity or the worthy types... At present, we do just the reverse. There is no check to the fecundity of those who are subnormal...(Chase, 1977, p. 15).

Moreover, history would reveal later that the period between the presidency of Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt was an era of eugenic excitement (Chase, 1977). The affluent members of society had begun to practice birth control, while state governments eagerly legislated sterilization laws for the "unfit." At the national level, the Congress adopted legislation attaching quotas to the number of European immigrants permitted to enter the country. The explicit intent of this restrictive legislation was to limit ethnic and racial groups presumed inferior (e.g., non-Nordic groups) and thus likely to further adulterate America's superior race strain. From a domestic perspective, the intelligence test movement served a similar function since it kept those groups, particularly blacks, poor whites, and first-generation European immigrants, shackled as second-class citizens. This generally meant
such groups were confined socially and geographically to areas vacated by upper-class whites and converted into racial-ethnic enclaves. Intelligence tests with their inherent biases and racist implications subscribed invariably to arguments espousing the necessity of eugenic guidance and control while confirming in seemingly glaring, inescapable fashion the essence of social Darwinism.

Although Darwin furnished the necessary evolutionary groundwork and rationalizations, the conversion of many of his rather biologically-specific assumptions and hypotheses into socio-biological pronouncements to show the purported natural quality of the existing social order lay with two prominent quasi-biological precursors, Herbert Spencer and Francis Galton. The work of Spencer, the architect of social Darwinism, and Galton, the originator of the eugenic cult, modified Darwinian concepts and strengthened many of Malthus' precepts regarding the poor as an innately subordinate entity. As forebearers of the Malthusian legacy both men who were major English proponents of scientific racism (Chase, 1977) were in accord with the twisted logic that the poor, the dispossessed and various ethnic groups were "unworthy of social concern."

"Unworthy of Social Concern"

The social Darwinism perspective of Spencer provided in terms of Darwinian evolutionary theory an explanation of one's unalterable destiny. If one was born poor, it was a natural, immutable phenomenon or selection; any attempt to rescue those of the lower classes from their inhuman conditions (via social reform legislation) posed a menacing threat to society and violated the biological laws which guided the evo-
volutionary process. This inference of Spencer typified his affinity to Malthus and revealed the type of adjustments from the laws of God to biological laws required of Malthusianism to keep abreast with the changing times—particularly the greater import of the sciences.

The avaricious, exploitative and aggressive behavior of the non-poor toward the poor demonstrated, argued Spencer, the viability of the notion of the "survival of the fittest." Parenthetically, the phrase "survival of the fittest," coined by Herbert Spencer, has been considered erroneously as an invention of Charles Darwin (Chase, 1977; Hofstadter, 1967). In addition to revealing the true originator of this well-known expression, Chase destroyed another persistent misconception regarding Darwin and Spencer's relationship. Chase noted, "that Darwin considered Spencer to be a conceited and ill-informed boor who made sweeping scientific statements on the basis of inadequate evidence and personal observations" (p. 106). Nonetheless, Spencer commanded the attention of the affluent and presented the evolutionary process as revolving around the "survival of the fittest" concept. The rich were able to endure because the "mechanism of nature" has insured their superiority and survival (Chase, 1977).

Disease, unsanitary health conditions, illiteracy, low wages, hazardous working conditions, long working hours and poor housing did little, stressed Spencer, to undermine the poor's chance to survive; instead he pointed to the non-rich biologically defective constitution as causing their misfortunes. This meant that efforts to preserve the poor were destined to failure and were wasteful enterprises that unnecessarily deprived the deserving rich of their total wealth while assisting in-
effectively the "undeserving," "shiftless" poor (Chase, 1977; Hofstadter, 1967). His perversion of Darwin's theory of evolution led him to believe that overpopulation would vanish as a function of the human organism's evolutionary progression (Boner, 1955). The biological sciences, Spencer held, have demonstrated that all organisms, including the human organism, increase at a slower rate as the maintenance of individual life improves.\(^{15}\) Spencer based his reasoning on the continual development of the human organism's nervous system and on the "pressure of population." The "pressure of population" compelled many human organisms to become disciplined and prudent in their sexual activity which had the enigmatic effect of developing the nervous system. Those organisms lacking discipline and restraint were less fortunate and thus prone to misery and death. However, by 1870 Spencer in his *Principles of Psychology* envisioned science aiding the evolutionary process in the task of purging society of inferior "types." His proposed solution to the "problem of inferior races" required science to devise a formula or process to isolate those aspects of an inferior race's disposition deemed socially valuable. These usable bits and pieces of the disposition of lesser breeds would be pooled scientifically to produce a more worthy race of people. This questionable scheme of Spencer revealed the striking

---

15 Improvement in environmental hygiene was a benefit shared predominantly by the aristocrats of England. Improved sanitary conditions (e.g., the installation of a sewer system) and medical discoveries resulted in a decline in infant mortality and greater longevity for the affluent. Such improvements also showed signs of slowing the birth rate of the wealthy. Clearly, Spencer failed to comprehend the socio-economic influences on the slower rate of growth among the affluent. For an indepth and cogent discussion of this topic see Chase (1977).
influence of genetic engineering and the prominence of eugenics in the industrialized world of the nineteenth century.

Though at times the distinction between the social Darwinist movement and the scientific cult of eugenics seemed obfuscated, this was understandable since the intent of both pseudo-sciences overlapped. Similarly, the major dogma of Galton centered on the prevention of the less suitable racial strains from trampling the more socially suitable raced strains in the human eco-system. In his "masterwork," *Hereditary Genius* (1968), Galton identified various indices typical of innate superiority which entailed the individual's reputation, his immediate ancestral lineage, his occupation, his accumulated wealth, etc. In addition to these indices he constructed a fictitious seven-letter graded class scheme based on innate ability of the human race:

Class A people, the lowest Galtonian class of all, had an order of ability of 1 in 4: that is one in every four people matched their low levels of inborn ability. People in Class F --Galton's 'eminent' class--came along only once in every 4,000 births. Finally, the people of very exceptional hereditary endowment who made up the superior or genius humans of Galton's Class G emerged only once in every 79,000 live births (Chase, 1977, p. 102-103).

This kind of spurious classification system allowed Galton to distort with considerable regularity massive volumes of biological truths while enforcing his contention of the necessity to enhance the superior strain's propagation and at the same time prohibit inferior breeds from procreating. This invidious proposal akin to those echoed by Malthus and Spencer dramatized the extreme extent of the affluents' intolerance for the lower classes and their unyielding determination to preserve the
gap between the privileged and the non-privileged. Galton's eugenic thesis defined the problem as the lesser breed's proclivity to reproduce excessively while the more worthy strains, that is, members of the upper classes, inclined to exhibit a reverse propensity. The reason for this marked difference was the congestion of urban living. The urban environmental setting, Galton maintained, had an adverse effect on reproductive activity of the wealthy, causing an appreciable drop in their fertility rate. Galton claimed that the sordid conditions of urban living such as inadequate housing, substandard sanitary and sewer systems gave the upper hand to the undeserving poor; while debilitating the ranks of the non-poor. In the urban slums Nature gave the advantage "only to the least fit to survive" because they possessed, Galton complained, a primitive and innocuous predisposition to poverty and debauchery (Chase, 1977). Galton stated that

the ordinary struggle for existence under the bad sanitary conditions of our towns seems to me to spoil and not to improve our breed. It selects those who are able to withstand zymotic (infectious) diseases and impure and insufficient food, but such are not necessarily foremost in the qualities which make a great nation. On the contrary, it is the classes of a coarser organization who seem to be, on the whole, most favoured under this principle of selection, and who survive to become the parents of the next generation (Chase, 1977, p. 48).

To reverse the declining number of wealthy people and the swelling ranks of the impoverished due apparently to England's rapid, unprecedented urbanization, Galton outlined a twofold solution. First, he assumed that rural surroundings were more compatible and fostered a greater growth rate among the superior strain's members. Subsequently, the government should establish human breeding farms, similar to those employed in
livestock breeding, to increase the superior strain size in the general population. The plan also called for superior married couples to have two more children than they had planned. Stocking society with a high concentration of superior individuals, Galton held, would have the obvious influence of heightening the standard and quality of life.

In explicating the fertility discrepancies between the poor and non-poor in urban areas, Galton's reasoning was both wrong and biased. His neglect of socio-economic factors eclipsed only his ignorance of the ramifications of England's "Great Sanitary Movement" which had spanned most of the nineteenth century. Recognition of the various sanitary reforms enjoyed initially by the rich would have provided firm evidence concerning the fertility rates of the poor and the non-poor; instead Galton masqueraded outlandish speculations and generalizations as concrete factual proof of the hereditary inferiority of the "undeserving poor."

The efforts of Galton and Spencer to keep the poor prostrate at the bottom of the social hierarchy provided the privileged classes with a tailor-made mandate to proceed undisturbed and without guilt their continual oppression and dehumanization of the non-privileged members of society. Unfortunately, history has shown the relative ease with which pseudo-scientific statements, void of supportive and/or empirical evidence, can enjoy a socially penetrating eminence. The early indictment by Malthus that the population's soaring growth rate threatened seriously to outstrip its ability to subsist lacked an essential component--supportive evidence. In fact, Malthus lived during a period when the accumulated information conclusively refuted his claim. England's Agri-
cultural Revolution which started around the middle 1700's and continued after 1800 yielded consistently bumper crops, giving the population more than adequate subsistence (Chase, 1977).

Galton's concern with the demise of the poor became apparent as he described the second stage of his two-part solution. This phase of his solution required prohibiting copulation among the poor, thus resigning them to a life of celibacy. Failure to voluntarily acquiesce impelled governmental intervention. As Galton viewed it,

I do not see why any insolence of cast should prevent the gifted class, when they had the power, from treating their compatriots with all kindness, so long as they maintained celibacy. But if these continued to procreate children, inferior in moral, intellectual and physical qualities, it is easy to believe that the time may come when such persons would be considered as enemies to the State, and to have forfeited all claims to kindness (Chase, 1977, p. 100).

Essentially, Galton was calling for the collaboration of government and science in a malicious campaign of compulsory sterilization of the poor. Cast from the same mold as Malthus and Spencer, Galton felt that sympathy and benevolency were wasted on the poor. The inferior breeds, the "human refuse" of society, had to be discarded to assure the superior strain's continual domination. This cynical motive formed the cornerstone for Malthusianism, social Darwinism and the Galtonian cult of eugenics. The ill-gotten words of Malthus (1803) enshrined the degenerative quality of these pseudo-scientific expose which became the recognized building blocks of twentieth century conventional wisdom.

"Questionable Profundity"

After being in abeyance for more than a half century the American
Margaret Sanger who worked in the Brownville section of Brooklyn with indigent immigrants of Jewish and Italian background became the movement's twentieth century pioneer. In *Birth Control in America: The Career of Margaret Sanger* David Kennedy (1970) reported that she became the leading crusader for several important reasons. First, Sanger, a nurse by profession, was from a lower class family and was sensitive to the problems inherent in having too many children and being financially limited. Secondly, outraged by the tragic death of a poor woman who had attempted a self-imposed abortion, Sanger opened the first contraceptive advice station in the United States. Thirdly, the French feminist, anarchist and birth control advocate, Emma Goldman, greatly affected Sanger's earlier views on contraceptives and subsequently prompted her incendiary indictment of capitalism for supporting poverty and large poor families.

The movement to make birth control information more accessible to indigent women actually began independent of the more prominent crusades (e.g., eugenics and social Darwinism) in America (Kennedy, 1970). In the incipient stage, from 1916 to 1919, the campaign to educate the poor to the benefits of birth control was non-racial. Chase (1977) reported that the birth control movement evolved out of a sincere and sentimental concern for poor mothers and that the stated aims were:

1. protecting families from the economic and emotional burdens of having unwanted children;

---

16Himes (1963) reports that the medical profession in the United States had a guarded interest in birth control and that literature and debates on the subject occurred as early as the 1880's.
2. preserving poor pregnant women from the agony of dying of toxemias of self-induced or neighborhood amateur abortions (p. 54).

Unfortunately, the movement which simply reflected attitudes and opinions of Sanger changed accordingly with her conversion to the cult of eugenics. Responsible for her conversion was the eugenic zealot, Havelock Ellis, a sexual psychologist and author of the prominent book *Studies in Sexual Psychology* (1923). To a somewhat lesser extent Sanger ingested much of the Malthusian teachings of George Drysdale whose work *Elements of Social Science* (1887) had a marked impact on her mentor, Ellis.17

As a consequence of this marriage between birth control and eugenics, Sanger no longer spoke for the poor. Instead she reclined to a middle-class, non-poor stance and blamed the poor and social reform (e.g., welfare programs and labor unions) as the root cause of high fertility among the undesirable, unfit segment of society. With the flair of Malthus, Sanger proclaimed that the procreative excessiveness of the poor pressured the middle class unjustly with overbearing taxes and futile legislative wars on poverty. From this socially elevated perspective the birth control movement proceeded. A major difference was that

17Like many pro-birth control eugenicists, Margaret Sanger referred to Malthus as the father of anti-fertility methods for reducing and restricting the population. This was specious. Malthus condemned throughout his infamous career the employment of birth control techniques. Such methods were iniquitous since they were hostile to the alleged teachings of the Divine Providence. One of Malthus's ideological adversaries, Robert Owen, Jr., favored and advocated vigorously the implementation of contraceptive usage (see Chase, 1977).
the birth control campaign now was eugenically correct and thus rapidly acquired an ethnocentric, racist intent.

Pro-birth control eugenicists fervently urged the fertility control of undesirable foreigners and unfit American groups as necessary for the superior strains to surpass the lesser breeds. Sanger, for instance, proposed a restricted quota system similar to the one used to limit the influx of immigrants as a meaningful approach to curbing the number of incapables in America's general population.

While we close our gates to the so-called undesirables from other countries, we make no attempt to discourage or cut down the rapid multiplication of the unfit and undesirables at home (Sanger, 1928, p. 303).

Such questionable profundity was consistent with eugenicism and the teaching of Havelock Ellis. Ellis maintained that the two fundamental eugenic aims "...more urgent today than they have ever been before ...are to impede the production of bad stock and to favour the production of good stocks" (Ellis, 1917, p. 86). In fact most eugenic proponents, like Harrison R. Hunt, believed with a reasonable degree of assurance that the more general use of contraceptives "would at the least reduce the extent to which the less efficient strata of society outbreed the upper social levels" (Hunt, 1930, p. 129).

While the techniques of birth control offered eugenicists a seeming panacea for halting the propagation of societal groups deemed the "refuse of humanity", drawbacks in the application of birth control procedures brought fears of dysgenic to the surface. For many eugenicists (Ellis, 1917; Hankins, 1932; Johnson, 1930; Lorimer, 1932) birth control
sounded an alarm because its usage remained greatest among the most "capable" whereas those categorized as "incapable" were usually beyond the reach of contraceptive intervention. While this paradoxical twist spurred most debate and concern, birth control continued to be considered as a feasible approach to reducing the ranks of America's unfortunate. More precisely, birth control was pictured as providing an adequate solution to the Malthusian dilemma which pitted the numerous progeny of early marriage against the blight of sexual immorality of delayed marriage (Hankins, 1932).

In essence these earlier years of eugenic birth control yielded many of the startling, draconian proposals and policies outlined by the eugenic cult's modern-day crusaders (e.g., Schockley). In 1923 Sanger, for instance, recommended the establishment of a systematic and scientific process for saving the American society's democratic principles from the "threatening hordes of the unfit." This proposal required parents to apply to have babies, a manner analogous to immigrants seeking visa permits (Kennedy, 1970). Three years later, Sanger offered a sterilization bonus plan for those least fit to bring babies of superior genes into the world. H. L. Mencken in 1937 and William Schockley in 1972 enunciated sterilization bonus plans that were identical to Sanger's blueprint (Chase, 1977). While early eugenicists proposed master plans for eradicating the "hordes of unfit" these proponents realized that the success of any "noble plan" for rescuing democracy from the gonads of the poor depended largely on the active participation of the government. F. H. Hankins (1932) stressed the necessity of government's commitment as follows: "I submit that the most direct, most logical and most effi-
caucious step would be the establishment of public birth control clinics under medical auspices as a part of the governmental relief services" (p. 198). This rather astonishing degree of exactness of yesterday's schemes with today's action for regulating the fertility of the poor has demonstrated that birth control remains potentially a degrading and oppressive social control mechanism.

Though anti-fertility methods played a salient role in the eugenic campaign, the primary focus was to directly assault the "gonads of the poor" (Chase, 1977). Kennedy (1970) wrote

by the 1920s,. . .many middle-class reformers sought through eugenic reform simply to eliminate the alien and the poor. They modified Spencerian description of society as an organism to allow for some surgical removals without damage to the vital parts (p. 120).

The pervasiveness of this attitude as the most effective way of resolving the so-called population problem had been apparent even earlier.\(^{18}\) The legislation of this attitude began in 1907 with the Indiana state legislature's passing of the world's first compulsory sterilization law. This law applied

- to every state institution entrusted with the care of confirmed criminals, idiots, rapists and imbeciles and authorising (sic) an operation for the prevention of procreation if a committee of experts and the board of managers decide that procreation is inadvisable and there is no proability (sic) of improvement in the mental and physical condition of the inmate

\(^{18}\)In these earlier years Sanger and many of her colleagues opposed abortions. Abortions were considered morally and ethically wrong. In fact, it was presumed that adequate knowledge of birth control measures precluded abortions (Dickinson, 1929).
concerned. . . . The operations were performed without regard to the wishes of the patients (Editorial, *Eugenics Review*, 1923, p. 287).

In the span of eight years this precedent setting legislation of nefarious intent was joined by 15 other states that enacted laws related to sterilization of criminals and mentally defective persons (*Eugenic Review*, 1923). This list grew even more as other states saw fit to legally sanction salingectomy (i.e., sterilization). In 1929, for instance, the North Carolina General Assembly empowered its state institutions to perform the necessary asexualization or sterilization operation upon any mentally defective or feeble-minded inmate or patient thereof, as may be considered best in the interest of the mental, moral or physical improvement of the patient or inmate, or for the public good (Johnson, *Eugenics*, 1929, p. 30).

Though states' legislative efforts to prevent via forced sterilization and segregation the propagation of those deemed a social threat varied in their intensity such attempts represented nonetheless a fairly systematic means of managing and manipulating the general population.

Charles B. Davenport and Harry H. Laughlin, perhaps the most devout eugenic advocates, vigorously advanced compulsory sterilization of the "unfit." Davenport's (1911) work, "Heredity in Relation to Eugenics," which was overcrowded with myths and racist statements, urged the protection of superior racial strains from genetic enslavement. To avoid the domination of the racially supreme breed, Davenport recommended restricted immigration quotas on non-Nordic immigrants and forced sterilization of all race menaces (i.e., so-called inferior breeds).
Such draconian suggestions were given even greater notoriety with the introduction of Laghlin's Model Eugenical Sterilization Law (1922). This "humanitarian document" outlined sterilization for the following:

1. Feeble-minded;
2. Insane (including the psychopathic);
3. Criminalistic (including the delinquent and the wayward);
4. Epileptic;
5. Inebriate (including drug-habitues);
6. Diseased (including the tuberculous, syphilitic, leprous, and others with chronic infections and legally segregable diseases);
7. Blind (including those with seriously impaired vision);
8. Deaf (including those with seriously impaired hearing);
9. Deformed (including the crippled);
10. Dependent (including orphans, ne'er-do-wells, the homeless, tramps and paupers) (Laghlin, in the United States, 1922, 446-447).

Attesting to the influential nature of Laghlin's globalistic model was 30 state sterilization laws which to some degree had adopted aspects of this early blueprint. In addition to a number of states deriving enacting sterilization laws, Presidents of the United States, federal legislators, scientists, academicians and a substantial segment of the general public courted the application of eugenic ideas of Laghlin to the social system. Chase (1977) noted that Laghlin's sterilization law offered

the taxpayers a simplistic alternative to costly tax-supported government 'charity' programs. . .the sterilizer's knife loomed as a cheaper and more 'equitable' instrument of coping with the health, welfare and geriatric problems that were and are the province of government social agencies (p. 134).

\^Chase (1977) reported that the German government in 1933 utilized Laghlin's model law as a nomenclature for determining eugenically inadequate individuals who were then forcefully sterilized.
Laughlin's model of sterilization, the standard reference for framing state compulsory sterilization policy, furnished much of the movement's continuity in its nationwide intent to extirpate the social and racial "undesirables."

Those espousing the philosophy of these pseudo-scientific tenets were without a doubt concerned with furthering social control. Although the early twentieth century dogmatists' activities were identified as social reform, such labeling was at best a misnomer. Social reform during this period was primarily concerned with furnishing for the affluent "social relief." Examination of the excitement surrounding anti-fertility showed poignantly that such social currents, though often associated with rather global, grandiose goals of engineering a superior breed, has a more immediate objective. This goal, while still a mundane interest, was the reduction of the non-privileged segments of society. The seemingly inherent value of thinning out the poor was twofold. First, it provided the affluent with tax relief. Appropriating tax revenue into governmental programs for the poor tended to incense most of the non-poor and thus made them allies of any measure designed to repress the poor. Secondly, the non-poor favored reducing the poor's number because many felt threatened and intimidated by the relative size difference of the two groups. The affluent grappled with the fear of eventually relinquishing control of society because of being overtaken by the sheer size of the poor was disquieting and stirred among the privileged an undercurrent of concern. Much of this apprehension became the spine of campaigns urging a population based on quality and not quantity or seeking relief from excessive taxation caused by programs for managing the
The pervasiveness of social Darwinism and the momentum of eugenics gave the non-poor their rationalization and method for resolving the issue of the poor.

The period examined in this chapter was rather lengthy and certainly could have received a more detailed inspection. However, the primary intent was to show the affinity among several of the prominent theorists of population and birth control issues. In showing this overlap to exist almost independent of time, the focus concentrated on outlining the functional usage of poverty for manipulating and restricting blacks, other non-whites and poor whites population groups. The core of much of this writing emphasized the guarding of the present social system by limiting the less fortunate's social flexibility and mobility. Generally speaking, these writings often had a profound influence on the prevailing social viewpoint and policies.

Inherent in the writings was the notion of social control and its importance in safeguarding the established social order. In many respects the early population theorists and birth control crusades against the poor coincided with America's proponents of racial demagoguery and determinism against Black Americans. Malthus's view of the poorer classes, for instance, diverged only slightly from the impressions of Joshua Nott or his eugenic predecessors on the issue of race. An a priori assumption of these racial and class theories was that the downtrodden were irreconcilably ordained as servants of society. Blacks' and other non-white poor groups' station in life was to handle laborious and otherwise demeaning and dangerous tasks for the privileged sector of society (Gans, 1972). Yet exponents of containing the non-privileged
group's size as a way of social control recognized in most cases the advantages of a large pool of cheap, readily available workers. However, allowing the poor or black population to expand freely forced the unwilling upper social classes to commit more resources. This usually heightened the affluent's resentment toward poor and blacks since subsequent increases in services and resources allotted to the impecunious were seen as an expensive, unnecessary burden (Lorimer, 1932). Throughout this chapter, these status quo pragmatists found partial solutions to the seemingly ever-increasing black and poor groups via population control (a euphemism for social control). As the staunch eugenic disciple Rosewell H. Johnson said, "society meets the threat (of an inadequate birth rate) by attempts at social control..." (1930, p. 326). These "attempts at social control" have ranged from such death-producing schemes inherent in the Malthusian plan of misery and vice (e.g., the withholding of adequate health care, sanitary system, etc.) to the utilization of birth control and sterilization procedures for achieving eugenically engineered objectives.

Although keeping the size of the poor and black populations manageable was desired, the contradiction to this general plan of action was that the slavocrats pushed for blacks to breed. This divergence occurred primarily because the mechanisms for controlling blacks under the slave system (which included both legal and extra legal modes) provided the existing social order with ample safeguards. The lucrative market of slave breeding offered a vast labor force which served also to encourage their reproductive output. These two dimensions (in addition to the slave's hue which probably invoked for the ante-bellum white com-
paratively less guilt) distinguished the black slave from the white poor. Yet this practice of stimulating the procreativity of blacks resulted in a dilemma when chattel slavery was abolished. While existing discriminatory practices blocked effectively the flow of blacks into the mainstream of American society, this releasing of several millions of blacks intensified fears of race mixing and produced apprehensions of a growing free black population. Relocating blacks elsewhere, though nominally tried, was deemed infeasible; their economic value had not diminished with their release from chattel slavery. Instead high infant and adult mortality rates, the gross lack of medical, education and employment opportunities and the use of violence served to limit their advances while maintaining the black population's symbiotic relationship with their white oppressor.

Controlling the black populace relied heavily on neglecting many of their basic needs, making social institutions inaccessible and building a labyrinth of insurmountable social barriers. Such tactics, though they admittedly hampered black growth, were only partially effective. Although mortality rates for blacks rose during the nineteenth and twen-

---

20 What to do with this large black population became an increasing concern of the American government. The president, Lincoln, as well as some prominent black spokesmen urged the relocation of blacks outside the United States border. While this may have had appealing qualities, most capitalists consciously dismissed such plans as frivolous. With the rapid growth of free enterprise this reservoir of raw manpower was indispensable.

21 This does not imply that mortality rates for blacks were drastically lower under slavery. However, Fogel and Engerman (1974), Genovese (1971, 1974), and Gutman (1976) suggest that the economic importance of slaves tended to result in greater health care for the ante-bellum's south human commodity.
tieth centuries (Farley, 1970) substantially, the black population con-
tinued to grow. This fact took on greater significance with the en-
trance into the United States of scores of immigrants who also became a
labor resource in the country's march toward industrialization and mod-
ernization. While this latter group over approximately a three-genera-
tion span and after displacing the black labor force became absorbed
eventually into the American mainstream, its size, added to the existing
indigent black population, posed initially serious concerns for those
pre-occupied with protecting the intactness of the social structure.

The eugenic crusaders of the early twentieth century epitomized
this ideological trend of saving the American ideals from the intrusion
of immigrants, particularly those deemed unfit and the swelling number
of indigent Americans, many of whom were black. This concern cultivated
by eugenicists often had a jingoistic intensity. For example, the jour-
nal Eugenics in 1929 ran a series of reactions from eugenic spokesper-
sons on the compatibility of eugenics and democracy. Although they con-
sensually saw the democratic tenets as handicapping the full implementa-
tion of a vigorous eugenic program, they rejected the assumption that
the goals of eugenics were unobtainable under democracy (Hrdlicka, 1929;
Popenoe, 1929; Sherbon, 1929). This rejection was based on the advances
evident at the state level. The legalization of compulsory steriliza-
tion by many state governments attested to highly elastic qualities of
the democratic principles, allowing the acceptance of eugenic efforts.
Popenoe (1929) wrote confidently about the compatibility of eugenics and
democracy.
The experience of California with the administration of compulsory sterilization law for the past twenty years throws some light, I believe, on the question of whether democracy will support any program based on eugenics. Not only has there been no popular feeling, in any stratum of society, against such a law—on the contrary public opinion is almost solidly behind it. . . . In other words, people do not, in general, resent being sterilized. . . (p. 28).

This approving public sentiment, though seemingly inadvertently given by the inactivity and apathy of the public, allowed the eugenic sterilization of untold thousands of blacks and other poor Americans in the name of social betterment and racial improvement.

Eugenicists insisted that prophylactic measures benefitted all who were burdened by unwanted births. That is, the affluent members of society avoided additional taxes while the indigent had smaller, more manageable families, resulting in improved quality of family life. Though eugenicists saw contraceptives and sterilization of blacks and other poor groups as socially ameliorative, such perceptions were not shared by leaders of Black America. Early prominent black leaders' viewpoints on the use of eugenic methods in the black community as well as an examination of population features of blacks in the United States will be surveyed in the following chapter.
The issue of birth control in the black community has been a rather lengthy, ongoing debate with roots deep in Black America's past. A prominent feature of the debate has centered on whether uncontrolled black fertility is "eugenic" or "dysgenic." This dialogue has overlapped in some important ways with mainstream's discussion of black reproduction. Some blacks (Carter, 1932; DuBois, 1932; Fisher, 1932; Garvin, 1932; Holmes, 1932; Schuyler, 1932; Terpenning, 1932) assume that regulating black growth enhances the black race's social progress. Other blacks (Cobb, 1939; Frazier, 1933; Garvey, 1934) argued more cautiously that restricting fertility may be detrimental to black survival and may undermine efforts toward attaining meaningful eco-political-social gains.

Inherent in these early viewpoints are divergent lines of thought regarding the implications and motives of black birth control. This chapter will examine the polemics of whether black birth control is dysgenic or eugenic. The examination will focus primarily on surveying the attitudes and opinions of black leaders since the advent of the "pill." However, to appreciate the evolution of the argument requires at the very least a cursory inspection of Black America's earlier views of birth control. Broadly speaking, many of the prominent features of these early perspectives remain critical to arguments entertained by
many of today's black leaders and citizens.

**Black Birth Control: Early Perspectives**

The early birth control arguments revolved largely around delineating its perceived benefits or detriments. Blacks urging the practice of fertility control were usually members of the black upper class. For the "black bourgeoisie" regulating black fertility constituted a partial remedy to black poverty and wretchedness. The black elite oftentimes had inculcated fervently the attitudes and values of White America and have tended to believe that society was predicated on such mundane notions as "survival of the fittest" and the "bootstrap" argument. Many of the black upper-middle class members saw in a neo-Malthusian spirit the economically destitute blacks as impairing assimilation and the mainstream's acceptance. The resolution of this problem was eugenically prescribed birth control to reduce the growth rate and number of the black poor.

Black opposition to birth control viewed this "benign solution" as a "malignant remedy." Many of these opponents adhered to some aspect of the "strength through number premise." This historical rationale for resisting contraceptives drew from various levels of the Afro-American experience; that is, from the gracious welcome of black fertility by enterprising slave owners, to the prophylactic arguments of eugenics and racial determinism of the thirties. DuBois (1932) in an article supportive of birth control, "Black Folk and Birth Control," captured the antecedent influence on black reproduction when he wrote:

> As slaves, every incentive was furnished to raise the largest
number of children possible. The chief surplus crop of Virginia and other border states consisted of this natural increase of slaves and it was realized in the consequent slave trade to feed the plantations of the lower South and Southwest. . . (p. 166).

In the same edition of Birth Control Review, Charles S. Johnson added that

Throughout the history of Negroes in America they have been marked by a high rate of fertility. It was encouraged in slavery. . . . It appears to have reached the limits of human fertility during this period (p. 167).  

Opponents and even proponents of black birth control in the early 1900's recognized that high fertility rates among blacks were partially a conditioned response to the pressures and demands of slavery. The post-Civil War era with its lack of public health services, as evident by the high death rate among urban blacks (Farley, 1970), strengthened anti-birth control sentiments of blacks who considered the past the prelude to the present and the future. Johnson (1932) keenly pointed out that, "after their emancipation this high fertility continued, but with a violent check on population increase caused by an extravagantly high mortality" (p. 167).

Eugenic thought and racism kept the flow of health care into the black neighborhood at a trickle while further heightening the tide of black apprehension. The ominous legacy of the eugenic movement with its

---

22In his article, "A Question of Negro Health," Charles S. Johnson based his pronouncement that during slavery black fertility rates had reached the farthest edge of human fertility threshold on Dr. Louis I. Dublin's calculations (see Dublin, The Health of the Negro, Annals of the American Academy, 1928).
draconian solutions caused many blacks to consider birth control as an incidious and incipient way of effacing the black population. In fact, eugenicists with their incessant appeal for race betterment and their call for the prophylactic sterilization of innumerable institutionalized "victims," many of whom were black, saw birth control as a prescription for achieving a superordinate white race. James F. Cooper (1929), an eugenicist, stated that "eugenics cannot come without intelligent regulation of the birth rate which is birth control" (p. 20). The president of the American Eugenics Society, Henry Pratt Fairchild, proclaimed that "eugenics and birth control are inseparably linked together in a lasting relationship" (1930, p. 20).

Nonetheless, blacks who embraced the birth control logic were convinced that black survival and eventual acceptance into the mainstream of American society depended on limiting the black population. Advocates often made sweeping, unsubstantiated claims regarding black acceptance and eagerness to practice eugenic birth control. The liberal white physician, Lemuel T. Sewell (1933), contended that at least 75% of black women in two prenatal clinics and obstetrical service in a black Philadelphia hospital were anxious for birth control information and instruction. Sewell stated further that "90% of (black) physicians favor birth control, and stand ready and willing to give advice to their patients. . . . The Negro press gives hearty support to the birth control movement. . . ." (1933, p. 131). In accordance with Sewell's stance, Charles H. Garvin (1932), a prominent black Cleveland surgeon, reported that birth control instruction was vitally essential for the social, physical and economic advancement of the Negro group (p. 269).
As previously mentioned, early support for the dissemination of birth control information and instructions came largely from the black elite. George S. Schuyler, described as a "black John Bircher" (Weisbord, 1975), insisted that there "was no great opposition to birth control among the twelve million brown Americans" (1932, p. 165). Echoing Schuyler's and Garvin's beliefs was Elmer A. Carter (1932), the editor of Opportunity, who presumed that the practice of birth control among wealthier blacks was "distinctly dysgenic" while the unrestricted fertility rate of poor blacks contributed to social inequality and racial discrimination. The implicit message of his remark was that blacks could alleviate much of the social inequities plaguing them by adjusting their fertility and birth rates downward. Presumably, such adjustments encouraged social betterment, diluted white fears and defensiveness and provided a key for eliminating the alarmingly high mortality rate among blacks. Yet blacks who found the idea of smaller families appealing were often unable to avail themselves of birth control procedures because of the paucity of reliable contraceptive information in the black neighborhoods. In fact most blacks, except for a few, saw little advantage in shrinking family size. The inducements attached to contraceptive usage remained for many blacks simply too ephemeral and extraneous.

To a large degree, the lifeways and tradition of Black Americans resisted the rapid embracement of anti-fertility programs (DuBois, 1932; Frazier, 1933; Garvey, 1934; Johnson, 1932). Many blacks and whites of pro-birth control leanings neglected black cultural antecedents with their durable moral and religious fiber. For instance, the liberal minded white physician, Lemuel Sewell (1933), after a perusal of black
colleagues, black newspapers and black maternity patients under his care drew the conclusion that "the Negroes are interested in birth control; they welcome it, and they will practice it" (p. 131). Furthermore, he surmised erroneously that birth control would be readily accepted because organized religious opposition to its practice was non-existent. Such an opinion was derived from the popular and scientifically-held view that blacks lacked meaningful and enduring institutions such as church and family (Harris, 1979). Thus there was little opportunity for them to cultivate sturdy religious beliefs or moral integrity. Although Sewell inferred broad-based support for birth control in the black neighborhood from a rather skewed sample of black leaders and professionals, black proponents tended to overshadow religious resistance and not to dismiss it as a nonentity. That is, they attempted to displace issues of morality and religion by urging a rational examination of contraception's ameliorative potential on Black America's plight. In this vein Schuyler (1932) wrote:

Why should the Negroes who are conducting a desperate struggle against the social and economic forces aimed at their destruction continue to enrich the morticians and choke jails with unwanted children? It were far better to have less children and improve the social and physical well-being of those they have (p. 165).

Although black birth control advocates did not attack the inexorable aspects of black religion and morals, they (Schuyler, 1932; Carter, 1932) admonished black leaders, many of whom were religious leaders, for their hesitance in sanctioning birth control usage. Carter (1932) chided the black leadership in his article, "Eugenics for the Negro,"
for failing to endorse eugenically sound birth control. "The Negro leadership," he argued, "has for the most part been reluctant to advocate the procedure (birth control) as a solution for any of the problems which confront their fellows in America" (p. 169). The occupation of Schuyler and Carter with the future resulted in their myopic appreciation of socio-cultural barriers to anti-fertility. However, not all blacks with leanings towards birth control underestimated the socio-cultural component of the black reaction. W. E. B. DuBois in examining black attitude toward anti-fertility programs in the black community pointed to the religious background and moral beliefs of blacks as a stalwart pocket of resistance. DuBois noted that

After emancipation, there arose the inevitable clash of ideals between those Negroes who were striving to improve their economic position and those whose religious faith made the limitation of children a sin (1932, p. 166).

Moreover, DuBois wrote that "Negro churches" were not of a "liberal attitude" toward this issue and "like most people with middle class standards of morality, they think that birth control is inherently immoral" (1932, p. 167). DuBois, Johnson and others (Alexander, Fisher, Holmes and Terpenning) found their efforts to loosen blacks from their traditional moorings, which viewed contraceptive methods negatively, at best arduous.

Large families were traditionally a source of pride and encouraging smaller families contradicted this well-rooted value. In fact, Marcus Garvey, often described as the "father of Black Nationalism," appealed to the ethics of blacks in denouncing the en masse practice of fertility
restriction. Beside being inimical to black attitudes and beliefs, it perpetuated black oppression and loomed as an eminent racial threat. Garvey boldly remarked that "any attempt to interfere with the natural function of life is a rebellion against the conceived purpose of divinity in making man a part of his spiritual self" (A. Garvey, 1967, p. 47). He further extolled blacks not to "accept the theory or practice of birth control such as is being advocated by irresponsible speculators who are attempting to interfere with the course of nature and with the purpose of the God in whom we believe" (p. 49). In raising his considerations in an ethical context, Garvey illustrated the integral role of morality in shaping the size of the black family. As a disputant of birth control, Garvey offered the provocative analogy that limited black growth would bring about a demise similar to that suffered by the Native American at the hands of the United States government.

Admittedly some black supporters, like Elmer A. Carter (1932), recognized that the overly cautious, suspicious attitude of many blacks toward the purpose of fertility control had some justification. Carter, in fact, protested the almost pandemic inclination to approach the birth control needs of the black community in relation to whites. The use of comparative population growth statistics showed blacks with relatively higher rates of fertility and infant mortality than whites. These statistics, drawn from inappropriate comparisons, became the vertebrae of such notions as unfitness and innate inferiority of the black race. Moreover, they anchored the eugenic argument calling for the selective fertility of Afro-Americans. Certainly the statistical evidence of many of the arguments and counterarguments were held together in a rather
loose manner. Eugenicists and other advocates of racial determinism recruited the contrasting figures of comparative studies to predict the exact date of the total disappearance of blacks from the "American scene" (Carter, 1932). This lamentable prognostication gave those most concerned with the "vexatious Negro problem" an idyllic solution. Black proponents of birth control cited the despicably high black mortality rate in buttressing their argument for greater contraceptive usage. Counterarguments of blacks explained high fertility as necessary to withstand the ravages of disease and pestulence in the black community.

One of the earliest systematic examinations of the effects of birth control on Black Americans was conducted by E. Franklin Frazier (1933). Frazier in a 1933 Birth Control Review article, "The Negro and Birth Control," declared

> While we might admit that many Negro families of low economic status have more children than they can support adequately, we are not prepared to say that differential birth and survival rates have been favorable to the less desirable elements in the Negro population. Moreover, when we go into the question of a policy of rational control of fertility, we find that there are important factors in the present rapid urbanization of the Negro population that must be considered (p. 68).

Frazier's guarded impression of the necessity of rational control of fertility for blacks derived from an overall belief that the full realization of urban pressures and Black America's relinquishment of its folklore tradition would in the final analysis affect a stabilized population trend. In inspecting the assumptions and findings on which the effort of blacks to promote birth control rested, Frazier criticized many of their assertions (Garvin, 1932; Schuyler, 1932). For one, Fra-
zier questioned the belief that affluent blacks were controlling their fertility rate to Black America's detriment. He contended that such a viewpoint was more likely the work of an inadequate analysis of the 1910 and 1920 census data. Examining the census classifications of black and mulatto separately as Garvin, Schuyler and others have done showed, though erroneously, a negative trend. Upon collapsing over these nomenclatures, the argument that the upper social strata of Black America appeared to be dwindling became ungrounded. Frazier concluded that "the efficient and intelligent element" of the black population has had "as many children on the average as the less competent and more illiterate" (p. 69). This "efficient and intelligent element" was also more likely to have a fairly stable family life which enhanced the survival rate of its children more than the less stable segment of the black population.

Frazier also refuted the argument calling for eugenic restriction of black progeny as a mode of resolving the Afro-American's social discomfort and difficulties. In exploring the relation of rapid urbanization of blacks to "rational control of their fertility," he inferred that urban life has had a far more adverse effect on black than white fertility. This meant that black women bore fewer children than their white counterparts. Moreover, Frazier steadfastly contended that urban life was far more cataclysmic for black fertility than for whites.

Frazier reminded many of his colleagues that the continuous flow of migrants into northern cities was responsible for much of the black growth.23

23To support his contention of fertility differential between black
Frazier's opposition to the premise of the more educated, supposedly superior blacks being extirpated because of exceptionally low reproductive rate was based on statistical data which showed the ratio of children to women of child-bearing age (i.e., from 15-44 years) grew as one proceeded from the innermost to the outermost urban zones. That is, as one left the poorer, more illiterate, disorganized black areas and moved to areas of homeownership and higher economic and social rank, childbearing tended to increase among blacks. Such findings dispelled or at least weakened the widely held belief that "incompetent blacks were supplanting the more efficient black by their reproductive efforts."

Besides questioning some of the main tenets of the black pro-birth control movement, Frazier's keen observations showed vividly that a number of pertinent factors endemic to the urbanized Afro-American had to be judiciously weighed prior to beginning a program of "rational" black fertility control. The following passage nicely summed up Frazier's ambivalence and concern toward black birth control usage and black survival:

If the increasing urbanization of the Negro simply means disorganization, he may use birth control for purely individual ends and bring about his own destruction; but if, because of a developed social consciousness he desires to become a more efficient and intelligent, though probably a relatively smaller, element in the population, then birth control, that is the rational control of his numbers, offers one of the best means to the fulfillment of this end (1933, p. 70).

and white women, and particularly his observation regarding the effects of urbanization on black fertility, Frazier referred to the supporting work of Warren S. Thompson, Ratio of Children to Women: 1920 (Washington, D.C., 1930, pp. 141-154).
Although he recognized and urged greater scrutiny of the matrix of factors and possible implications of restricted black fertility, Frazier's remarks, like many of his colleagues, gravitated to the issue of "quality vs. quantity."

**Quality or Quantity: A Black Dilemma**

Black leaders' recommendations to increase or reduce the black population were in response to improving the conditions of blacks and to insuring their survival. These suggestions were also in response to the prejudicial, racist view held by whites. Gunnar Myrdal (1944) outlined graphically the popular theories on the growth of the black population.

At times it has been claimed that Negroes 'breed like rabbits,' and that they will ultimately crowd out the whites if they are not deported or their procreation restricted. At other times it has been pronounced that they are a 'dying race,' bound to lose out in the 'struggle for survival.' Statistics—both the comprehensive kind in the U.S. Census and the limited kind gathered in sample surveys—have been used to bolster both arguments (p. 165).

Black obliteration was implied to a varying extent in the arguments of black birth control advocates. Schuyler, a proponent of black quality and eugenic birth control, furnished grim statistics to support the notion that future existence of Black Americans was contingent on the quality of the race. He noted that the black death rate was twice that of whites and that death due to tuberculosis was three times greater among blacks. These lamentable findings were even more shocking when considered along with the data that stillbirths and death at childbirth were 100% more likely to occur among blacks than their white counterparts. Schuyler concluded from this appalling loss of black life that
"the Negro health is where white health was 40 years ago" (p. 165).

This grim assessment of black health which was consistent with the findings and opinions of others (Holmes, 1932; Johnson, 1932) prompted Schuyler to view the burden of black survival as resting "heaviest upon the shoulders of the black woman." These two general factors, the poor health of many blacks and the weighty responsibility of the black woman who invariably outnumbered black males in urban centers, convinced Schuyler that selective fertility among Black Americans advanced black hopes of survival in the United States. Similarly, Carter (1932) summed up poignantly the attitudes of selective fertility advocates as the most rational mode of developing the quality and superiority of the black race.

It would appear that the Negro, aware of the tremendous handicaps which his children must face under the most favorable conditions, is even more impelled to limit their number than his white compatriots similarly placed. Therein lies the danger, for Negroes who by virtue of their education and capacity are best able to rear children shrink from that responsibility and the Negro who, in addition to the handicaps of race and color, is shackled by mental and social incompetence serenely goes on his way bringing into the world children whose chances of mere existence are apparently becoming more and more hazardous (Carter, 1932, p. 169).

Walter A. Terpenning (1932) in a Malthusian style exclaimeud that

the size of the colored population is kept down, not by a low birth rate, but mainly by the brutal and barbarous checks of malnutrition, disease and death. These crude checks must give place to the more humane provision of birth control, and the denial of the knowledge of such provision is one of the most hypocritical and savage illustration of man's inhumanity to man...the practice of birth control among the majority of colored people would probably be more eugenic than among their white compatriots (p. 172).
This eugenic birth control scheme of some blacks crested during a period when massive economic instability prevailed, and when most available indicators predicted for most Americans a "life and death" struggle. They saw black fecundity and penury against the backdrop of the Great Depression and surmised that fewer blacks would lead to social betterment for blacks. This proposition presumed spuriously that unrestricted black progeny was a principal cause of black oppression and exploitation. Garvin (1932) exclaimed that "the high fertility of the Negro has perhaps made us insensible and obdurate" (p. 269). Although they considered fewer blacks racially hygenic, advocates of selective fertility inadvertently fueled mainstream's stereotypical thoughts of blacks' reproductive behavior as "rabbit-like."

While most blacks held out hope that the future stored better opportunities, the perception of eugenically applied birth control programs as the catalyst was for many questionable and suspect. Frazier (1933) acknowledged the potential benefits of birth control but restrained from advocating it as an immediate remedy to the social-economic problems of blacks. For most blacks opposing birth control America's disregard for black needs and aspirations validated their resistance to birth control and its purported social advantages. Certainly, Afro-Americans were not alone in their rejection of birth control methods. Non-Nordic immigrants and other poor Americans were also targeted by eugenicists for birth control. Blacks, other non-white Americans and immigrants comprised the lower strata of the social system and were the hardest hit by the 1930's economic collapse. Unemployment, though always inflated for them, staggered higher. Eugenicists, how-
ever, saw the acute employment shortage as a vivid reason to manage the
less privileged progeny through compulsory sterilization (Chase, 1975). At the third International Congress of Eugenics, Lena K. Sadler stated that

There is no question that a sterilization law, enforced throughout the United States, would result, in less than 100 years, in eliminating at least 90% of crime, insanity, feeble-mindedness, moronism, and abnormal sexuality, not to mention many other forms of defectiveness and degeneracy. Thus, within a century, our asylums, prisons, and state hospitals would be largely emptied of their present victims of human woe and misery. The indigent and aged paupers, and the unfortunate degenerates of various types would disappear as a troublesome factor in civilized society (Sadler, 1934, in Chase, 1975, 327-328).

While sterilization was the ultimate answer for eradicating "race
and class refuse", its usage was exploited at different levels. For example, it became a desired way of improving the efficiency of women workers particularly those women whose painstaking efforts formed the spine of the textile and related industries. As Robert Owens had discovered in his New Lanark experiment, contraceptives enhanced productivity. American industrialists, influenced by eugenic thought, similarly encouraged the sterilization of female workers. In subjecting female laborers to the "benefits" of restricted reproduction, the nation's industrial leaders found that sterilized women made significantly better workers than non-sterilized women. Sterilized women missed fewer days due to menstruation and female related illnesses. Their work was not interrupted abruptly by pregnancy and thus they spent less time away from work caring for infants or sick children. Besides greater working time, the quality of their work showed marked improvement. Managerial-
ly, the sterilized female became a machine, a female enunch whose production increased with concomitant cost reduction (see the Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1929). The poor of America faced this and other types of horrendous social measures for controlling and advancing their exploitation. For Blacks, economic wretchedness has shaded their American experience. W. G. Alexander, a black physician who favored black birth control, wrote insightfully on the relationship between economic manipulation of the black population and fertility:

The exploitation of the Negro slave as a commercial asset was the precursor of American big business, and to make it profitable, it was necessary to reach into the future and apply what is called high pressure methods. High pressure methods in the slave business meant the encouragement of prolific reproduction; for the greater number of slave children born, the greater the possible profits for the slave owner.

The same big business that was responsible for mass production of slave babies was also responsible for creating an economic status for the Negro that has placed and continues to hold him at the bottom of the economic dump heap (1932, p. 175).

With the horror of slavery and of the violent post-Civil War era still fresh in the memories of many blacks, the 1920's and 30's offered them little encouragement. Concern for race suicide, consensually validated by the disproportionately high rate of black mortality, also prevented the massive practice of birth control among blacks. E. Franklin Frazier (1933), after critically inspecting the fertility and mortality figures on blacks as well as various other social-economic political factors showed mixed feelings toward the practice of birth control in the black community. Marcus Garvey's (1934) condemnation of birth con-
trol usage among blacks emphasized moral and religious concerns.

Garvey's framing of anti-fertility as blasphemous was instrumental in stirring black resistance. Although Garvey never linked together explicitly birth control and population reduction (Weisbord, 1975), he nevertheless expressed misgivings that the black race would become extinct if it failed to maintain a relatively high birth rate. Other studies also pointed to the importance of ethics and morality in the forming of Black America's attitude towards birth control. Weisbord (1975) in his book, Genocide?, cited two studies conducted in Nashville, Tennessee (1940, 1949), of black mothers' attitudes toward birth control practices. Both studies revealed strong moral and religious opposition to birth control. While activity around the issue of black birth control declined as the country's denizens turned their attention to the war, several persons and organizations continued to pursue the issue of birth control and the black community.

The pro-birth control element in the black community was recognized officially by the Birth Control Federation with the creation of a division of Negro Service. Thirty-four eminent blacks comprised its National Negro Advisory Council which included Dr. DuBois, Mary McLeod Bethune of the National Council of Negro Women, Walter White, Executive Director of NAACP, Reverend Adam Clayton Powell, Professor E. Franklin

24Birth Control Federation of America, the formal organization of the Birth Control Council, was a coalition of the American Birth Control League (1921) and the Clinical Research Bureau. In 1941, the Birth Control Federation of America became the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. In 1963, it joined with the World Population Emergency Campaign to form the organization called Planned Parenthood-World Population (Austin, 1974; Weisbord, 1975).
Frazier, and other prominent blacks. In 1941, Mary M. Bethune, founder and the pristine leader of the National Council of Negro Women, addressed family planning and birth control at the Council's annual convention, and urged all black organizations to join her group in conveying to blacks the necessity of having children based on the ability of the family to afford and support more children (Weisbord, 1975). Perhaps the pioneering pro-birth control organization was the National Medical Association. Black physicians were one of the most adamant and persistent groups in the thirties and forties, calling for family planning and fertility regulations. Another prominent black leader of this early era, A. Phillip Randolph, one of the most influential black trade unionists, suggested that family planning was the first step toward guaranteeing a better living and health standard for future black generations (Weisbord, 1975). The logic behind this premise, the cornerstone of black birth control proponents, was that smaller families yielded greater quality which subsequently would provide greater inroads into the mainstream of American society. Seemingly, prejudicial and segregationist barriers raised to halt black social advancement would be weakened, even razed, as a function of black social maturity. Clearly, the aim of black birth control adherents was both the preservation and uplifting of blacks in America. Similarly, dissenters of birth control sought an internal locus of control over Black America's destiny. That is, they saw a synergic connection between the future of the black race and black growth. The size of the black race would become a powerful social-political force in the American society, prompting concessions leading to the enhancement of black posterity. The Black anthropolo-
gist, W. Montague Cobb, in 1939 wrote that

he (the black man) should maintain his high birth rate observing the conditions of life necessary to this end. This alone has made him able to increase in spite of decimating mortality hardships. If the tide should turn against him later, strength will be better than weakness in numbers (pp. 345-346).

Supporting this claim was Dr. Julian Lewis, a pathologist and professor at the University of Chicago. He noted that, whereas the growth of the white race was guaranteed by a low death rate, the survival of the black race in the United States was dependent upon a high birth rate (Weisbord, 1975, p. 52). Lewis (1945) urged the enhancing of black life span by improving medical care and eradicating a sundry of health nemeses plaguing blacks. Lewis emphatically rejected the calculus which equated fewer blacks with an improved living condition. Instead, he formulated the equation that broad based implementation of birth control methods would be for blacks "race suicide" (1945). William Patterson pointed out with great precision a number of the perils of race suicide confronting blacks daily. However his book We Charge Genocide—The Historic Petition of the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government against the Negro People (1951) overlooked birth control as a genocide nemesis, but introduced the word "genocide" to opponents of black birth control. Although he did not address birth control in his initial discussion of genocide intent, his argument was compatible to birth control disputants because both highlighted the systemic nature of black oppression while questioning mainstream's motives and effects on the future of Black Americans.25 In general, the early
arguments for and against black usage of birth control interpreted black fertility and mortality statistics differently. At one level, the different views of these data were necessary to justify the claims and arguments of the discussants. While these statistics were molded to fit specific postures and thus susceptible to inaccurate analysis, the statistical findings and a host of causal factors related to fertility and mortality trends have continued to be the fundamental crucible for most arguments on black birth control.

Accordingly, the aim of the next section will be to sketch the fertility and mortality rates of Black America. Examination of these patterns will rely heavily on the United States census and several scholarly endeavors (Austin, 1974; Farley, 1970; Pinkney, 1975).

**Black Fertility and Mortality**

At the time of the first census in 1790, the black population totaled 757,000. As indicated in Table 1 this represented 19% of the total population. Essentially, one out of every five persons in the United States was black and with each subsequent enumeration the number of blacks rose. While numerical gains were evident, the rate of black growth with respect to the overall population declined. This proportional decrease occurred from the 1790's to 1930's, where upon the percentage of the total population held by blacks had been reduced by fifty percent. Two factors accounted primarily for this downward trend in the proportion of blacks: first, the cessation of slave import which was

---

Table 1
The Black Population of the United States (1790-1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total U.S. Population (000)</th>
<th>Total Black Population (000)</th>
<th>Percent Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>203,212</td>
<td>22,580</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>179,323</td>
<td>18,872</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>150,697</td>
<td>15,042</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>131,669</td>
<td>12,866</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>122,775</td>
<td>11,891</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>105,711</td>
<td>10,463</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>91,972</td>
<td>9,798</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>75,945</td>
<td>8,834</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>62,975</td>
<td>7,489</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>50,156</td>
<td>6,581</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>39,818</td>
<td>5,392</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>31,443</td>
<td>4,442</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>23,192</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>17,069</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>12,866</td>
<td>2,329</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>9,638</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>7,240</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>3,929</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

outlawed in 1808 but continued illegally until the Civil War; and, secondly, a significant influx of European immigrants during this period which added directly to the white American population. Less directly, but nonetheless germane, was the tendency of foreign born whites to have high birth rates (Myrdal, 1944; Farley, 1970; Austin, 1974; Pinkney, 1975). Notwithstanding, the rate of increase among the native born white population during this period exceeded the increase among blacks. This occurred even though the black birth rate appeared greater than whites which was cancelled due to a paralleling high infant mortality. Consequently, the growth trends depicted "a greater rate of natural increase among whites" (Austin, 1974).

Black fertility rates were at a very high level prior to the Civil War (Farley, 1971). After the War, these rates showed a downward decline, reaching their lowest level during the Depression years. Reversal of this trend occurred during and immediately following the World War II years. As Farley congenitally noted:

The years since 1940 have witnessed increases in fertility and decreases in childlessness among all groups of black women. Fertility went up among urban women, among college educated women, as well as among women on southern farms and among women who did not even complete elementary school (1971, p. 6).

The greatest single historical contributor to the black population's increase has been the excess of births over deaths (natural increase). An inconsequential factor to black population growth has been black immigration (Austin, 1974; Farley, 1970; Myrdal, 1944; Pinkney, 1975). While black fertility rate in the present century has fluctuated, the
birth rate among blacks has remained consistently higher than whites (Austin, 1974; Farley, 1970b; Pinkney, 1975). However, since the mid-fifties, the birth rate for blacks and whites has shown a gradual but consistent decline. In fact, this crude birth rate decrease has maintained itself into the present decade.

Black mortality rates, like fertility rates, exceeded those for whites. In 1900, for cities in the Death Registration Area, a staggering infant death rate of 3 out of every 10 births was registered. Farley (1971) reported that the life span of blacks in Washington, D.C. for the period 1901-1910 was thirty years. Supporting Farley's findings, Pinkney indicated that the life expectancy at birth for blacks and whites was 33 years and 47.6 years respectively. Primarily as a function of reduced infant mortality rates, life expectancy at birth in 1970 climbed to 64.6 years for blacks and 71.7 years for whites.

Several pertinent features of black mortality, many of which have fueled arguments of genocide, require further elaboration. For instance, the childlessness pervasive among black women was not the effect of birth control, but a problem of fecundity (Farley, 1971). The period in question stretches from the Reconstruction epoch well into the third-

26 Since Afro-Americans comprised overwhelmingly the largest percentage with the United States Census' non-white category, Afro-American instead of non-white has been used.

27 Robert Reinhold (1977) and Zelnik and Kantner (1978) noted that birth rate among girls 15 to 17 years old had risen over the last decade. Similarly, the rate of illegitimacy for the age group had nearly doubled during this 10-year period. In both cases, the upward trends occurred only among white girls. Birth and illegitimacy rates of black girls declined. "However, these rates are still higher among blacks than whites."
ties. Farley (1970, 1971) and others (Myrdal, 1944) argue, though cautiously, that "the incidence of childlessness" among blacks was "a consequence of an increase of venereal disease." Farley (1970, 1971) notes that 20 percent of the adult black population during the Depression Era may have had either syphilis or gonorrhea. It is well documented that venereal diseases have a harmful effect on fertility. Gonorrhea when not treated produces sterility while syphilis can drastically impair one's reproductive capabilities. Accordingly, a substantial percentage of still births (i.e., fetal deaths), black infants' deaths, and maternal mortality are attributable to syphilis and other contagious diseases. From 1937 to 1955, ameliorative public health programs were responsible for a pronounced decline in all three areas. Farley points out that maternal and infant health conditions declined very little, if at all, before the mid 1930's but then, for a score of years, they fell very rapidly. In general, these rates reached low levels during the mid 1950's and since that time, there has been very little fluctuation (1971, p. 215).

Indeed, syphilis-related infant deaths are reported to have been reduced by the mid 50's to about 3 per 100,000 births. While venereal diseases in the first four decades of this century were of epidemic intensity

---

28This brief presentation of fertility and mortality among Black Americans does not examine the differential between rural and urban populations. For an indepth study of these differences, see Farley (1970). Also, prior to the 1900's, the data on black mortality trends were not gathered. Such information had not been included on the census schedules. Consequently, mortality rates have been derived from inferences and estimations. Farley has written, "it is even more problematic to study long run trends in death rates among blacks than it is to analyze trends in fertility. ..fluctuations in the completeness of the census counts of blacks."
among blacks, other infectious and parasitic diseases shared in this sordid distinction (e.g., tuberculosis).\textsuperscript{29} Contagious diseases, like pellagra (the lack of niacin), contributed greatly to the overall death rate among Afro-Americans.

Pellagra, a dietary deficiency ailment, generally not a fatal disease, caused approximately 7,000 fatalities each year during the 1920's and contributed to many other deaths. Pellagra victims, often poor blacks, were far more susceptible to infectious diseases (e.g., venereal diseases). Complications among pregnant women and fetal deaths were far more likely among suffers of pellagra. Efforts to eradicate pellagra were thwarted approximately two decades after Joseph Goldberger, an epidemiologist with the United States Public Health Services, uncovered in 1914 its etiology and established preventive measures leading to its eradication (Chases, 1977; Farley, 1971). Not only did Goldberger pinpoint its cause, but also observed that the disease was not transmissible and was void of a constitutional-genetic core. Charles Benedict Davenport and his eugenic colleagues dismissed the wealth of data Goldberger had compiled and even construed "false correlations" depicting it as an hereditary disease. Chase (1977) aptly pointed out that "it was cheaper to believe the pseudo genetic myth of pellagra as an infectious disease of a subrace of inferior hereditary stock" (p. 220). Consequently, "the great pellagra cover-up of 1916-33" resulted in untold scores of pella-

\textsuperscript{29}Chase (1977) notes that the Model Eugenical Sterilization Law authored primarily by Harry H. Laughlin (1922) included among the "socially inadequate classes" people suffering from tuberculosis, syphilis, as well as other infectious diseases, "regardless of etiology or prognosis." The Model's recommendation was compulsory sterilization.
gra related black deaths and illnesses. No doubt, the pellagra scandal was not an isolated phenomenon (e.g., withholding of penicillin for venereal diseases). Indeed, such malicious and ruthless activities perpetrated against a specific segment of the country's population, blacks and other poor groups, have done little to dissuade those who argued that fertility regulating programs' overall aim is selective population growth and social control.

Admittedly, the crude death rate for Black Americans has decreased, thus narrowing the gap between blacks and whites. Still blacks have remained three times more likely to die from tuberculosis and syphilis than whites. Indisputably, medical technology has done much to control these once ravaging diseases and has contributed greatly to shrinkage of crude death. However, another salient factor which must be weighed heavily has been the fact that this reduction in the death rate is partly a function of the age discrepancy between the black and white populations (Austin, 1974; Farley, 1971; Pinkney, 1975). Austin reported "that the non-white population, to a median of 27.4 in 1971, was considerable younger than the white population which had a median age of 28.9" (p. 9). Besides being a younger population, Pinkney has indicated further that

---

30 Certainly, poor people, both white and non-white, were victimized by this inhumane and unethical act.

31 According to the National Center for Health Statistics of the Public Health Service, as reported in the New York Times (9-18-77), the United States death rate reached a record low in 1976. The rate fell to an estimated 8.9 deaths for each 1,000 persons, compared to 9.1 per thousand the previous year.
there are substantially more females than males in the black population, the males are younger. With continuing difficulties that blacks face in securing and maintaining employment, such a population composition is likely to contribute to increased disillusionment. . . (1975, p. 46).

The relatively youthful disillusioned black population has retained much of the dissonance of earlier generations of Afro-Americans. They have found themselves wrestling with a similar set of choices and questions. For instance, will a smaller black population expedite the improvement of the black social economic forecast? Or, will a growing politically aware black constituency compel an unwilling society to respond to their demands and needs? Put differently, what will benefit black progress, restricted or unrestricted fertility? Though pertinent questions for Black America, their answers will necessarily have to consider dominant society's answers to these very questions. While pursuit of this relation is intriguing, its investigation falls beyond the dissertation's scope. However, a sample of one possible perspective will be surveyed.

Sex-Economy-Race: The Birth Control Triad?

The call for selective black fertility control came at first from eugenicists and racial determinists. These zealous advocates with their jingoistic brand of Americanism offered controlled fertility as a societal cure-all. The resisting element in society was largely from religious antagonists who attacked the unnatural and ungodly features of purposeful birth control. Nonetheless, these counter arguments, albeit in line with certain religious mores, have ignored the core issue of restricted birth control. Some blacks have shown a propensity to deline-
ate for Black Americans possible counter indications to birth control usage. In other words, they have moved towards interpreting the relationship between pseudo-scientific race theory and the application of birth control. One way of interpreting this partnership has been the sex-economy-race sociology of Wilhelm Reich.

Reich's work, The Mass Psychology of Facism (1976), originally published in German 50 years ago, has weathered the years admirably, providing valuable insights into several axioms of race theory and its social significance. Reich described "race theory" as biological mysticism. Allan Chase (1977) defined "scientific racism" (32) (a synonym for "race theory") as

the creation of employment of a body of legitimately scientific, or patently pseudo-scientific, data as rationales for the preservation of poverty, inequality of opportunity for upward mobility, and related regressive social arrangements. In the performance of these functions, scientific racism has often also institutionalized and lent scientific respectability to racist dogma and practices that were all for far older than science itself (p. 72).

For Reich, the irrationality of race theory becomes explainable when examined through the sex-economy framework. Reich writes that

\[32\] For the purpose of this discussion, eugenicists and race determinists will not be differentiated, but will be used interchangeably. Eugenicism is perceived as an ideological element within the larger domain of racial determinism.

\[33\] Sex economy means the manner in which an individual handles his biological energies; how much of it he dams up and how much of it he discharges orgastically. The factors that influence this manner of regulation are of a sociological, psychological, and biological nature. The science of sex-economy consisted of that body of knowledge that was derived from a study of these factors (Reich, 1976, p. xxxii).
sex economic sociology was born from the effort to harmonize Freud's depth psychology with Marx's economic theory. In-

Looking through Reich's sex-economy prism, the fundamental aim of a race theory is "to improve the race genetically and to safeguard it against racial interbreeding" (p. 70). While Reich's inferences are built on his observations of Hitler's Germany before World War II, his examinations of the existing interface between race theory and population policies (e.g., discriminate sterilization) furnishes significant corollaries for inspecting race theory's involvement in the formulation of the United States population policies. To dismiss this relationship is to deny the copious amount of historical and contemporary material which weaves these two principles together. Moreover, Chase's detailed analysis of the function of twentieth century pseudo-scientific racism demonstrates, quite vividly, the striking similarity between the United States and Germany's population policies. In fact, Chase unveils the startling wealth of evidence showing the immense reliance of Germany's draconian population policies on the American eugenic movement. Because of Germany's heinous population policies, it is seldom mentioned that Germany and the United States both strove for race purity through their

34 Reich notes that race theorists "are as old as imperialism itself" (p. 73). Chase adds that "the doctrine or feeling of racial differences or antagonism, especially with references to supposed racial superiority, inferiority, or purity—was not new to the 19th century. Nor for that matter was it new to our millenium" (p. 72).
population policies.

The irrational component of race theory results in a theory that "instead of proceeding from facts to valuations, proceeded from valuations to a distortion of the facts" (p. 73). For instance, the admixture of blood drops the level of racial purity, obfuscates the line of destruction between the superordinate and subordinate (master-slave dichotomy), and degenerates entire cultures. These are subjective impressions which acquired, within the context of a race theory, the status of objective truths. The Reichian viewpoint thus proceeds on the notion that to repute race theory requires exposing its contradictions and inconsistencies. This means uncovering its irrational functions "of which there are essentially two: that of giving expression to certain 'unconscious' and 'emotional' currents prevalent in the nationalistically disposed man and of concealing certain psychic tendencies" (p. 73).

In discussing race ideology's irrationalities, Reich explores with the aid of his sex-economy sociology the instinctual/emotional forces behind the obsession of race and blood purity and the abstract ethical belief among White Americans of a divine/superior destiny. Such race ideology converts human sexuality into a pejorative, dirty term. More precisely, human sexuality becomes draped in mysticism and misunderstandings which lead to action designed to curb and to regulate its activity. The prostitution of human sexuality, by the social order, results in the dichotomization of sex activity into procreativity and sexual gratuity. Quite vividly, this distinction shows the dominance of male authoritarianism which renders a distinction of mortality-immortality primarily on the basis of the sexual behavior of women. Sexual activity in the serv-
冰 of the existing social order is morally valued motherhood. This kind of sexual behavior suggests that women function solely as a "birth machine" which society "idealizes and deifies." On the other hand, sexuality of a sensual nature is viewed as immoral and is used to epitomize the sexual behavior of blacks and others (i.e., the lower classes and the non-white groups which Reich calls "the alien race"). The value assignment of immoral to black sexual behavior identifies their progeny as promiscuous and undesirable. This moral-immoral division implies that sexual feelings, besides those elicited for socially desired procreative purposes, are to be suppressed.

This formulation equates Black Americans with sensual strivings; both to be inhibited and disowned because they are sinful. Race theory does not allow "natural sexual feelings" legitimate avenues for expression. Sexual suppression by means of guilt, mores and taboos plays a key role in preventing race and/or class intermingling. Reich argues impressively that

sexual interbreeding between classes means an undermining of class rule; it creates the possibility of a 'democratization,' that is to say, the possibility of the proletarianization of the aristocratic youth. For the lower social strata of every social order develop sexual conceptions and habits that constitute a serious threat to the rulers of every authoritarian order (p. 88).

Although material suppression is specific to the lower classes, sexual suppression permeates all social classes. Economically, sexual inhibition's first order purpose is to keep within the ruling domain the wealth and power of its class members. (This objective has been enunciated by Plato, Aristotle, Malthus, Spencer, and contemporary "survival
of the fittest" proponents.) The internalization of this governing edict by members of the upper class "is intended to safeguard those possessions that were acquired through the exploitation of the lower classes" (p. 68). Sexual suppression among the oppressed gains importance for the ruling class when the lower classes display organized activities in pursuit of greater socio-political considerations and when it achieves cultural advances (Reich, 1976). At this point, the upper class evinces a newfound attentiveness to the morality of the lower classes (e.g., the unwanted child). Such attention usually coincides with the lower class's assimilation of the ruling class's ideology and subsequent absorption, though perhaps only partially, of the "official" sexual-moralistic inhibitions (e.g., a decline in the black illegitimacy rate). This greater identification with the ruling authoritarian class is facilitated by the middle class relaxation of its rigid class borders and heightens the ruling class's apprehension of race degeneration. Increased overlap between the more organized lower class and the quiescent middle class as well as the impact of economic instability on the middle class's sexual being produces this concern. Reich addresses this point as follows:

it is precisely when the economy of the lower middle classes shows signs of breaking down that natural sexuality must appear as a particular threat to the continued existence of sexual institutions. Since the lower middle class is the mainstay of the authoritarian order, the latter attaches special importance to its 'morality' and to its 'remaining uncontaminated' by the influence of 'inferior races.' If the lower middle class would lose its moralistic attitude toward sex to the same extent that it loses its intermediate economic position. . .this would constitute a very grave threat to (the existing social order) (p. 90).
With changes in the relationships between the middle and lower classes, sexual and moral suppression no longer operate as adequate measures of control. Efforts to safeguard society against so-called racial and cultural degeneration brought on by the reawakening of one's sexual being and greater intra-class contact lead to tactical adjustments within the overall strategy. Women, for instance, become disenchanted with the singular existence of their sexuality under the idealized rubric of motherhood. Womanhood and its instinctual currents are lost in the morass of "childbearing machine" activities. Nonetheless, the continual deification of motherhood is a necessary operation in the preservation of the family and the official code of morality. Any shift in the populace's perception of this ideal demands a sufficient counter-reaction on behalf of the ruling upper class. In this case, the counter-reaction takes the form of birth control. The fact of the matter is that birth control resolves for the ruling class the dilemma caused by the general populace's reassessment of motherhood. With motherhood becoming less the "choice" of women and with increased competition from motherhood's liberated anti-thesis, the sexual being, a birth control resolution becomes appealing because it allows both motherhood and the sexual being theoretically to co-exist. Birth control, with its rather strong endorsement among women of all classes and races, provides women with greater expression of their sexual being. However, such changes in sexual behavior remain within the context and control of the social order, and are not seen as supplanting the idealization of motherhood or disassembling the antithetical argument between motherhood and sexuality. Essentially, birth control services the needs and
desires of women for sexual gratification and similarly provides the ruling class some protection of the blood and race pureness. The present popularity and acceptance of birth control from most quarters of American society parallels the liberation of sexual expression. The recommendations from birth control proponents for the need to systematically carry sex education into the school system (Hardin, 1968, 1970; Erhlich, 1968; Konner, 1977; Hartley, 1973, 1972) is exemplary of the relaxation of certain sexual taboos. A National Opinion Survey (1977) reveals that "6 out of 10 of the 24,000 teenagers polled approve of premarital sex." Reed (1978) comments that "a generation earlier the pill would have been dismissed as a dangerous interference to natural processes; the IUD would have been banned as an abortifacient" (p. 376).

Birth control and family planning is advertised as loosening the social shackles on one's sexual being while simultaneously controlling the birth rate. 35

It is not surprising that while sexual activity has increased, early prognostication of higher fertility rates have not generally oc-

35 Heightened sexual expression permeated all age levels. A contrary statistic, however, has been adolescent pregnancies, which have risen in the last 10 years, even though there has been since 1972 a "dramatic" increase in teenage contraception (Zelnik & Kanter, 1978; Reinhold, 1977). In a New York Times editorial, Melvin J. Konner (1977) argued that opposition and abortion on moral grounds should not prevent pregnant children from receiving such services. "An abortion must always be available to a teenager." Zelnik and Kanter (1978) reported that "about 780,000 teenagers experience a premarital pregnancy each year. If they were not using contraception, an additional 680,000 would become pregnant—a total of 1,460,000. However, if all who did not want a baby were practicing contraception consistently, we could reduce the number of pregnancies by at least 313,000. Only 467,000 would become pregnant, and half of these pregnancies would be wanted" (p. 135).
Recently, Paul and Anne Ehrlich (1979) noted that virtually all demographers thought that the early 1970's would be a time of rising birth rates in the United States. . . . But contrary to all expectations, the birth rate plunged dramatically from 18.4 in 1970 to around 15 by 1973, and it has remained there ever since (p. 88).

The phenomenal rise in both knowledge and usage of contraceptives occurred in the mid-sixties. Its emergence in the sixties usurped the spotlight from a number of social, economic and racial issues, including the Civil Rights Movement, the Viet Nam War, and inflation. In retrospect, the introduction of birth control occurred when social unrest and protest, fears of family breakdown, and a sundry of related social maladies tested the strengths of society's social controls. From the standpoint of the ruling class increased demands "for democratization" from blacks, women, and other minority groups posed a threat. This was also a period when the middle class, particularly its youth, shared with the lower classes and non-white ethnic groups a common foe, "the Establishment." Recalling Reich's formulation, the increasing permeability of the middle class by the lower class compelled the ruling class to react to shield their "race" from lower element contamination. The form of the response was couched in a manner that highlighted the country's population growth rate as a "crisis" and recommended an ecological approach. People, particularly blacks and other poor groups, had stopped being a national exploitable resource; instead, they had become a national pollutant.

An examination of the major arguments insisting a "population crisis" and plans for defusing the "population bomb" will precede the dis-
discussion of population policies and the response of Black America. This overview provides the arena for further understanding the contemporary black debate on birth control and family planning.

Population Bomb: Real or Unreal?

One of the more sensational works on population growth and its implications was Paul R. Erhlich's (1968) *The Population Bomb*. In the legacy of Malthus, Ehrlich painted an alarming, ominous picture with hues of facts and fantasies to describe the country's advancement toward an "ecocatastrophe." The media's extensive treatment of Erhlich revived Malthusian canon and sent waves of concerns cavalcading throughout the country and government. His core argument was that

The birth rate must be brought into balance with the death rate or mankind will breed itself into oblivion (p. 11).

... Basically then, there are only two kinds of solutions to the population problem. One is a "birth rate solution," in which we find ways to lower the birth rate. The other is a "death rate solution," in which ways to raise the death rate... war, famine, pestilence—find us. The problem could have been avoided by population control, in which mankind consciously adjusted the birth rate... (p. 35).

The work of Erhlich subsequently became the gospel and he became the leading apostle on population problems. In his recapitulation of the Malthusian dogma, Ehrlich was greatly influenced by the pseudo-scientific enterprises of Paddock and Paddock (1967) and Vogt (1948, 1960). A general consensus among these and similar works was, as Allan Chase disdainfully called it, "to commit genocide and save western civilization"

---

The perils of population growth has been the theme of a number of studies supporting direct, aggressive action to curb the country's rate of growth (Hardin, 1968, 1970; Hartley, 1972, 1973; Lader, 1971; Chasteen, 1971). The impact of these inchoate presentations of the multifaceted issue of population growth on the attitude of the American public was tremendous. "By 1970," Chase noted, "thousands of earnest and idealistic Americans of all ages were swapping the 'end the killing in Viet Nam' buttons for more modish buttons bearing the words 'people pollute'" (p. 386). The United States' unrestricted population growth and extravagant consumption habits have been indicted as the cause of environmental deterioration (Ehrlich, 1968). Presumably, the additive effects of population expansion and prosperity has produced over the years pollution and economical erosion (Hardin, 1968). A common axiom of this viewpoint has been that population growth imperils renewable resources. Lester Brown, an agricultural economist and specialist in resource management, in a paper entitled, "The Global Economic Prospect: New Sources of Economic Stress," warned that as human needs outstrip the carrying capacity of biological systems and as oil reserves shrink, the emphasis in economic thinking must shift from growth to sustainability (Farnsworth, 1978).

This kind of caveat beginning with Ehrlich's spaceship metaphor of finite capacity has persisted for more than a decade. Consequently,

---

As early as 1960, Edward S. Deevy stated that "in the short span of his existency, man has come to consume more food than all other land animals put together. This raises the question of how many men the earth can support" (p. 3). He further contended that to some horrified observers, the population increase has become a "population explosion"
the question of whether there is a population problem has become moot and the focus has turned to what is the most efficient and thorough approach to solving the problem of "unwanted" population growth (Buckout, 1972; Lipe, 1971; Westoff, 1974). While the adjudication of the so-called population dilemma has become the active endeavor of many, an officially endorsed rational population policy has remained elusive (Buckout, 1972; Westoff, 1974).

Still, the decade of the 70's has unveiled with greater clarity the evolving profile of America's implicit population blueprint. Although prudent perusals of government documents do not reveal readily a comprehensive national population policy, the activities of government agencies and private foundations have produced discernible trends. Broadly speaking, the ultimate goal has centered on accomplishing "a zero population growth rate" (Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1970; Westoff, 1974). Perhaps the closest document to a national population policy has been the President's Commission Report, Population and the American Future (Westoff, 1974). The stabilization of the country's rate of growth constituted one of the commission's core recommendations. While the approach to achieving this rather ambitious goal has not been delineated precisely, the momentary plan of action has been steered toward making available an assortment of anti-fertility methods and propounding the eco-social consequences of overpopulation (Erhlich, (p. 3). The similarity of Deevey's and Erhlich's presentations has illustrated the contemporary longevity of the crusade to adopt the ethic of triage or the life boat ethic, that is, only a finite number of people can be taken aboard and the life boat keep afloat.
1968). A multifaceted problem, the population problem has been bombarded with proposed solutions. This litany of solutions has fallen roughly under one of three broad theoretical headings: Malthusian, optimum, and demographic transition. The Malthusian model has been largely based on the manipulation of reinforcements (positive and negative) to deter progeny from reaching the limit of the food supply. Optimum model has the guiding tenet that there exists an advantageous level of persons and such a level was a function of availability of resources. Once the relationship has been discerned manipulations similar to Malthusian approach is applied to maintain the "correct" balance.

The demographic transition model has the basic notion that a decline in the death rate produces similar behavior in the birth rate when economic development occurs (Hartley, 1972).

Ralph Potter, in his paper "The Simple Structure of the Population Debate" (1977), applies an analogy to the population problem called "the banquet of life metaphor." Potter writes, "we can 1) provide more, 2) invite fewer guests, 3) require each to get along with a smaller share, or 4) exclude some from access to the common table" (p. 349). He adds that "the issues can be seen primarily as questions of resource development, demographic trends, standards of living, or questions of distributive justice" (p. 349). Birth control and population policy disputants tend to crowd the aisles when it comes to devising population schemes. While these plans may exhibit a variety of outward appearances, dynamically they are reduced to either voluntary or involuntary control with the central aim of these population plans relatively fixed --the achievement of "zero population growth."
Both Kingsley Davis (1967) and Garrett Hardin (1968), two zealous proponents of population control, scorn the reliance on voluntary measures to lower fecundity. In his attacks on family planning, Davis argued that

the things that make family planning acceptable are the very things that make it ineffective for population control. By stressing the rights of parents to have the number of children they want, it evades the basic question of population policy, which is how to give societies the number of children they need. By offering only the means for couples to control fertility, it neglects the means for societies to do so (p. 33).

Hardin (1968) prescribes a trajectory of "mutual coercion, mutually agreed upon" (1947). He assumes the inexorable posture that "social arrangements that produce responsibility are arrangements that create 'coercion'" (p. 1247). Myopically, Hardin sees the synergic relationship between voluntarism and family planning as breeding a tragic, ruinous course of action for all.

A diametrically opposing view was held by Donald Bogue (1967) and Ronald Freeman (1964). Even before population growth had become an item of public interest, Bogue forecasted that

from 1965 onward. . .the rate of the world population growth may be expected to decline to each passing year. The growth will slacken at such a pace that it will be zero or near zero at about the year 2000, so that population growth will not be regarded as a major social problem. . . (p. 19).

Bogue's contention received support from the work of Freeman (1964), Hauser (1969), and Westoff (1974) who have reported, independently, that the nation's fertility rate (for that matter the world's fertility rate) for several decades has exhibited a downward trend. Beside a slowing
down of the fertility rate, Wrong (1966) found that since 1940, intra-
national groups or class fertility differences have diminished markedly.
Unfortunately, these and related findings, depicting a reduction in fer-
tility patterns, were virtually ignored; instead, the more emotionally
charged, doomsday argument of the crowded, finite spaceship Earth occu-
pied the foreground of the population debate. The Winikoff's study and
the Indian Ambassador's, Mr. Shankarnaraya, accusations of the immense
contribution of the United States to the threatening eco-catastrophe has
remained inadequately addressed. Winikoff (1978) convincingly disputed
arguments reducing nutritional problems and the reason for so many mal-
nourished people to a population problem. Winikoff wrecked the Malthu-
sian premise that the so-called accelerated procreativity pace was out-
stripping the country's food supply. On the contrary, she asserted that
there is enough to feed everyone "if the problem of unequal distribution
can be solved" (p. 895). Similarly, Shankarnaraya exposed the inher-
ent irony of the United States' Malthusian argument when he revealed
that the average American family's dog received "more animal protein per
week than the average Indian family" obtained in a month. In his scath-
ing attack, the Ambassador questioned, "How do you (United States gov-
ernment) justify taking fish from protein-starved Peruvians and feeding

38In her report, Winikoff (1968) also argued that feeding children
was merely just another level of comprehensive family planning measure.
Families with healthy children tend to have smaller families. Further-
more, breast-fed children are significantly more likely to be healthier
than non-breast-fed children. Also, mothers of breast-fed children are
more inclined to have lengthier lactation periods which causes amenor-
rhea. Therefore, breast feeding serves a natural prophylactic role.
Such a notion applied conjointly with thorough health promoting pre-
natal care could be an element of a positive population policy.
them to your animals?" He concluded with the striking analysis that "the birth of an American baby is a greater disaster for the world than that of 25 Indian babies." The reports of Winikoff and Shankarnaraya suggest a negatively skewed relation between food supply and food distribution; they both were equivocal about the magnitude of the population problem.

While Winikoff and Shankarnaraya pointed to the contradictory nature of the ecology-minded "people pollute" campaign in the United States, other disputants expressed concern over the equitability of a national population policy. Blake (1967) criticized the logic of a federally aided birth control program for the poor as a basis of national population control plan. In her critique, Blake unveiled several faulty underpinnings which hold such a population policy together. First, it has been assumed that fertility is the only component of population growth requiring the federal government's attention. Second, reduction in fertility has to be induced vis a vis birth control programs. Third, the poor and uneducated have been targeted because they "have used birth control methods less effectively than other groups" (p. 522). Consequently, the proponents of birth control viewed the poor as either irresponsible or lacking opportunity to regulate efficiently their fertility rate. For the most part, the latter view has been the choice of most control advocates.

Blake argued that the reasoning for assuming that the population difficulty can be simply resolved by using government sponsored birth control services is ominously short-sighted. Indeed, the strength of her criticisms caused several population control supporters, and perhaps
most associated to the evolving public policy, to supply a rejoinder (Harkavy, Jaffee, & Wishnik, 1969). More importantly, Blake and others (Buckhout, 1972; Chrisman, 1971) have contended that there is something inherently wrong with a national population policy aimed at the poor. This issue, in fact, has formed the backbone of quality vs. quantity, birth control and anti-birth control debates in the black community.

The following section examines the contemporary arguments that birth control and family planning among blacks are "genocidal." Subsumed under these generic names, birth control and family planning, are such prophylactic measures as sterilization, abortion, the pill, IUD's, as well as others.

An appreciation of this rather incendiary debate is essential for understanding black abhorrence or acceptance of fertility control measures. The apprehension and suspicion of some blacks is shown to be firmly rooted in a factual foundation and not one of pathogenic paranoia. The acceptance of birth control is often attached to the rationale that birth control enables one to be sexually active without the compelling fears of the woman becoming pregnant with an unwanted child. Although the immediate impression may define this argument as "either/or", such a viewpoint is limited and ignores the complexity of the black genocide issue. Admittedly, some of the arguments of proponents and opponents may fall in the extreme categories; however, the bulk of the arguments are weighed with contingencies. For instance, a birth control clinic in black neighborhoods is more acceptable when operated by blacks (Darity & Turner, 1972). Birth control clinics as part of a comprehensive health care facility are regarded with less suspicion by blacks.
This illustrates the point that necessary conditions must be met to alleviate the fears and suspicions of some blacks to birth control. Moreover, the examination of those arguments citing the genocidal nature of birth control affords the continual opportunity to discern the relative attitudes of black leaders and the general black population. Such information is helpful in interpreting the present study's findings.

**Contemporary Black Leaders and the Birth Control Movement**

For Afro-Americans the decades of the sixties and seventies have seen their perennial list of salient concerns and issues enlarged to include the impact of population policies and birth control methods on their future in the United States. Within the black community, the responses to birth control programs have ranged from proclaiming them as valuable, beneficial services, to indicting them as part of a plot to eliminate blacks. Generally, supporters of birth control programming and usage in the black community have argued that limiting black fertility would loosen the grip of poverty (Farney, 1971; Harkavy, Jaffe, & Wishik, 1969; Moynihan, 1970; Stycos, 1977). Likened to a quality control mechanism in business and industry, the practice of birth control techniques has the potential to prevent unwanted pregnancies (Furstenberg, 1971; Guttmacher, 1967; Jaffe, 1964; Uhlenberg, 1966), reduce family size, and increase social mobility. In other words, the efficacy of birth control services in the black community has for some the power to change the social landscape by shortening the seemingly "unbridgeable" gap between America's "haves" and "have nots." Those advocating birth control usage in the black community have included such black
leaders as Toni Cade, Congresswoman Shirly Chisholm, Julius Lester, Martin Luther King, Dr. Alvin Poussaint, Carl Rowan, Malcolm X, and others. A keen distinction made implicitly by many black supporters is that birth control programs should give the individual the "freedom of choice" on the size of one's family, whereas population control is usually a government policy dictating the number of live births in a given period of time (e.g., India, Paraguay, Puerto Rico). Although black supporters of birth control programs have acknowledged the occurrence of incidences of a sinister nature, they have dismissed accusations that a national conspiracy to reduce the size of the black population underlies birth control and family planning in Afro-American communities. Congresswoman Chisholm (1973) addressed the black genocide question as follows: "to label family planning and legal abortion programs, 'genocide' is male rhetoric for male ears. It falls flat to female listeners, and to thoughtful male ones" (Lerner, 1973, p. 604). Francis E. Ruffin (1972), in her article, "Birth Control, a Choice: Genocide or Survival?", waged a supportive pro-birth control battle. Ruffin captured the

39 Although Malcolm X viewed the planning of family among blacks as beneficial, he saw such planning as a function of specific techniques exclusively (e.g., the rhythm method or coitus interruptus) (Weisbord, 1973).

40 The Catholic Church has been seen as a major adversary to birth control measures, particularly abortion and sterilization. However, in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico where the population is predominantly Catholic, the Church has remained in the background, not campaigning in its traditional pro-life manner. This seemingly political inaction of the Church has occurred even though 35% of all women of child-bearing age (more than one out of every three) have been sterilized through governmental programs (Muhammad Speaks, December 1, 1975, p. 13).
core logic of black birth control proponents when she stated that
the general acceptance and availability of the "pill" (and other contraception techniques) has given me this right as well as the freedom of choice to engage in a sexual relationship without becoming an unwilling player in a game of roulette. . . . I have made the choice to have my children when I can emotionally and economically give them the best chance for survival in this world" (p. 71-72).

Also, Toni Cade (1970) delivered a stinging blow to "black brothers" who urged "sisters" to reject birth control. Her incisive denouncement ridiculed male-oriented strategy which recommended increased fertility among black women as a means of political resistance. Basically, she was adamantly against the enslavement of black women to a 'revolutionary mattress' because of a political ideology. Simply put, Black women had far more to contribute than their bodies in the ongoing struggle for black survival in America (Cade, 1970). Yet Cade warned that fertility control must be approached judiciously and cautiously

. . . I know it's not for nothing, certainly not for love, that birth control clinics have been mushrooming in our communities. It's very much tied up to the man's changing to that long since refuted '10 percent.' When so many census agencies agree that we more than likely comprise 30 percent of the population (1970, p. 167).

Mary Smith's (1968) article, "Birth Control and the Negro Woman," originally published in Ebony Magazine and reprinted for distribution by Planned Parenthood-World Population, underplays the significance of birth control as "a whiteman's plot" to contain the black population. Instead, she relegates such apprehensions and suspicions to predominantly black ghetto dwellers who "naively" equate birth control to black
Although birth control and black genocide do not necessarily represent antithetical notions, the historical and contemporary context which birth control has been mounted upon leaves some blacks no choice but to "cry black genocide." A striking feature of the cry of "black genocide" is that the group represents a cross-section of Black America. That is, the chorus of outcries comes from prominent black scholars, lawyers, doctors, civil rights activists, writers, self-styled revolutionaries as well as from everyday black folks. This admixture of the conservative, moderate, and liberal elements of this black community belies the contention of Mary Smith (1968) that those harboring genocidal fears are primarily at the bottom of the social ladder, the ghetto dwellers. This chorus of black voices is indeed significant in raising, though unfortunately not optimally, the "ears" of public policy makers. Charles V. Willie (1971), in a very cogent and hard-hitting position paper entitled "A Perspective from the Black Community on Population Policy and Growth," impressed upon the Commission on Population Growth and American Future that "the genocidal charge is neither 'absurd' nor 'hollow'" (p. 1).

The validity of the charge that population/birth control imbues a genocidal intent for blacks can be understood from at least three different angles. These include, a socio-historical, a legalistic, and a scholarly/empirical perspective. The former of these viewpoints will not be discussed below, since an adequate survey of the socio-historical component of the genocidal argument has been presented earlier in the text. The implicit and explicit collusion of the legal system in legitimizing harsh, unjust sterilization policies is well-documented (Chase,
Morris E. Davis (1974), a lawyer and associate editor of the *Journal of Black Health* Perspective presented a paper at the 51st annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association titled, "Involuntary Sterilization: A Legal Method of Social Control." Davis pointed out that prevention of the propagation of so-called "undesirables" through legislated activity was unsuccessfully tried as early as 1905 in Pennsylvania. However, by 1907, the country experienced the beginning of what became a cascading effect of state legislatures converting punitive sterilization bills (primarily directed towards Blacks and other poor groups) into laws. As late as 1968, 27 states with legislated and judicial support still retained sterilization laws (Paul, 1968). Julius Paul (1968) has reported that during the thirties, an estimated 25,000 operations were performed, making it the peak period for eugenic sterilization. Paul further revealed that in 1968, the "annual rate of reported state sterilization has been running close to 400 or less, with nearly half of these coming from one state, North Carolina" (p. 78).

Although such figures are admittedly petrifying, its sordid nature has been eclipsed by Federal District Judge, Gerhard Gesell's 1974 estimation of the pervasiveness of sterilization. Judge Gesell wrote that "over the last few years, an estimated 100,000 to 150,000 low income persons have been sterilized annually under federally funded programs" (Chase, 1977, p. 16). Gesell cited the obfuscated line dividing family

---

41 To put this seemingly minor statistic in perspective, punitive sterilization has been legally sanctioned in this country for 72 years.
planning and eugenics, and the absence of provisions for safeguarding civil and human rights of the poor as the culprits of this nefarious deed. Chase's (1977) analogue which compares this rate to that of Nazi Germany when two million Germans were involuntarily sterilized has a similar jolting impact. Davis (1974) and others (Chase, 1977; Morrison, 1965; Paul, 1968) have shown that blacks as early as 1912 challenged coercive sterilization laws. Almost instantaneously blacks realized the brutal disregard for black life as well as the racist intent of these laws. Davis referred to a number of cases where the appellate was black and his/her complaint stemmed from the law's oppressive tendencies.

A parallel trend directed at blacks and other poor people can be seen over the last two decades. For instance, in 1962 the Student Non-Vilent Coordinating Committee distributed a pamphlet, Genocide in Mississippi, which denounced Mississippi's state legislature's enactment of a morality law making it a felony to bear more than one child out of wedlock. Escaping a five-year prison term depended on the individual submitting to sterilization. Elsewhere, the Tennessee legislature, with constant lobbying efforts from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other civil rights organizations, narrowly defeated in 1973 an attempt to legally coerce women with "illegitimate" children into "choosing" between sterilization and the loss of all welfare benefits (Weisbord, 1975). In Louisiana, a non-profit family planning service was established in which the state welfare agency fed pertinent information regarding recipients and applications, while the Department of Welfare Services in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, mailed information about terminating unwanted pregnancies (i.e., abortion notices)
with welfare checks (Rutledge, 1973). Davis (1976) and Paul (1968) both have reported that modern day sterilization proposals are aimed primarily at mothers with illegitimate children receiving AFDC assistance (Aid to Families with Dependent Children). Paul (1968) has declared that numerous legislative attempts have included sterilization as part of welfare benefits, the imprisonment and/or fining of the mother, the loss of custody of the children, and various combinations of the above. The arguments in favor of these proposals are couched in economic terms (the rising costs of welfare services), or "moral" terms (the alarming rise in the rate of illegitimacy, especially among Negroes), and sometimes covertly or overtly on racial grounds (p. 78).

While abortion and sterilization methods of birth control have received much of the attention, the overall notion of family planning and birth control in its present form have been viewed by some local and national black leaders as repressive and genocidal. Indeed, the Conference on Human Values in Family Planning held in Cleveland, Ohio, in November, 1968, was viewed in certain quarters as the crystallization of black expression of family planning as genocidal (Austin, 1974; Darity, 1970). Advancing such views were black nationalists and other community leaders. An earlier manifestation of the genocidal viewpoint occurred in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, when a highly respected black physician of the predominantly black Homewood-Brushton area, Dr. Charles E. Greenlee, and a local black activist, William Haden, opposed in 1967 the operation of a family planning clinic in the community. Dr. Greenlee accused the clinic of "pill pushing" and warned that "our birth rate is the only thing we have. If we keep on producing, they're going to have to either kill us or grant us full citizenship" (cf. M. Smith, 1968).
At the national level, prominent Black Americans and the Nation of Islam's weekly organ, *Muhammad Speaks* (now circulated under the name *Bel-alian News*), have brought family planning and birth control programs under a stern review. Writing in the *New York Post*, Langston Hughes (1965) through folk character "Simple" remarked prophetically "that colored folks is who white folks is aiming birth control at... they would try it out on colored folks first, calling themselves being helpful to poor underprivileged Harlem, curbing the population explosion" (p. 44).

The Nation of Islam, through its nationally distributed newspaper, has campaigned incessantly against black solicitation of family planning services (14X, 1974; Kashif, 1974a, 1974b, 1974c; 9A & Williams, 1970; Smith, 1974). Lonnie Kashif (1974b), the principal spokesperson of the paper on this issue, saw the pressing urgency of government backed family planning programs as inimical to the statistically revealing fact of "a 36.8% drop in black fertility." In the final analysis, the real thrust of the so-called population planners' birth control and alleged family planning clinics has been to decimate the black population (p. 21). Likewise, Robert D. X and Phyllis Williams called population control under the guise of fertility management "one of the many faces" of a Malthusian plot and that

the practice of genocide against Blacks began with the infamous slave trade that resulted in hundreds of thousands of Blacks being torn, violently, from their native land, bred and sold like cattle upon the auction blocks of America and subjected to more than 400 years of death-dealing servitude (*Muhammad Speaks*, November 20, 1970, p. 5).
Naomi Gray provided yet another view when she stated at the hearings on Population Growth and the American Future (1971) "that many of those who are the most vocal in opting for coercion are those who would like to see black population reduced, if not eliminated." And, finally, Jessie Jackson made the unyielding association that "abortion is genocide."

In raising genocidal issues around the implementation of family planning and birth control programs, these leaders and activists perceive the services as both misguided and racially threatening. Unquestionably, a unidimensional population policy of fertility control targeted toward blacks and poor Americans is dangerously nearsighted. Seamingly, this kind of population policy which encourages the undermining of procreativity for "social convenience" is also likely to disregard or at the very least to be insensitive to the human liberties of those who bear the brunt of a selective population plan.

Tragedies of this nature have been recorded at an alarming frequency. Two extensively covered recent incidents were the Relf family ordeal and the Tuskegee Syphilis Project. The youngest two children of the Relf family were victims of involuntary sterilization. The visiting nurses assigned to the Montgomery Family Planning Clinic in Montgomery, Alabama, reportedly had not amply informed the children's parents that they were to be subjected to tubal ligation operations. News of this wretched act immediately produced a cry of genocide from the black community. Investigation of the Relf tragedy revealed that the clinic had sterilized 11 minors previously, of whom 10 were black. Also appalling was the infamous "Tuskegee experiment." Its recent disclosure revealed that 600 indigent black males who had been medically identified as hav-
ing chronic syphilitic infections were deliberately allowed to go untreated indefinitely for the "sake of science." For many of these men, the source of death was due to the lack of systematic treatment for syphilis. Unfortunately, these and other revelations of the blatant violation of people's human liberties and the withholding of necessary medical assistance have not halted such practices. Hidden behind the doors of many state hospitals, prisons and local clinics are other "Tuskegee-styled projects" subjecting Black Americans and other non-whites to an array of human experiments including sterilization, genetic screening, drug testing, and behavior control studies (Bilalian News, January 30, 1976, p. 40). These racially inspired black atrocities were not isolated, rare incidences; instead, they are part of a destructive trend whose legacy spans some 400 years. Black America's ongoing monitoring of the activities of society and its collective reaction to insensitive social policies has been and continues to be paramount in black people's struggle for survival and growth. The eminent Georgia state legislator, Julian Bond, observed that "we blacks tend to walk the thin line of paranoia" (Alexander, 1973). Therefore, it was not unusual for many Afro-Americans to assume a rather dim, disbelieving attitude when the Nixon Administration declared "war" on the country's supposedly unchecked growth rate. Moreover, the focal point of this campaign was

42During the Nixon Administration, a White House Memorandum was circulated, describing Dr. Arnold Hutschnecher's response to Milton S. Eisenhower's Commission statement on violent crime. Hutschnecher recommended a "concentration camp solution" for the prevention of crime. His plan required identifying the criminal at age six years, subjecting them to Pavlovian behavior modification methods. The fact that this "Clockwork Orange" approach had received an audience from the White House, as-
the country's indigent. An illustrative example of this strategy was Pierre S. DuPont, the chairperson of the Republican Task Force on Population Growth and Ecology, who in his address to the House of Representatives tended to assign the burden of population reduction to blacks and other non-affluent Americans. DuPont exhorted that "one of the major accomplishments of the (Nixon Administration) has been the launching of a national program to provide family planning services to more than six million medically indigent women." (October 4, 1972, p. 1).

The swift installment of birth control clinics in areas densely populated by blacks has attested to DuPont's unsavory claim (Kammeyer, Yetman, & McClendon, 1975). The subsequent black clamor over the installment of anti-fertility facilities arose because they pre-empted a critical need for comprehensive medical care in most black communities (Kammeyer et al., 1975). In retrospect, E. Franklin Frazier had advised almost five decades earlier that extensive black birth control usage was dysgenic largely because black communities lacked this very necessity—comprehensive medical attention. Without this attention, the death checks have a disproportionately higher impact on blacks. The undeniable accuracy of this statistic leads to the logical conclusion that the black population checked by its excessive death rate would, with the vigorous introduction of family planning services, begin to exhibit both a decline in its growth rate and eventually in its numerical size.

Contemporary black scholarly thought has built on the earlier ob-

sisted in concretizing their suspicion and mistrust (Afro-American, April 18, 1970; McLellan, 1970; White House Memorandum, 1969).
servations of Frazier, Garvey, and others. Charles V. Wille (1971) ex-
trolled the Commission on Population Growth to devise a national popula-
tion plan committed to black "survival with dignity and equality."
Hare (1970) and Murray (1977) also contended that replacing black ine-
equities with social and economic parity with whites was an essential first step of a just population plan. The liberal white psychologist, Robert Buckhout (1972) offered the following insightful analysis:

to launch a 'war on people' which will, de facto, fall first on minority people, sets the stage for a deepening of the level of distrust between the races which is already tearing this country apart. Extensive population control programs aimed at minority people will be called, with considerable justification, distracting, racist, and genocidal. In advance of a 'war,' when experts are discussing the choice of weapons and ignoring the voices from the target populations, we call it irresponsible (p. 24).43

Without question America's distortion of black lifeways has pre-
vented the creation of enlightened public policy with regard to fertil-
ity control (Staples, 1972). A case in point has been the polemical
Moynihan Report. The Report (1965) diagnosed the black family as disor-
ganized, deteriorating, and fragile, and that its so-called pathogno-
monic natures were caused by "the extraordinary rise in Negro popula-
lation." Willie (1971) urged the Commission on Population Growth not to become "merely an extension and refinement of the Moynihan call for a national program to stabilize the black family" (p. 4). Essentially, Willie attempted to warn the Commission against the intrusive pitfalls

43"War on People", a euphemism of many blacks, particularly, the young, for population control policies (Buckhout, 1972).
of the Moynihan Report and a population plan that is negative and unconcerned with black health and survival.

A population plan imbued with these sordid attributes, he surmised, would surely not "serve the self-interest of blacks" and therefore black cooperation would not develop. William Darity in a brief paper "Is ZPG Black Genocide--Yes!" supported Willie's (1971) contention that a negative population plan would have a genocidal outcome. In a number of studies assessing the attitude of Black Americans to family planning and birth control, Darity, in collaboration with Castellano B. Turner, showed that many blacks held genocidal misgivings (Darity, 1971; Darity & Turner, 1972, 1974; Turner & Darity, 1971, 1973). Darity, Turner, and Thiebaux (1971) investigated "barriers to family planning," and found that 68% of a Hartford, Connecticut, sample of Black Americans viewed birth control clinics "as aimed at the lower income groups." They rated sterilization and abortion highly unacceptable. Fifty percent of the respondents agreed that "Blacks should not limit their family size." In an expanded version of their earlier study, Darity and Turner (1972, 1973) examined representative samples from two large urban areas, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Charlotte, North Carolina. They concluded that the fear of genocide remains for many a serious concern and that family planning services were desired but only if operated by Blacks.

Heightened resistance and suspicions of the aim of family planning and birth control programs have not halted the fertility control movement from making significant inroads into the black community. Moreover, these advances have been achieved without responding to the demands and needs of the black community, that is, with comprehensive
medical services. Afro-Americans' ever-increasing usage of family planning and birth control methods, statistical evidences showing sterilization and abortion as rivaling "the pill" as the premier prophylactic, and the declining black birth rate have all suggested in recent years that strength of Black resistance has waned (Chase, 1977). Faced with a worsening economic crisis, blacks have been compelled to weigh the immediate future against the distant future and understandably have displayed an increasing proclivity to pot for the short-term approach. For many blacks, the short-term solution has often entailed abortion or sterilization.

Yet sampling the arguments on both sides of the birth control issue underscores the frustration and uncertainty intrinsically woven into the neverending struggle of Black America for survival and social-economic advancement. Studies by Darity et al. (1971) and Darity and Turner (1972, 1973) have shown that the black community has not returned a singular verdict on birth control and related anti-fertility programs; instead, it appears ensnared in a quagmire of indecisiveness. In other words, these studies have tapped the ambivalence of the black community concerning whether to align itself with those insisting that a sinister motive lies behind efforts to push "en masse" birth control clinics into black neighborhoods or to join supporters of the birth control movement in a personal drive for greater economic affluence.

Recently, the posture of the black leadership on the issue of birth control and genocide was empirically considered. Turner and Darity (1976) explored the attitudes and beliefs of black leaders toward family planning programs, birth control, and population policies. Their find-
ings suggested that leaders often grappled with their suspicions of genocide and the need for total voluntary publicly financed birth control facilities.

Exactly where the general black population and black leaders stand relative to each other on the question of birth control and related issues has not been adequately assessed, although the idea of studying the relationship among black leadership, its rank-and-file, and non-members has been proposed (Turner & Darity, 1976). However, findings have suggested that their stance on this matter may change over time. A case in point was the Brink and Harris studies (1966, 1963) which showed an attitudinal shift between leaders and a general sample of Black Americans occurred on the dimension of "militancy." This notion of militancy has significance for the present investigation, because the degree of militancy has been viewed as a correlate of one's attitude and belief toward family planning and birth control. Generally speaking, militant blacks have been inclined to reject anti-fertility services while less militant blacks have endorsed, with greater frequency, fertility control.

Brink and Harris' (1963) initial study revealed that black leaders were less militant than the general black sample, but by the 1966 survey leaders had become more militant than their "constituents." Brink and Harris (1963, 1966) and others (Marx, 1970) have restricted militancy to an "activist attitude of achieving civil rights." Perhaps a more precise view has been offered by Darity et al. (1970) who pinpointed "the two most common indications of Black militance":

1. support of programs that recommend the use of pressure tactics to promote the interest of Black people; and
2. promotion of structural pluralism, i.e., structurally separate Black institutions (p. 19).

Nevertheless, the generic quality of the term "black militancy" has subjected it to a number of interpretations depending on one's political persuasion. Without question, militancy or the lack of militant behavior among blacks has played an integral role in the formulation of models to explain attitudes and behaviors of Afro-Americans (Jackson, 1962; Lenski, 1954; Marx, 1970; Pettigrew, 1964, 1971; Turner & Wilson, 1976; Wilhelm, 1970; Works, 1961).

Many of the models appear quite similar in their formulation of black attitudes and beliefs (Jackson, 1962; Lenski, 1954; Pettigrew, 1964, 1970) whereas others stand in opposition to one another (Marx, 1970; Turner & Wilson, 1976; Wilhelm, 1970). Two conflicting frameworks, the rising expectation (Marx, 1970) and the direct linear models (Turner & Wilson, 1976; Wilhelm, 1970), present a salient issue which this study will investigate. The rising expectation model suggests that high socio-economic Afro-Americans constitute the least conservative force while low status blacks are the most conservative element. In conceptualizing the "most privileged" and the least socially isolated as more militant, Gary Marx explains that they have the "necessary psychological outlook to support and encourage militancy, morale, sophistication and pride in self" (1970, p. 93). On the other hand, proponents of the direct linear model postulate that the less privileged blacks would be more likely to hold negative opinions of whites and to support a militant ideology. The rising expectation model assumes a paralleling effect between social class and militancy, whereas the direct linear model
considers militancy a direct function of low social status. One difficulty in testing these models against each other is that black militancy is judged differently. Rising expectation model adheres to the use of militant, aggressive behavior to achieve integration. The direct linear model considers separatism an important issue for today's black militant.

Without question the issue of black militancy is salient to the study of Black America's approval of family planning services, birth control techniques, and its fears of race genocide. Turner and Darity (1972, 1973) demonstrate that one's attitude toward family planning, birth control, and race genocide is tied to such ideology dimensions as alienation, separatism and race consciousness. These dimensions which are ingrained in the notion of "black militancy" become critical factors in an investigation of the relation between a black leadership sample and a general black sample. This is particularly true of the separatism and alienation dimensions which are related intrinsically to the fear of genocide (Turner & Wilson, 1976) and support for family planning programs.

Yet one point appears certain--the leadership of "activist" organizations has assumed a sentry role for Black America; lobbying for black concerns in the various social, political and economic arenas. It is presumed generally by White America that black leaders are the voice of the community on such topics as housing, employment, and education; and indeed, leaders seem quite harmonious in their demands and needs. This rather consensual response gives way to mixed feelings of skepticism and support when discussing the utility and purpose of birth control pro-
gramming in the black community. Delineating lines of support for the various positions surrounding the birth control question depends to a great extent on a host of demographic factors (Turner & Darity, 1973).

Statement of Problem and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to compare samples of the black leaders and the general black population attitudes towards birth control programming and other related beliefs. Respondents were compared on the following scaled dimensions: acceptance of birth control, fear of genocide, black alienation and separatism, and inter-racial optimism.

1. **Acceptance of birth control** means approval of the usage of methods to prevent conception including sterilization and abortion. A birth control advocate is also more inclined to favor the dissemination of information to adolescents and to endorse publicly financed family planning and birth control services.

2. **Fear of genocide** (black genocide) refers to the fear that a general plan or conspiracy exists to eliminate systematically the black race (Turner & Darity, 1973).

3. **Black alienation** speaks to the psychological disengagement and estrangement of blacks with regard to the dominant society. Feelings of hopelessness and despair are the principal views of alienation (Turner & Wilson, 1976).

4. **Black separatism** is a heightened sense of racial solidarity prompted in part by broader society's abandonment of blacks (Wilson, Turner, & Darity, 1973). This increased sense of solidarity seeks control of institutions serving the black population and to isolate "black social, economic, and political relations from white society" (Turner & Wilson, 1976).

5. **Inter-racial optimism** refers to a futuristic, hopeful view that the relationship between the races will be one of cooperation and of racial parity.

The aggregate scores for these dimensions, based on the specific inter-
view items, formed the respondents' dependent measures (consult Chapter III for scale items). In examining the differences between the leadership and the general black sample, the control variables were region, sex, age, and education.

A number of studies have highlighted the importance of these demographic and general characteristic factors in assessing and distinguishing group opinion. For instance, Wilson, Turner, and Darity (1973) concluded that separatist attitudes toward the education of blacks was far more likely to be characteristic of black males, under age 30, who lived in a northern urban community. Wilson et al. found this group to be race conscious, alienated, and of low educational status. In a study of urban black attitudes and ideology, Turner and Wilson (1976) noticed that activist attitudes were found more often among females living in the South and older than thirty.44 Other investigations (Bogue, 1969; Kammeyer et al., 1974; Zelnik & Kantner, 1970) have focused on sex, age, region and education in their analyses of black attitudes about fertility.

In addition to demographic factors affecting black attitudes toward family planning and birth control services, Darity, Turner and Thubaux (1971); Turner and Darity (1972, 1973); and Turner and Wilson (1976) have established that a person's feeling of alienation, race consciousness, support for separatism, and for inter-racial cooperation influence
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44 Family size information was not available for both sample groups. Information such as the number of children would have been a valuable index for examining respondents' attitude toward birth control usage and fears of genocide.
the view of these issues. Of these constructs, black alienation and support for separatism have been related to a more pessimistic appraisal of family planning programs and the possibility of a plot to reduce the size of the black population. The specific aim of this study was to compare the two groups on the five dependent measures and to utilize the control variables in interpreting these relationships.

It was expected that group differences would emerge on the five constructs--birth control acceptance and usage, fear of genocide, black alienation, separatism, and optimism. With regard to all items the leaders and the general sample group respondents were requested to respond to each item according to their personal beliefs and attitudes. As mentioned, Brink and Harris (1963, 1966) on both occasions have detected group differences between black leaders and the general black population. Likewise, Marx's (1967) rising expectation model and Turner and Wilson's (1976) direct linear formulation, though emphasizing differences in the attitudinal direction, nevertheless have the two groups differing. This was the study's basic assumption. The specific hypotheses and their directions as suggested by the direct linear paradigm have been enumerated below:

I-A. It was predicted that the acceptance of family planning services in the black community and the usage of birth control would be greater among the general sample of blacks than among the Black leadership. The rationale was that the black populace was presumably a more needy group than the leadership and would therefore view anti-fertility projects as helpful. This prediction, in fact, would not be inimical to Brink and Harris' (1963, 1966) or Marx's (1967) perspectives. Both positions would have postulated greater acceptance among the general sample of respondents; however, the reason would be because the general sample group is the more conserva-
tive, and thus more inclined to utilize such facilities and programs.

B. Fear of genocide was postulated as greater among the leadership sample. Suggesting a heightened apprehension of race genocide among leaders was derived partly from the assumption that their wider accessibility to information and their keener sense of the political ramification of depopulation would evoke a stronger fear of genocide. Moreover, throughout history, black leaders have been the sentry for the black race and consequently, have had the arduous task of alerting blacks to potential genocidal threats.

C. It was expected that support for separatism would be greater among the general black sample than among the leaders. The less privileged were assumed, as suggested by Turner and Wilson (1976), and Wilhelm (1971), to be more supportive of separatist philosophy.

D. It was hypothesized that feelings of alienation would be greater among the general black sample than among black leaders. Wilson et al. (1973), Turner and Darity (1973) and Turner and Wilson (1976) suggested that feeling alienated is a direct function of one's social-economic status. Wilhelm (1970) also contended that negativism, despair, and hopelessness is more likely to be apparent in those caught in society's lower rungs. Therefore, the general black sample, presumably a less affluent group than the black leadership sample, was expected to have a higher alienation score. Both the separatism and the black alienation hypotheses disputed Marx's rising expectation argument that the more privileged Afro-Americans are more likely to register feelings of frustration and disillusionment.

E. It was predicted that black leaders (assumed to be less alienated and less inclined to embrace separatism) would show greater optimism concerning inter-racial cooperation. As evidence, the logic of this hypothesis was anchored in the direct linear conceptual framework.

Other main effects besides group differences were hypothesized.

II. Region was expected to produce a main effect. In particular, northern respondents were considered more fearful of race genocide and therefore less likely to accept birth control usage. The northern sample was viewed also as more likely to favor separatism and to feel
alienated than its southern counterpart. Recognizing recent reported advances in race relations in the South, it was theorized that inter-racial optimism would have greater support among southern respondents.

III. It was assumed that the respondent's sex influenced his/her attitude on the five scale constructs. Black males rather than females were expected to be more fearful of race genocide, more alienated and more inclined to embrace separatism. Black females were viewed as more likely to accept the practice of birth control and to be more optimistic of future inter-racial cooperation.

IV. It was hypothesized that respondents 30 years and older would show greater approval for birth control usage and display a greater sense of inter-racial optimism. Those under 30 years were seen as inclined more to express genocidal fears, to support separatism and to feel alienated.45

V. Respondents of low educational attainment (under 12 years) were viewed as likely to favor birth control usage and were considered less optimistic of inter-racial cooperation than those of high educational attainment (12 years or more). Individuals of high educational attainment were assumed less fearful of race genocide, less alienated, and less supportive of separatism. Furthermore, for the purpose of this study, education level was the best index of social class status and upward mobility.

A number of significant first-order interactions between the independent variables were expected on the five dimensions of the study. Turner and Wilson (1976), for instance, found that the combined variables region, age and education were directly related to one's willingness to support a separatist philosophy, to express feelings of alienation and to exhibit fear of genocide. Consequently, statistically sig-

45 Splitting the group at a slightly higher age than its median split of 28 years is necessary because the leadership group is skewed in the higher age direction. Dichotomizing at 30 years provides a better balance between the two age groupings.
nificant interaction effects between region and age, between region and education, and between age and education were expected.

Indeed, it was expected that comparing attitudes of the leadership and the general population toward birth control usage and other pertinent issues would delineate further the profiles of their relationship. In other words, such a comparison presumably would demonstrate more precisely whether the Black leadership speaks for the majority of the Black community's constituency on critical issues of birth control usage and race genocide. If the Black leadership was the predominant voice of the community, then their role in the designing and developing of public policy and programs relevant to the Black community must expand greatly. Although Black involvement at all levels of program design and development is deemed critical, the establishment of such services would depend wholly on the community's priorities and needs.

Moreover, the study considered Brink and Harris' contention that militancy was endemic in the leadership rather than the general population. A close examination of the groups on the five constructs facilitated this specific inspection.

Also, the influence of background and demographic factors on the attitudes and beliefs of Black leaders and the general Black sample and the possible implications of such effects were considered.

Birth control and family planning in the black community has been bitterly contested and defended. Its black proponents have argued that it leads to improved social conditions and gives blacks a greater sense of control of their destiny. This rather patent claim, espoused by Schuyler (1932), Congresswoman Chisholm (1973) and a host of black sup-
porters, has remained a principal fixture in Black America's pro-birth control argument. Antagonists of black birth control have cried, at time vociferously, that its presence in the black community is genocidal. The root of their suspicion and concern has been stimulated by the nightmarish caveat of Garvey (1934) that birth control would make blacks the twentieth-century Indian and by Frazier's (1933) scholarly analysis showing black birth control as dysgenetic. Atrocities against Blacks spanning 400 years have been a chilling reminder of America's ongoing, systematic oppression and exploitation of the black race. This has not only kept the incendiary debate over birth control ablaze, but has created a dilemma which stretches from the pinnacles of black leadership to the grassroots of Black America. For black leaders, the dilemma has been whether to discourage or encourage birth control usage among the black populace. This conflict has raised the question and thus prompted the present investigation into the relationship between black leaders and the general black population on the issue of birth control and genocidal fear. Methods used in studying these issues are described in the next section.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

General Sample Characteristics

The overall sample consisted of 1961 respondents. Females totaled 1036 (53%) while males were 924 (47%). The median age of the sample was 28 years, with an age range from 12 to 77 years.\(^{46}\) The education of respondents showed that 57% of the sample population was at least a high school graduate. Marital status data revealed 49% of respondents single and 51% of them were categorized as married. Marked differences arose when respondents were asked "the region where they were raised." A substantial 87% indicated that they were raised in the South, only 12% reported being reared in the North.

The sample population was made up of two distinct groups, a leadership and a general black population group. The general black population group of 1886 respondents showed little variance from the overall sample's characteristics. One thousand and six females (53%) and 879 males (47%) constituted the group whose median age was 28 years. These respondents were originally from the study, "Alienation, Black Militancy, Race Consciousness: Barriers to Birth Control" (Darity, Turner, Wilson, & Thiebaux, 1972).

The other 75 respondents formed the leadership sample. The sex

\(^{46}\) Two percent of the total sample (n = 40) did not divulge their age.
breakdown of the group was 31 (41%) female and 44 (59%) male. The median age of 41 years differed from the general black population sample. Organization heads and leaders were in general older. This feature adhered to the general ethos found in most societies that correlates wisdom, prudence, and mental maturity with age advancement. This pool of respondents was drawn from the project, "Population Policy and the Response of Black America" (Turner & Darity, 1976).

Clearly, the present study's sample population was acquired from two different investigations of Black America's attitude and beliefs about birth control and population policies. These studies employed different sampling techniques and criteria and investigated different concerns of the same general issue. For example, the general population group respondent lived either in the northern metropolis of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or the southern city of Charlotte, North Carolina. The selection of respondents from these two regionally different cities was dependent on several specific factors

a. their different geographical location;
b. their large and socio-economically diverse black population;  
c. their general tendency to represent the problems and characteristics of urban American life; and
d. permanently based birth control services available within both cities (Darity & Turner, 1972; Darity, Turner, Wilson, & Thiebaux, 1972).

Inclusion in the leadership sample depended on the respondent's affilia-

47 While the total population of Charlotte, North Carolina, is considerably smaller than that of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, both areas were at least 30% black (Darity & Turner, 1972).
tion with a national black organization. At the outset of their leadership study, Turner and Darity (1976) target population included "the national leadership of the ten most 'visible' black organizations in the country" (p. 6). Based on the judgment of the investigators' "visibility" was the extent of national news media coverage these organizations had received. The ten original organizations included: Opportunities Industrialization Center, Black Muslims, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Operation Bread Basket, National Urban League, Congress on Racial Equality, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Black Panther Party, and People United to Save Humanity.

Several problems arose during the data collection, prompting the investigators to expand their sample of black national organizations to 20 (consult Table 2 for full listing of the names of organizations and numbers of interviews obtained). The investigators first discovered that the organization, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), was no longer functional and that neither individual leaders nor headquarters could be located. "Even those individuals who had worked with SNCC were now clearly involved with other organizations and could not correctly be considered representatives of SNCC" (Turner & Darity, 1976, p. 7).

Lack of cooperation from some organizations posed for the researchers a second type of problem. A common factor in such instances was the inaccessibility of top leadership. The rationale for their covert or overt refusal to accept the formal invitation to participate was never clearly discerned. Turner and Darity however surmised, even though
# Table 2

Organizations for which Usable Interviews Were Obtained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>National and Regional Offices</th>
<th>Local Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban League</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Cities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Panther Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress on Racial Equality (CORE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation of Islam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Negro Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Business Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Medical Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Welfare Rights Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Black Psychologists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Leadership Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women Organized for Action</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro Business and Professional Women's Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Liberation Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro-American Historical and Cultural Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and Jill Parent-Child Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all interviewers were black, "that some of the organizations considered the project to be too closely tied to the 'White Establishment.' Whether there was suspicion that their responses would be misused or whether this unwillingness to cooperate was a general stance toward such research is unclear" (Turner & Darity, 1976, p. 8).

A concern of some participants, and perhaps of some who did not participate, was the method for dispensing honoraria. The method adopted required the interviewer to obtain the respondent's social security number. The uneasiness and hesitancy about divulging social security numbers was partly due the news media revelations of federal agencies' surveillance of American citizens, especially the compilation of data banks with the assistance of social security numbers. While only a few respondents displayed over apprehension over disclosing their numbers, the issue further amplified the complexity of leadership and organizational data collection.

The difficulty in acquiring an adequate sample from the original ten target groups compelled Turner and Darity to extend the organizations studied to twenty. A complementary reason for expanding the size of the target population was that the investigators had become aware of other black organizations having "some interest in the issue of population policy" (p. 9). In deciding to increase the number of organizations sampled, Turner and Darity wrote "there seems to be no basis for believing that the leaders of these additional organizations are any less representative of their black constituents than those in the original list" (p. 9). In the actual listing of organizations in Table 2, a distinction was made between interviews obtained at the national re-
regional level and those at the local level. No differentiating between regional and national offices was made because of the overwhelming tendency for regional offices to serve merely as extensions of the national office. Local offices, on the other hand, displayed more autonomy and were far more inclined to establish priorities and practices consistent with the needs of its local constituency. The national and regional offices' symbiotic relationship disallowed the cultivation of regional autonomy.

Also, the investigators noted other idiosyncracies of the leadership sample. Among organizations added to the original ten, the largest category included those typically classified as professional organizations. Comprising this grouping were the following: National Business Association, National Medical Association, National Association of Black Psychologists, and the Negro Business and Professional Women's Club. The element added with their inclusion was their "specific concerns for the professional role in addressing the needs of the black community" (Turner & Darity, 1976, p. 9).

The next new category of organizations exhibited many of the features found among the original ten organizations. Though smaller and with a more specific membership, these organizations were involved in activities "aimed at social change or service to black communities." This category included National Association of Negro Women, National Youth Organization, Black Leadership Forum, and Black Women Organized for Action.

The final organizational grouping was characterized by its collective focus on rather specific areas of concern. Included among these
organizations were the National Welfare Rights Organization, African Liberation Committee, Afro-American Historical and Cultural Society, and Jack and Jill Parent Child Association.

Scale Items

The scale items (consult Chapter IV for item list) were a series of agree-disagree statements tapping the respondent's personal belief and feelings about family planning and birth control, genocide fears, separatism, black alienation, and inter-racial optimism. The instructions (Turner & Darity, 1976) for responding to these items were as follows:

Now I would like to ask some more general questions concerning your feelings about family planning and the situation of Black Americans. After I have read each statement, please indicate whether you AGREE or DISAGREE with the statement. Your response should reflect your own opinions!

Experimental Design

To test the study's specific hypotheses, a randomized multifactor 2 (group) x 2 (region) x 2 (sex) x 2 (age) x 2 (education) design with alpha level of .05 was chosen.

In comparing the leadership sample with the general population sample, the appreciable difference in their size posed a potential methodological problem. An alternative approach called for an inter-sampling of the general population group instead of using the entire sample in all analysis. However, this methodological concern was overcome by using factor scores in the analysis.

The major analyses were factor analysis analysis of variance (ANOVA), t-tests, and correlational tests. Analysis of variance was
selected because it enabled the simultaneous control and manipulation of two or more variables, providing more precision than less sophisticated designs. Furthermore, ANOVA afforded the opportunity to investigate the interaction of independent variables on the dependent measures. T-tests were helpful in examining relationships between the various levels of the factors and in determining the thrust of the effect. Correlational analyses were used to test the five scales' integrity and their relationship with each other.

**Sampling Procedures**

A thousand households were surveyed in the general population study. To achieve this objective, it was necessary for Darity *et al.* (1972) to identify within the cities of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Charlotte, North Carolina, communities that were at least fifty percent black. After consulting the United States Census Report, they selected predominantly black communities whose residents' average income was categorized either as low or in the middle to high area. Two lower class and two middle-upper class communities were selected randomly, since SES stratified samples of black residents in each city were most desired (Darity & Turner, 1972). In stratifying the sample, the desired ratio between low SES and middle-high SES respondents of 60-40, respectively, was procured. After identifying the target communities, households were chosen from the street list by means of computerized random sampling procedures. In each household a female 15-44 years of age was contacted. Because marital status was considered irrelevant, all of the following possibilities were included:
1. Married women with husbands present;  
2. Married women with husbands absent, for whatever reason or duration; and  

In addition to obtaining for each household an interview with an age eligible female, a second interview with her significant male partner "was often conducted simultaneously in another room or area of the house." Given that he resided in the same city, when the male counterpart interview was not held conjointly, a "reasonable" attempt to secure his interview was made. Households yielding two interviews were labeled "complete," those with only one interview were considered "incomplete."

With the leadership group the method of choosing respondents followed the purposive sampling procedure. The adoption of the purposive sampling procedure, a non-probability technique, was based on the assumption that "with good judgment and an appropriate strategy, one can handpick the cases to be included in the sample and thus develop samples that are satisfactory in relation to one's needs" (I. Chein in Selltiz, Johoda, Deutsch, & Cook, 1959, p. 520). With regards to this line of thought, the leadership sample was obtained by selecting cases judged as representative of that sector of the black population under investigation. It was further assumed that errors of judgment in the selection would counterbalance each other (Chein, 1959). The objective basis for
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49 Interviewing a female and her significant male partner was handled with the employment of sex matched interviewers to safeguard the integrity of the data.
making the judgments strengthened considerably this assumption. For instance, leaders were identified vis a vis a national organization. Most leaders held significant decision-making influence within their respective national or affiliate organization. All organizations were categorized as either a social change or service delivery agency. Consequently, the leaders who were picked and agreed to participate were involved in concerted, organized activities for the amelioration of the black populace's social conditions. Other considerations leading to the adoption of the purposive sampling procedure were efficacy, financial feasibility, and the aim of the investigators. Survey analysts (Chein, 1959; Warwick & Lininger, 1975), though conceding the superiority in principle of probability sampling, have acknowledged the merits of non-probability sampling such as a purposive sampling, when correctly applied, and accompanied with a rather thorough and rigorous method of data collection.

On the other hand, the general population group, the bulk of the study's respondents, was a probability sample. The investigators applied a stratified random sampling procedure to control the representativeness of the sample. Random sampling within the two strata, a low and middle-high income level, yielded a sample population with the desired 60-40 SES level profile.

While the leadership and general population groups were obtained via different sampling procedures because of their special features, no serious methodological difficulty arose to question the statistical analysis conducted on these two population samples. In fact, the generalizability of the study's findings have been increased seemingly with
the inclusion of this sampling approach of black leaders. For one, leaders from the more visible national black organizations have been amply represented. Indeed, the non-inclusion of many of these highly visible black organizations and their leaders because of a random chance factor would have compromised severely any generalization derived from the leader-general population analyses.

**Interview Schedules**

The interview schedules for the general and leadership samples, though similar in many facets, differed with regards to issues addressed. The Philadelphia and Charlotte interview schedules contained 121 items (see Appendix A). These items covered pertinent demographic information, attitude, knowledge, and usage of birth control methods and family planning practices. In addition, certain items tapped dimensions of racial ideology, including separatism, black alienation, genocide fears, pro-birth control, and racial optimism (Turner & Wilson, 1976). The leadership interview schedule included 90 items which explored the organization's programmatic characteristics, its view and stance regarding population policies. Some of the items surveyed leader's attitude toward birth control, family planning, separatism, black alienation, genocide fears, and inter-racial cooperation.

The overlap in these two interview schedules lay largely with items assessing the racial ideology dimensions of the study. In the present study, items used were identically worded on both interview schedules. Darity, Turner, and Thiebaux (1971); Darity and Turner (1972); Turner and Darity (1973); and Turner and Wilson (1976) have demonstrated that
respondents' attitude as reflected on these dimensions of racial ideology influences their outlook on birth control and family planning.

**Procedures**

The interviewing procedures for these two sample groups were similar. All interviewers were trained in a standard fashion. This was accomplished by developing an interview manual and group training sessions which focused on the mechanisms of an interview. Interviewers were taught how to approach the interview and how to handle questions arising during the interview. Interviewers were urged to approach the interview as a participant-observer and to avoid influencing or biasing the respondents' answers. Similarly, criteria for accepting or probing a response were included in the training.

The contact procedures for the two sample groups were slightly different. With the general population group, a male-female interviewing team was responsible for contacting via telephone (whenever possible) computer-selected households and arranging two sex-matched interviews. Generally speaking, matched male-female interviews were conducted simultaneously in different parts of the residence of the respondents. Matching interviewer and interviewee on sex was designed to allay interviewee's anxiety and apprehension especially when items touched on issues perceived as sensitive (Darity & Turner, 1972; Darity et al., 1971; Turner & Darity, 1973). All interviewers were recruited from the neighborhood where interviews were taken. Leaders of organizations identified for inclusion were contacted by letter soliciting their participation. A proposal summary was also enclosed to provide potential parti-
cipients with a synopsis of the study (see Appendix B). This written solicitation preceded a telephone contact by one of the project's interviewers to arrange a personal interview to discuss the organization's stance on certain population policies. While the original intention was to interview the organization's principal leader, there were occasions when other prominent, and influential agency personnel were interviewed.

Several differences are evident in the interviewing and sampling procedures of these two samples. In both instances, sampling was dictated by the target population. A random stratified sampling method was used with the general black population, while sampling of leaders was based on organization affiliation and organizational role. Likewise, interview schedules were designed to meet overall objectives of the two studies, and thus the schedules differ in some important aspects. Information concerning knowledge and use of contraceptive techniques was an exclusive characteristic of the general black sampling schedule. However, the leadership interview schedule contained questions about the type of organizations (e.g., direct services or social change agent) and its stance on a variety of population policies. The general population sample interviews were sex matched. Such was not the case for the leadership group. All members of the leadership sample were interviewed by male interviewers. The sex-matched procedure was absent with the leaders because many of the sensitive issues regarding birth control practice and usage were excluded from the leadership interview schedule.

Still there existed considerable overlap between the two interview schedules. First, the interviewing format in both cases was one-to-one (i.e., interviewer-interviewee). Second, both interview schedules were
pre-coded and all interviewers were put through a standardized training program as a means of maximizing the usable content of responses. Third, a number of attitudinal items were common to both interview schedules. This overlap in the interview construction, the sampling procedure, and the manner used to collect data created the opportunity to comparatively study the relationship between the black leadership and the general black population.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In presenting the results the chapter begins with an inspection of the factor analysis and the correlational coefficients generated from the five factor scores. These results show the item-factor and inter-factor relationships. Second, the analysis of variance findings and their directions for the major hypotheses of the study are reported. And third, the t-tests results and directions for first and second order interactions are outlined. This breakdown of significant results furnishes the structure for discussing the findings and their socio-cultural implications.

Factor Structure

A 32-item attitude pool common to both interview schedules was submitted to a factor analysis with a Kaiser Varimax rotation and examined for content. The factor analysis allowed the empirical examination of the item aggregates and loading characteristics. Items with loadings on a single factor of at least .30 and the highest loading compared to the other factors were selected to create the five empirical scales. The five factors, their percent of variance and item composition have been included in the following section (see Table 3 for a presentation of the factor matrix).

Factor 1: Separatism. In the analysis, this factor accounts for 55% of the variance and "seems to reflect primarily sentiments of sep-
Table 3

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>-.04101</td>
<td>.01775</td>
<td>-.07926</td>
<td>.45254</td>
<td>-.12886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>.02652</td>
<td>.01252</td>
<td>.03942</td>
<td>.35326</td>
<td>.07084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>.02428</td>
<td>-.00831</td>
<td>-.02129</td>
<td>.30189</td>
<td>.12368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>.05105</td>
<td>.01259</td>
<td>-.00607</td>
<td>.30250</td>
<td>.01334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>.37613</td>
<td>.18920</td>
<td>.18345</td>
<td>.08362</td>
<td>-.00991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>-.12194</td>
<td>-.08848</td>
<td>.00568</td>
<td>.05349</td>
<td>.49100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>-.20073</td>
<td>.01131</td>
<td>-.05924</td>
<td>.24119</td>
<td>.31878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>-.03161</td>
<td>-.06310</td>
<td>-.05840</td>
<td>.03833</td>
<td>.54789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>.48117</td>
<td>.08357</td>
<td>.06969</td>
<td>.05760</td>
<td>-.14405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>.57329</td>
<td>.04738</td>
<td>.19642</td>
<td>-.13114</td>
<td>-.00183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>.21778</td>
<td>.06260</td>
<td>.22041</td>
<td>-.03961</td>
<td>.04256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>.39888</td>
<td>.27524</td>
<td>.05770</td>
<td>.08542</td>
<td>-.08384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>.06922</td>
<td>.56939</td>
<td>.13397</td>
<td>.06588</td>
<td>-.07182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>.08200</td>
<td>.54756</td>
<td>.10943</td>
<td>.04342</td>
<td>-.06130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>.25292</td>
<td>.41372</td>
<td>.08214</td>
<td>-.09757</td>
<td>.14622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>.26660</td>
<td>.50738</td>
<td>.14160</td>
<td>-.17484</td>
<td>-.08486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>.01103</td>
<td>.11571</td>
<td>.15844</td>
<td>-.03264</td>
<td>-.02368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>.17598</td>
<td>.08170</td>
<td>.62351</td>
<td>-.06058</td>
<td>-.10970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>.20519</td>
<td>.01201</td>
<td>.70003</td>
<td>.00155</td>
<td>.07429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>.27011</td>
<td>.00406</td>
<td>.59413</td>
<td>-.02035</td>
<td>.13818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>.21380</td>
<td>.20796</td>
<td>.49067</td>
<td>-.06560</td>
<td>.00222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>.11299</td>
<td>.15806</td>
<td>.34816</td>
<td>.06118</td>
<td>-.02334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>.42067</td>
<td>.08152</td>
<td>.10017</td>
<td>.06721</td>
<td>-.07854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>.64797</td>
<td>.09873</td>
<td>.21131</td>
<td>-.03017</td>
<td>-.01584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>.51850</td>
<td>-.00447</td>
<td>.26781</td>
<td>-.18288</td>
<td>.09789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>.68324</td>
<td>.03616</td>
<td>.18281</td>
<td>-.09422</td>
<td>.02274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>.12475</td>
<td>.03516</td>
<td>.14177</td>
<td>.05748</td>
<td>.39433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>.64313</td>
<td>.16427</td>
<td>.05234</td>
<td>.10611</td>
<td>-.04150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>.41441</td>
<td>.11111</td>
<td>.31358</td>
<td>.02391</td>
<td>.13175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>-.08291</td>
<td>-.08503</td>
<td>-.01843</td>
<td>.51408</td>
<td>.07144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
aratism and of community control" (Turner & Wilson, 1976). Items comprising the separatism scale and their factor loadings are as follows:

1. Black people must form totally black institutions, credit unions, co-ops, and political parties. (.48)
2. Only black teachers should teach black students. (.57)
3. Black people should gain full control over their communities. (.42)
4. Public schools in the black community should be run solely by black educators and black committee members. (.65)
5. The answer to the racial problem is the total separation of blacks and whites. (.52)
6. Blacks should support only black political leaders. (.68)
7. All businesses in the black communities should be owned by blacks. (.64)

Factor II: Black alienation. This scale which accounts for 12% of the variance contains items based on the Srole Anomie Scale (1956). The five scale items, though modified slightly so as to refer to blacks, measure a person's "feelings of powerlessness, hopelessness, normlessness, and distrust." Essentially, the construct taps the psychological dimension underlying disengagement and estrangement from larger society (Turner & Wilson, 1976). The five scale items are as follows:

1. In spite of what some people say, things are getting worse for black people. (.62)
2. It is hardly fair to bring black children into the world the way things look for black people. (.70)
3. Nowadays, black people have to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. (.59)
4. There is little use in black people writing to public officials because often the officials are not really inter-
ested in the problems of black people. (.49)

5. These days, black people do not really know whom they can count on. (.35)

Factor III: Fears of genocide. This factor accounts for 14% of the variance. Wilhelm (1971) and Willie (1971) specify that genocidal fears among blacks incorporate the historical and contemporary adversities which impinge upon Black America. The systemic nature of black oppression and exploitation fuels the Afro-American's apprehension and suspicion towards White America (Turner & Wilson, 1976).

1. As the need for cheap labor goes down, there will be an effort to reduce the number of blacks. (.57)

2. As blacks become more militant, there will be an effort to decrease the black population. (.55)

3. The survival of black people depends on increasing the number of black births. (.44)

4. Birth control programs are a plot to eliminate blacks. (.51)

Factor IV: Pro-birth control. The pro-birth control factor accounts for 11% of the variance. The scale items assess attitude toward fertility control and preventive fertility education.

1. If a woman is pregnant and does want a baby, an abortion is acceptable. (.45)

2. Sterilization is an acceptable method of birth control. (.35)

3. Pregnancy and birth control should be taught in a course on preparation for marriage in the junior and senior high schools. (.30)

4. Elementary and secondary schools should give sex education as part of their programs. (.30)
5. Are you in favor of free publicly financed birth control assistance? (.51)

Factor V: Optimism. This factor, which accounts for eight percent of the variance, is orthogonal to the separatism factor. Thematically, the scale items emphasize integrationism and inter-racial cooperation. The fundamental construct of this factor, racial equality, characterizes the attitude of many blacks following the Civil War and still typifies the hopes and expectations of some contemporary blacks. A case in point, the Civil Rights Movement of the fifties and sixties, strove toward the goal of equal acceptance of blacks into mainstream society. While the vigor and vitality of the Civil Rights Movement has seemingly waned, Pettigrew (1971) has remained convinced that the core view—equality of the races—is an unalterable "ideal for a majority of Black Americans."

1. Blacks can win rights without the use of violence. (.49)
2. It is necessary for blacks and whites to work together to bring about a changed American society. (.32)
3. The United States will eventually live up to its ideals of equality and justice for all men. (.55)
4. If every American were given a decent way of life, it would solve our racial problem. (.39)

A composite factor score was generated by the factor analysis. The five composite factor scores comprised the study's dependent measures.51

50The response format for this item was yes-no, which differs from the customary agree-disagree format.
51Note that factor scores were computed for each S on each of the
These five factor scores, representative of five ideology dimensions, were considered related to respondents' attitudes toward family planning and birth control usage, as well as more general attitudes related to blacks.

Turner and Wilson (1976) have categorized independent variables into four groups: general characteristics, socio-economic status, interracial contact variables, and subjective assessment of socio-economic well-being. The present study has included independent variables only from the general characteristic and socio-economic status (SES) categories.

A. General characteristics were group, age, sex and region. Except for group, these variables have been shown to correlate with a variety of attitudinal concerns among blacks (Campbell & Schuman, 1968; Goldman, 1970; Harris & Brink, 1963, 1966; Marx, 1970; Wilson et al., 1973).

B. The SES variable was education. The general black sample interview schedule included other SES variables (e.g., occupation, income, status of living quarters); however, similar information was not available for the leadership sample. Nonetheless, education was chosen because it rep-

5 factors, using the following formula based on Nie, Bent and Hull (1970):

\[ f_1 = F_1z_1 + F_2z_2 + \ldots + F_25z_25 \]

where \( f_1 \) = factor scale score for each \( S \) on Factor I;
\( F_1 \) to \( F_25 \) = actual factor-score coefficients of the 25 items on Factor I; and
\( z_1 \) to \( z_25 \) = the standardized scores of the 25 items (i.e., using the general formula, \( z = (X - \bar{X})/SD \)).

The formula used by Harman (1967) for calculating the factor-score coefficient matrix is \( F = S'R^{-1} \) where \( F \) represents the factor-score coefficient matrix, \( S' \) the rotated factor structure matrix, and \( R \) the correlation matrix.

Nie, Bent, and Hull (1970) maintain that this complete-estimation method has a major advantage over the customary method of building factor scales using only those variables that have substantial loadings on a given factor: the influence of all variables are controlled.
resents "a good single index of social class (Hollingshead & Redlich, 1958; Turner & Darity, 1973) and because the level of educational attainment seems related to the formation of attitudes to birth control and related ideological dimensions" (Turner & Darity, 1973).

The five composite factor scores were submitted to a correlational analysis (consult Table 4 for inter-factor correlation coefficients). The findings verified the relative independence of the five factors to each other. This is as expected, but it is important to note, since some of the scores seem to have logical connections with each other. This will be particularly important in understanding the pattern of findings in the ANOVAS which follow and in the interpretations of the findings in the Discussion chapter.

Analysis of Variance: Test of Major Hypotheses

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was the principal statistical procedure for testing the study's hypotheses. The ANOVA was administered with and without education covaried. The undertaking of ANOVA in this dual manner provides a method for examining the significance of education on the respondents' attitude and belief system. Studies have shown that the SES index can have a strong influence on one's opinions and

52Bartlett's Box F, a test for homogeneity of variance, was conducted on the five dependent measures. A significant F at the .01 level occurred on the separatism dimension, while non-significant findings were obtained on the other four factors. The significant F for separatism was not viewed as vitiating the analysis of the factor. E. Lindquist (1953) and Kerlinger (1973) have argued that "the importance of normality and homogeneity is over-rated" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 287). Lindquist in his cogent review of Norton's study stated that "the F distribution is amazingly insensitive to the form of the distribution of criterion measures in the parent population" (p. 81).
### Table 4

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Separatism</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black Alienation</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Genocide Fears</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Optimism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personal views (Turner & Wilson, 1976). In the initial uncontrolled application of ANOVA, several significant main and interaction effects emerged.

A significant group (leaders vs. general sample) main effect was recorded on the dependent measures **Separatism** \( (F = 3.787, p < .05) \) and **Pro Birth Control** \( (F = 17.634, p < .001) \), consult Tables 5 and 6 for ANOVA summary respectively. As indicated by inspection of the means (Table 7), the general population sample was more inclined to support separatist ideology and the leaders were significantly more likely to entertain pro birth control sentiments. The former finding supported the hypothesis of the study while the direction of the latter result was contrary to the postulated direction.

Although group differences were not significant on the **Optimism**, **Black Alienation** or **Genocide** factors, leaders nevertheless showed a greater tendency to express optimism, to feel less alienated, and slightly more fearful of black genocide than the general black population sample. These non-significant group findings are still meaningful because of their direction. That is, leaders tended to be optimistic and less disaffected, a finding which leans toward a direct linear interpretation. The somewhat greater tendency of leaders to harbor fear of genocide seemed consistent with the assumption of their wider accessibility to information and their keener sense of the political ramifications of reduced black population. These non-significant results suggest that group differences with regards to Optimism, Black Alienation and Genocide are not substantial.

Tables 8 and 9 revealed significant regional (North vs. South) main
Table 5
Analysis of Variance for Separatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>3.787*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>2.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.726</td>
<td>2.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>1.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>1.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.334</td>
<td>5.635*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>1.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>3.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.010</td>
<td>6.313*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>1.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 6

Analysis of Variance for Pro Birth Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.711</td>
<td>17.634***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>1.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>1.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>2.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001
### Table 7

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Groups on the Five Ideological Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Separatism</th>
<th>Black Alienation</th>
<th>Genocide Fears</th>
<th>Pro Birth Control</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>.22 .68 75</td>
<td>.08 .78 75</td>
<td>-.05 .74 75</td>
<td>-.37 .49 75</td>
<td>-.16 .64 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population Sample</td>
<td>-.01 .89 1885</td>
<td>.00 .84 1885</td>
<td>.00 .78 1885</td>
<td>.01 .75 1885</td>
<td>.01 .75 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>.00 .88 1960</td>
<td>.00 .84 1960</td>
<td>.00 .78 1960</td>
<td>.00 .74 1960</td>
<td>.00 .75 1960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Analysis of Variance for Genocide Fears

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.612</td>
<td>27.635***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.030</td>
<td>6.705**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>2.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.257</td>
<td>7.082**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>2.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>1.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>3.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>2.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
***p < .001
Table 9
Analysis of Variance for Optimism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>3.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.588</td>
<td>13.731***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>2.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>1.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>5.417*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>1.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>1.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
*** p < .001
effects on factors **Black Genocide Fears** and **Optimism**. The F ratios were 27.635 ($p < .001$) and 13.731 ($p < .001$) respectively. Southern respondents were more inclined to express genocidal fears and were also more likely to hold optimistic feelings of inter-racial cooperation (see Means in Table 10). The greater tendency for southerners to acknowledge genocidal fears refuted the study's hypotheses. However, the inclination of southerners to appear more optimistic about the development of inter-racial cooperation agreed with the adopted postulation. This apparent paradox will be discussed in the next chapter.

The **sex** main effect on each of the five dependent factors was statistically non-significant (consult Means in Table 11). **Age** main effect proved significantly only for the Black Genocide factor ($F = 6.705$, $p < .01$, see Table 8). As revealed in Table 12, black respondents 30 years and under displayed a greater fear of genocide than respondents over 30 years. An **education** main effect for the Black Alienation factor was obtained. Adhering to the hypothesized direction of the study, blacks with educational attainment less than 12 years tended to be more alienated than blacks who have achieved at least 12 years of education ($F = 9.913$, $p < .01$, see ANOVA Table 13 and Means in Table 14).

While 24% of the total number of main effects with education uncontrolled were statistically significant, only two first-order interactions were statistically significant. The **Region X Age** interaction on the **Genocide** factor was statistically significant ($F = 7.082$, $p < .01$). The means (Table 15) showed vividly that northern and southern respondents 30 years and under, and southerners over 30 years tended to hold more fears of genocide, whereas older northerners were less likely to harbor
Table 1.0
Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Region on the Five Ideological Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>Black Separation</th>
<th>Alienation</th>
<th>Genocide Fears</th>
<th>Pro Birth Control</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.88 1626</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.85 1626</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.77 1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.88 334</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.81 334</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.79 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.88 1960</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.84 1960</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.78 1960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 11
Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Sex on the Five Ideological Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Separatism</th>
<th>Black Alienation</th>
<th>Genocide Fears</th>
<th>Pro Birth Control</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.03 .88 924</td>
<td>.01 .83 924</td>
<td>-.01 .80 924</td>
<td>.02 .75 924</td>
<td>.01 .76 924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.03 .88 1035</td>
<td>-.01 .85 1035</td>
<td>.01 .76 1035</td>
<td>-.01 .74 1035</td>
<td>-.01 .74 1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>.00 .88 1959</td>
<td>.00 .84 1959</td>
<td>.00 .78 1959</td>
<td>.00 .74 1959</td>
<td>.00 175 1959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Age on the Five Ideological Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D. Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>-.02 .90 1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and Over</td>
<td>-.03 .85 833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>.00 .88 1956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13
Analysis of Variance for Black Alienation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>1.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.002</td>
<td>9.913**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>3.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.607</td>
<td>2.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>1.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>1.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
Table 14

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Education on the Five Ideological Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Separatism</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genocide Fears</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro Birth Control</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes
for Region X Age on Genocide Fears

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region X Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North X 30 and Over</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North X Under 30</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South X 30 and Over</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South X Under 30</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strong genocidal fears. Sex X Education on the Separatism factor was the other significant two-way interaction (F = 5.635, p < .05). Male and female respondents with less than 12 years of education, and male respondents with 12 or more years of education shared a supportive view of separatist ideology. Only female respondents with at least 12 years of education held a view opposing separatism (see Means in Table 16).

There was also a paucity of significant three-way interactions. Region X sex X age (F = 6.513, p < .01, see Means in Table 17) interaction effect on the Separatism factor was one of only two statistically significant findings. Table 17 shows northern males, regardless of age, were likely to support separatism. Similarly, young northern females (i.e., 30 years or under), older females, and young southern males showed a greater tendency to agree with separatist thoughts. Older northern females and southern males, and young southern females yielded means suggesting disagreement with separatism. The Group X Region X Sex interaction (F = 2.993, p < .05, see Means in Table 18) occurred on the Optimism factor. An optimistic attitude of eventual development of inter-racial cooperation was found among southern males and females of the general sample population. Also, holding this more hopeful attitude were northern leaders of both sexes and southern male leaders. On the other hand, the general population's northern males and females, and southern male leaders displayed less optimism. Higher order interactions were not generated since interpretation of their meaning are at best speculative and tenuous.

Education, noted for its influence on the formulation of black perspectives and opinions, was concomitantly covaried during the analysis
Table 16
Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes
for Sex X Education on Separatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex X Education</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male, Less than High School Graduate</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, High School Graduate or More</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Less than High School Graduate</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, High School Graduate or More</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17
Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes
for Region X Sex X Age on Separatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region X Sex X Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern male, 30 and under</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern male, over 30</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern female, 30 and under</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern female, over 30</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern male, 30 and under</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern male, over 30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern female, 30 and under</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern female, over 30</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18
Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes for Group X Region X Sex on Optimism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group X Region X Sex</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern male, general population</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern female, general population</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern male, general population</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern female, general population</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern male, leader</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern female, leader</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern male, leader</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern female, leader</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of variance procedures. The objective behind covarying education was to correct for extraneous variability in the dependent measures before assessing the effect of the study's independent variables on them (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1970). The findings showed only a modicum of change with education covaried. The covariate, education, was only statistically significant for the Black Alienation factor \((F = 9.176, p < .01)\). In fact, the co-varying of education produced no additional significant findings in cases where education was a variable. The minimal discrepancy when ANOVA was undertaken with education controlled and not controlled has lent support that findings obtained from ANOVA without education covaried are not vitiated due to this particular SES index.

**T-Tests: Interpretation of Interaction Effects**

The Sex X Education interaction on the **Separatism** factor was submitted to a series of pairwise t-tests. Inspection of the results showed two significant t-values (see Table 19 and Figure 1). Males with educational attainment of high school or more differed from their female counterparts \((t = -2.25, p < .05)\). In this instance males were more inclined to endorse separatist ideology. Females with at least a high school education held statistically different views from females with less than a high school education \((t = -1.98, p < .05)\). Specifically, females with less than 12 years of education agreed with separatism and females with 12 or more years of education disagreed with sep-

---

53 The reported t values are separate variance estimates and the probabilities are all one-tailed.
Table 19

T-test Analysis of Sex X Education on Separatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex X Education</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male, less than High School Graduate</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male, High School Graduate or More</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>-2.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Female, less than High School Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Female, High School Graduate or More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Figure 1. A histogram of mean scores for Sex X Education on the Separatism factor.
Submitting the Region X Age interaction on the Genocide factor to a t-test analysis, the results revealed two significant t-values (see Table 20). Northerners, 30 years or younger, varied significantly from northerners older than 30 years ($t = -3.20, p < .001$). Older northerners, those older than 30 years, were significantly different from young southerners ($t = 3.39, p < .001$). In both instances, the younger respondents registered greater fears of genocide than respondents from the North and over 30 (for a graphic presentation, see Figure 2).

A total of five significant t-values were found for the Region X Sex X Age interaction on the Separatism factor. As evident in Figure 3, northern males, 30 years and younger, differed from northern females who were older than 30 years ($t = -2.59, p < .05$, see Table 21). Older northern males ($t = -2.78, p < .05$) and northern females, 30 years and younger ($t = -2.45, p < .05$), also deviated significantly from older northern females. Similarly, older northern females were statistically dissimilar from young southern males ($t = 2.06, p < .05$) and were different from their southern female counterparts ($t = 2.58, p < .05$). Common to the five significant t-tests was the group of northern females older than 30 years. This group was markedly opposed to separatism while northern males, young northern females, young southern males and older southern females were appreciably more inclined to agree with separatist ideology.

Four significant t-values for the interaction of Group X Region X Sex on the Optimism factor were registered. As shown in Table 22 and Figure 4 the general population sample of northern males and the
Table 20

T-Test Analysis of Region X Age on Genocide Fears

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region X Age</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Northern, 30 and under</td>
<td>-3.20***</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Northern, over 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39***</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Southern, 30 and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Southern, over 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001
Figure 2. A histogram of mean scores for Region X Age on the Fears of Genocide factor.
Figure 3. A histogram of mean scores for Region X Sex X Age on the Separatism factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region X Sex X Age</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Northern male, 30 and under</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-2.59*</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Northern male, over 30</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.78*</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Northern female, 30 and under</td>
<td>-2.45*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Northern female, over 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.06*</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.58*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Southern male, 30 and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Southern male, over 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Southern female, 30 and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Southern female, over 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 22

T-Test Analysis of Group X Region X Sex on Optimism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group X Region X Sex</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Population, Northern male</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.15*</td>
<td>2.24*</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population, Northern female</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>3.13*</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population, Southern male</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population, Southern female</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders, Northern male</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders, Northern female</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders, Southern male</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders, Southern female</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Figure 4. A histogram of mean scores for Group X Region X Sex on the Optimism factor.
northern female leaders were of contrasting opinions, with northern female leaders more likely to express optimism ($t = 3.15, p < .05$). This greater sense of optimism, also indicative of southern male leaders, distinguished them from the general population sample of northern males ($t = 2.24, p < .05$). Interestingly, the general population of northern females, like their northern male counterparts, were at variance with the northern female leaders ($t = 3.13, p < .05$) and with the southern male leaders ($t = 2.21, p < .05$). The general population of northern females were less optimistic than northern female leaders and southern male leaders.

The elaboration and interpretation of these results are included in the upcoming chapter. Also, the implication of the study's findings are addressed.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings of the study lend further support to the direct linear model while revealing pertinent ideological discrepancies in the attitudes of the general population and leadership samples. In addition, the statistically significant interaction effects add to the already well-documented influence of age, region, and sex on attitudes toward birth control and certain salient dimensions of black ideology (Darity et al., 1971; Darity & Turner, 1972; Turner & Darity, 1973; Turner & Wilson, 1976).

The aim of the preceding discussion is to interpret the findings' importance within the study's framework. The regrounding of the results into the theoretical framework of the study allows for the inspection and understanding of the results from either the direct linear model or from the "rising expectation" paradigm. Also, a broader interpretation, recognizing the social, historical and political context inherent in the aforementioned models is offered. It is this conceptual leap which paves the way for outlining the implications of the findings.

Black Leaders and General Sample of Black Americans: A Question of Leadership

The study's hypothesis that the general population sample was inclined more to embrace separatist philosophy was upheld. The less privileged Black Americans, indicative of the general black populace,
agreed more often with separatist views. This finding was congruent with the direct linear argument (Turner & Wilson, 1976; Wilhelm, 1970), while contradicting the empirical observations of Brink and Harris (1966) and Marx (1967). From the direct linear model's perspective low SES Afro-Americans have a greater propensity to react militantly in pursuit of improved social conditions than high SES status blacks. Having developed seemingly a greater sense of stability, high SES blacks have tended to show an ideological shift toward conservatism. In contrast, blacks of limited socio-economic mobility were considered more likely to resonate to ideologies demanding swift, significant social change. The "rising expectation" view has evolved from the conceptual sphere which presumes that socially mobile blacks characterize the more militant segment of the black population.

While these two paradigms, the direct linear and the rising expectation, hold opposing views, it is clear that each perspective contributes to a fuller understanding of the multifaceted features of black ideology. Nevertheless, this finding that leaders are inclined to disagree with separatism suggests that the black leadership is more likely than the general sample of Black Americans to espouse and to hold conservatist view and beliefs. Several possible explanations for this finding are plausible. First, the organizations sampled, and thus their leaders, were to a great extent organizations whose aims are racial equality and integration. In achieving these objectives the emphasis is on moderation, a strategy incompatible with a plan of action based on separatism.

Second, the discrepancy in sample size may have contributed to the
significant difference between leaders and the general population sample. While these concerns are certainly important considerations, the finding stands on rather firm ground. This result is consistent with Turner and Wilson's (1976) finding that the SES level of the respondent influences his/her view. Accordingly, they found high SES respondents less inclined to endorse separatist philosophy while low SES respondents were more accepting of separatism. Historically, leaders of Black America have generally advocated integration and denounced the maintenance of a dual system of separate but equal as detrimental to black social progress. Although leaders were asked to give their personal views, it is nonetheless extremely difficult to divorce one's opinion from organizational objectives and strategies, especially since one must oftentimes demonstrate commitment to organization's efforts prior to attaining a leadership role. It is also understandable that black leaders, advocates of Black America, cannot risk the loss of political clout in mainstream society by propounding views that widen the distance between the two races and encourage society's negligence of blacks.

Another statistically meaningful prediction was that group differences would emerge on the Pro Birth Control factor. However, the expected direction of this postulation was not confirmed. It was viewed initially that a more positive attitude toward birth control would be found among the general population sample. The rationale was that the black populace was more socio-economically in need and saw birth control and family planning as alleviating their impecunious condition. The basis of this postulation was derived from Brink and Harris's (1963, 1966), Marx's (1967), and Pettigrew's (1964, 1971) exposition of Black
America's "have-nots" forming the conservative, non-militant element in the black community. Perceiving the general sample population as conservative on the pro birth control dimension was colored by the black community's debate on birth control. The content of the debate has tended to portray advocates and users of birth control and family planning as leaning in a conservative direction while opponents and non-users have been labeled radical, even militant. Also, influencing the direction of this hypothesis was the growing number of published reports describing wider usage and greater accessibility to birth control methods for blacks of low SES status (Bogue, 1969; DuPont, 1972; Furstenberg, 1971; Kammeyer et al., 1972; Zelnik & Kantner, 1978). Although the result differed from the formulated rationale, the finding that leaders are more accepting of birth control than the general sample of blacks has substantial support. Historically, black pro birth control supporters have been rooted in the more conservative, more socially stable dominions of the black community (Carter, 1932; DuBois, 1932; Garvin, 1932; Schuyler, 1932). In fact, these early supporters castigated the black denizens for their reluctance to stray from their prohibitive religious and cultural mores concerning birth control. More recently, Coales (1968) has reported that middle class blacks fertility rate is below replacement level of 2.0, suggesting broad usage of birth control and family planning techniques. Black leaders frequently recruited from high SES classes would be more likely to restrict fertility so as not to impair upward mobility. From a personal viewpoint, one would expect most leaders to see intrinsic good in birth control usage. Among the general black population the usage of birth control methods
may have increased sharply due to economic pressures but greater usage among the general sample of blacks appears insufficient for a pro birth control attitude. Furthermore, with leaders demonstrating significantly greater acceptance of birth control and family planning the direct linear has received additional credence.

Although group differences were not significant on the Optimism, Black Alienation, and Fears of Genocide factors, leaders nevertheless were more likely to express optimism, to feel less alienated, and slightly more fearful of genocide than the general black sample population. While these mild trends were evident, the non-significance of these findings has suggested more universality on certain black ideological constructs. Black leaders as well as most Black Americans for the last four centuries have seen the advancement of blacks contingent upon the establishment of meaningful inter-racial cooperation. Indeed, optimism permeated the Civil Rights Movement which strove to elicit the cooperation of blacks and whites in the struggle for racial equality. The interaction effect of Group X Region X Sex on Optimism has provided additional support for the group main effects on Separatism and Pro-Birth Control. The finding showed respondents of the general population when compared with leaders of the same region and sex were less optimistic. The only reversed finding was found for female leaders from the South who were less optimistic than southern respondents of the general population. The effects of black alienation have accumulated also over the centuries. In particular, the degradation of slavery, the Jim Crowism of the 1900's, the failure to realize the fruits of the 1954 Civil Rights Act three decades later, unemployment, and a host of related
deprivations have stranded many blacks on islands of hopelessness and despair. Similarly, fears of genocide were registered among Afro-Americans with the first transcontinental voyage of unwilling black passengers to the New World. This inaugurated a process of systematic manipulation of the black population to meet the demands of enterprising whites. The process has not been overturned; consequently, the diminution of genocidal fears among blacks has not been warranted. Clearly, the attitudes reflected in these dimensions have roots which bore deep into the Black experience and are constant companions for most blacks (especially at the preconscious and unconscious levels). While the non-significant findings suggest attitudinal overlap between leaders and the general black sample, the two significant findings, Separatism and Pro-Birth Control, have implied differences in the socio-political strategies entertained by these two groups.

The North vs. the South: Regional Differences

The region of the respondents made a difference on the Genocide and Optimism factors, two unrelated dimensions. It was hypothesized that northerners were more inclined to hold fears of genocide. This was based largely on the assumption that northern blacks subjected perhaps more to the subtleties and covert features of racism would be fearful of genocide. Another premise underlying this hypothesis was that the northern sample was considered more alienated and therefore more suspicious of birth control and family planning as a genocide plot (Darity & Turner, 1972). In actuality, southern blacks showed a greater pro-clivity to agree to the genocide items. Furthermore, both young and old
southern respondents were inclined, as reported by the Region X Age interaction effects, to be more apprehensive of black genocide than northerners. The sordid chronicles of black atrocities, both outside the legal domain (e.g., lynchings) and under its guise (e.g., the Relf sisters, the Tuskegee Syphilis project), have sensitized southern blacks significantly more than their northern counterparts. Also, the mushrooming effect of birth control and family planning clinics occurred initially in southern areas densely populated by blacks (Kammeyer et al., 1975) and seemingly contributed to the hypervigilant attitude among southern blacks concerning White America's actions and behavior. While the finding shows southerners more fearful of genocide, the Region X Sex X Age interaction on Separatism revealed southerners less likely to agree with separatist ideology. These results convey the apprehension and uneasiness which accompany the hopefulness of southern blacks.

With regards to the Optimism factor, it was postulated that southern blacks would be more optimistic. The findings confirmed this postulation. Southern blacks in recent years have experienced improved race relations and noticeable (though certainly not sufficient) economic progress. The South has been the most successful battlefield for the Civil Rights Movement, but this has been greatly enhanced by renewed economic interests of big business in the South.

Still, one is struck immediately by the paradoxical nature of these two dimensions and their co-existence in the attitudes of southern blacks. This may be due in part to the changing image of the South. Until quite recently optimism had remained rather ephemeral, but with the migration of industry and greater acceptance among southern whites
of federal regulations, optimism has become more substantive. However, this more circumscribed feeling of optimism has not displaced the fears and suspicion among southern blacks. Nonetheless, in this study optimism has shown to be more endemic to southern respondents of the general population sample. Male southern leaders were more optimistic than northern leaders while female southern leaders tended to reject optimistic ideology more than female northern leaders.

Non-significant findings were obtained for region on the Separatism, Black Alienation, and Pro-Birth Control factors. It was inferred from these non-significant results that commitment to a particular view (for instance, either supportive of separatism or birth control) or a sense of powerlessness or despair is not specific to region, whereas one's genocidal fears and optimistic view of future inter-racial cooperation may be regionally determined.

Finally, if one's fear of genocide can be used as an index of oppression, then the finding that southern blacks were more fearful of genocide fits the direct linear argument. The optimistic outlook for the future of Southern respondents can also be explained from the direct linear viewpoint. As previously mentioned, southern black optimism comes from a sense of improved race relations and employment possibilities. Understandably, such changes, even if cosmetic in intent, are bound to create a greater sense of optimism.

Age: Its Relationship to Fears of Genocide

Fear of genocide, as reported by Turner and Darity (1972, 1973) and Turner and Wilson (1976), was significantly related to the age of the
respondent. Those 30 and under displayed more fears of genocide than respondents over 30. In the present study the Region X Age interaction supported previous findings that young respondents were more fearful of genocide. Such fears were shown also to be held by black southerners over 30. For most young Black Americans lack of educational and occupational opportunities have left many of them disillusioned and dissatisfied. These feelings of disaffection have fueled the suspicions and distrust that society's push of birth control and family planning into black communities has not been in the best interest of black people.

The relative stability of respondents over 30 and their tendency to express less fear of genocide furnished additional support for this interpretation. Likewise, the Region X Sex X Age interaction on Separatism showed older respondents to be less accepting of separatist ideology.

While fears of genocide run high among younger respondents (those 30 years and under) such a finding does not preclude the use of birth control and family planning methods (Cade, 1970; Turner & Darity, 1973). Zelnik and Kantner (1978) report that the usage of anti-fertility procedures is high among black females in the 15-30 year range. Still, these fears and mistrust, which are based on years of manifest neglect, feed their ambivalence about using birth control methods. The direct linear view is upheld with this finding of young black respondents more fearful of genocide. There is a strong connection between age, and social status and stability.

Non-significant findings for age on Separatism, Black Alienation, Pro-Birth Control and Optimism factors suggest that changes in the attitude of a person after age 30 on specific black ideological dimensions
Sex: Significant Interaction Effects

The sex main effect on the five factors was non-significant. While the trends concur with the hypothesized directions, the findings imply in a rather global fashion that attitudes of males and females on these particular dimensions do not deviate appreciably. Nonetheless, this statistical finding is surprising. Previous research (Turner & Wilson, 1976; Turner & Darity, 1972, 1973) shows a significant sex effect on some of the ideological dimensions. This difference may be due to the use of factor scores in the analysis undertaken in the current project while earlier studies used different analyses. The use of factor scores in the analyses may have washed out certain effects (e.g., sex), whereas the significant sex finding in the study conducted by Turner and Wilson (1976) may have been due to their use of the sum total of the item-factor correlation coefficients for that specific factor.

Although the sex main effect proved non-significant, the sex variable was involved in several significant interactions. For instance, a significant Sex X Education interaction on Separatism was found in which the most supportive respondents of separatist ideology were males with at least 12 years of education. The least likely respondents to endorse separatist thought were females with 12 or more years of education. Generally speaking, black males have a greater tendency to endorse separatism and to become disillusioned with dominant, White society (Turner & Wilson, 1976). Such characteristics, as suggested by the findings, may persist even among the more educated black males. This suggests
that education, a rather sturdy index of social mobility (Turner & Dar-
ity, 1972), may not provide some educated blacks with a sufficient sense
of belonging or acceptance into mainstream America. On the other hand,
educated black females are likely to be non-supportive of separatism
perhaps because they have overcome many of the barriers impeding black
social-political-economic advancement. Furthermore, the finding that
male and female respondents with less than 12 years of education sup-
ported separation confirmed the results of Darity et al. (1971), Turner
and Darity (1973), and Turner and Wilson (1976).

The second order interaction of Region X Sex X Age on Separatism
showed northern female respondents over 30 years to be less inclined to
express separatist ideology. Southern males over 30 and southern fe-
male 30 and under were also less supportive of separatism. This sug-
gests that older northern females and southern males may be the more
conservative elements in the black population. The tendency for young
southern females to be more educated may contribute to the likelihood of
their rejecting separatism. Also, it seems that the attitudes of re-
spondents may change as a function of time and perceived social change.
Specifically, young northern females supportive of separatist thought
may shift attitudinally away from separatism as they grow older, very
much in the manner shown in the Results chapter. Young northern males,
though in agreement with separatist thought, may become even more in-
clined to express feelings and attitudes of separatism as they mature.
A slightly different profile may develop for southern males. The sup-
portive attitude for separatism found among young southern males may
change to a more conservative, less supportive, separatist attitude with
Age. Moreover, the tendency of young southern females to disapprove of separatism may shift, as they become older, to a stance compatible with separatist views. This attitude change, going from a rather conservative to a more radical stance, may develop in response to heightened dissatisfaction and frustration among southern female respondents as social/personal achievement becomes more difficult to obtain.

As in the aforementioned interactions, the Group X Region X Sex effect on Optimism offers findings consistent with the general view of the study. For instance, southern female leaders were least optimistic about the future likelihood of inter-racial cooperation. The small sample of southern female leaders may have contributed to this sharp variance in attitude. However, this less optimistic attitude remains consistent with their acceptance of separatism. Comparing respondents of the general population sample from the same region and of the same sex showed attitudinal discrepancies with each comparison. Northern females of the general population were less optimistic than northern female leaders. Similarly, northern males were less likely to be optimistic than northern male leaders. This outcome was upheld when southern males from the general population sample were compared with leaders; however, the reverse was found when females from the general population and leadership samples were examined. As noted, southern female leaders were highly unlikely to be optimistic. Nevertheless, females were more inclined on the whole to express a sense of optimism than males. This may be due to the fact that the social system has been historically more accessible to black females than males. Indeed, this slight advantage seems reflected in their attitudes on Optimism.
The education main effect showed respondents with less than 12 years of education to be more alienated than those with 12 or more years. This finding was consistent with previous reported results showing a strong correlation between social status and alienation (Turner & Wilson, 1976; Turner & Darity, 1972, 1973). Less educated blacks, like many young blacks, have been frustrated in their efforts to gain greater access to mainstream society. This hypothesis that respondents with less than 12 years of education, often socially immobilized and thus more likely to experience heightened feelings of isolation, despair, and hopelessness, was derived from the direct linear perspective. While education seems to be a major factor with regards to social mobility, the Sex X Education interaction effect revealed that males with 12 or more years of education tend to join rank with those of lesser education. The finding has suggested that not only is education a salient factor but one's sex is also important in determining a sense of social mobility, and perhaps the extent of involvement in the larger society.

The findings of this study reveal the importance of attitudinal differences among respondents. The influence of group membership, geographic location, age, sex and education on the attitudes and beliefs of black respondents dispel arguments that the black community is monolithic in its views and attitudes. Some of the implications of the findings are described below.

Implications for Public Policy

Implications for public policy and future research emerged from the
findings of the study. Generally speaking, public policy designed to address the needs and concerns of the general black population depends too often on a few selective national black leaders or a few designated community spokespersons. While soliciting the views of blacks is certainly a positive step, it usually stops predictably short of effective consultation with members of the black community. Among policy makers there remains an almost irresistibile inclination to place Black Americans into a monolithic strait-jacket (Murray, 1970). This accusation does not overlook the sincerity of many policy makers who struggle to avoid this unitary trap, but many, often inadvertently, are seduced into public policy statements that are tailored to "a one track-one train" conceptual tunnel. The findings of the present study indicate how myopic such an approach in formulating public policy on family planning, population and fertility management is.

A sample of the spectrum of black views is a requisite for developing an empathic understanding of the needs of blacks. Without going beyond the considerations of black leaders whose representative views may be opinionated in the direction of their constituency, an appreciation of the complex nature of the black community and of the attitudes of blacks is lost. Indeed, the attitude differences between black leaders and the general black population sample demonstrates the importance of consulting different members of the community as a means of gathering a range of views. Specifically, certain ideological dimensions, like separatism and pro birth control, elicit attitudes that may be quite variable. Understanding attitudinal differences among blacks and the degree of attitudinal variance is critical. Equally important
is pinpointing areas of overlap in the attitudes of various groups of blacks. These shared views, based on the universality of the Black experience, are apparently impervious to status delimiters like education, income, age and sex. The commonality of attitudes depends, however, on the ideological dimensions. In the present study, the attitudes of northern and southern respondents are similar on the ideological dimensions of separatism, black alienation, and pro birth control. Broadly speaking, the results of the study suggest that population and family planning policies must incorporate creatively the variability and similarity of attitudes and beliefs of Afro-Americans. Also, these attitudinal data must be understood in relationship to salient demographic characteristics such as region, sex, age, education, and others. Finally, it is necessary for family planning councils and other public policy agencies to vigorously seek true representation of views of the people to be serviced.

**Implications for Further Research**

The findings of the study are suggestive of a number of research directions. First, the universal characteristics of black attitudes pose an intriguing research problem. Particularly, the delineation of ideological dimensions which may identify some aspects of a black attitudinal ethos warrants further study. Identifying variables affecting the attitude of respondents toward family planning and birth control is another important research area. For example, the role of religion in influencing the attitude and outlook of a person on birth control usage is pertinent. The examination of religious beliefs of respondents provides
the opportunity to explore how it enters into the decision-making process concerning the application of family planning and birth control practices. Similarly, urban-rural and East-West differences among respondents on the issue of family planning and birth control raise a host of research questions. For one, the degree of conservatism in respondents of different geographic backgrounds may yield clues into the relationship of conservatism and of the acceptance of birth control and family planning practices. Another research possibility is replication studies based on examining the attitudes of other ethnic minority groups (Native Americans, Spanish Americans, and Asian Americans) on these five dimensions could allow, cross-culturally, the investigation of family planning concerns, attitudes, and ideological issues. These and similar studies could facilitate the formulation of meaningful and constructive family planning policies and programs in these communities.
Beginning with antiquity there has existed fertility and population control activity. Such activity arose out of a sense of preservation for the existing social order. The Greco-Roman philosophers, Aristotle and Plato, called for stricter regulation of the birth and growth rate of society's common element. Fears of being overwhelmed prompted these learned individuals and their colleagues to outline strategies of continence and temperance for the poor (e.g., delayed marriages, penalties for conceiving more children than legally mandated, infanticide). The British political economist of the nineteenth century, Thomas Malthus, reiterated this theme of restricting the size of the poor and recommended the non-impediment of the nature's death checks (e.g., pestilence, famines). Robert Owen, Sr., and other neo-Malthusians introduced into the Malthusian equation prophylactic alternatives freeing the poor from the absurdities of sexual abstinence while controlling their fertility.

While nations of Europe in the 1800s sought ways to contain the growth of the poor, the United States was enjoying a period of unlimited growth and expansion. Enslaved blacks were encouraged, often forcefully, by slave owners to maintain high fertility and birth rates (Gutman, 1977). The economics of slavery made ideas of limiting the black slave population nonsensical until the 1860s. The defeat of the South brought a heightened wariness over the number of blacks, resulting in a chame-
leon-like shift in the attitude of White America concerning the unrestricted growth of the black population. The change in the economic value of blacks also brought a change in ideological emphasis. Superimposed onto the polymonogenism debate was the eugenic argument of Herbert Spencer. The race betterment views of Spencer propelled the eugenic advance at all societal levels (e.g., social, economic and political). Race betterment became the eugenic movement's euphemism for surgically severing the "gonads" of the country's black and poor (Chase, 1977). This aim of controlling black fertility and growth was strengthened by laws legislating the sterilization of the "unfit" and by the marriage of the pseudo-science of eugenicism with the birth control movement. As a result of this union birth control emerged as a requisite for achieving race betterment.

The attitude of Black Americans toward the benefits of birth control has been mixed. Some blacks (DuBois, 1932; Schuyler, 1932) saw birth control as improving the quality of black life and therefore enhancing the survival of the black race. Disputants of black birth control argued that its usage would be dysgenic (even race suicide) because numerous death checks were already limiting substantially the growth of the black population (Frazier, 1933; Garvey, 1934). If anything, maintenance of a high black fertility was held by some (Cobbs, 1939; Lewis, 1945) to be imperative for black survival.

For several decades the black birth control debate has persisted. Some blacks, borrowing from the eco-catastrophic analogy of overpopulating the spaceship Earth, have viewed unrestricted black fertility as impeding black progress. Other blacks have clamored that such ecological
referents are merely the guise of a "trojan horse." They have cited a litany of incidents and abuses (e.g., coercive sterilization, draconian human experiments on blacks, harsh penalties proposed to restrict the number of children by unwed mothers) which demonstrate from their perspective an incessant disregard for black life.

The most common line of demarcation of proponents and opponents of black birth control has been whether or not it is a threat to blacks. The present study explored this issue both historically as well as empirically. The empirical examination was a secondary analysis, comparing two samples of blacks--leaders and general population respondents. The study examined their attitudes and beliefs on five constructs--Pro Birth Control, Separatism, Black Alienation, Genocide Fears and Optimism--and found leaders and the general population sample differed. The two statistically significant group differences were on Separatism and Pro Birth Control. The findings of the study supported the "direct linear formulation" of Turner and Wilson (1976) that attitudes and beliefs of respondents are largely a function of their socio-economic status. The general population sample was more inclined to support separatist ideology and to feel alienated from dominant society while leaders were more fearful of genocide, more accepting of birth control and more optimistic about the eventual cooperation of the races.

The study showed differences in the attitudes of leaders and of the general black population sample on five black ideological dimensions. From the findings it was inferred that leaders may not always speak for the general black populace (i.e., the black consumer) and that region, age, sex and educational attainments are important variables to consider
when formulating public policy or when conducting research on family planning among blacks. In the final analysis, however, the nature and quality of the relationship between black leaders and the general black population may very well hold the key to black survival and advancement.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst, Massachusetts

POPULATION POLICY RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

DATE

NAME

ORGANIZATION

REGION

ADDRESS

INTERVIEWER'S INITIALS

INDICATE SEX

MALE

FEMALE

(A) First I would like to ask you some general questions about _____ organization.

1. Would you describe the _____ organization in general terms--on whatever dimensions you think appropriate?
a. What is the general purpose for which the _____ organization was originally formed?

b. Is that still the main purpose or do you see the main purpose as different now?

2. What aims or programs does _____ organization have in the following areas?

   Health

   Legal Aid

   Child Care

   Employment
Prison Reform

Voter Registration

Housing

Welfare Rights

Black Capitalism

Support for Minority Political Candidates

Family Planning
3. What is the approximate membership of your organization?
   (National)

   (Regional)

4. What determines membership in your organization?

5. I would like you to think about the overall membership of your organization. What percentage of the membership would you say falls into each of the income groups listed on this card? (HAND OVER INCOME LEVEL CARD)

   1. ________%   4. ________%
   2. ________%   5. ________%
   3. ________%   6. ________%

6. What religion makes up the largest portion of your membership?

7. What percentage of your membership would you estimate to be:
Black ________%
White ________%
Other ________% (Specify)

8. What percentage of your membership would you estimate have the following political leanings?
Democratic ________%
Republican ________%
Other ________% (Specify)

(B) Now, I would like to ask you some questions on the organization policy on the population issue.

1. Does your organization have a position on the population issue?
   Yes ________ (Please describe)
   No ________ (Is there any particular reason?)

2. From your own point of view, what would be the most useful policy for population planning (e.g., government stance and national programming)?

The proposals I am going to read have actually been put forth.

(HAND OVER APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL CARD)

On the card are six possible responses. Pick the one which you believe
represents or would represent the stance of your organization.

1. A law would be passed making abortion mandatory for any unmarried female found to be pregnant.

2. Any woman giving birth out of wedlock for the second time would be sterilized.

3. A national gene pool would be established by selecting certain males with appropriate gene composition; only selective women would have access to the pool.

4. A substantial percentage of welfare clients who have been receiving welfare for 5 years or more would not be allowed to have children.

5. Any woman whether married or not would be sterilized after having two children.

6. A very powerful anti-fertility agent would be developed that could be added to the public drinking water.

7. Implant pellets of anti-fertility agents or IUD's in every woman of childbearing age. Anyone wanting to have a child would have to apply for a license to have the agent or IUD removed.

8. A law would be passed requiring both persons to be 25 years of age or more to get a marriage license.

9. Legal restrictions on homosexuality would be removed.

10. Encourage women to work throughout life like men do.

11. There would be a substantial cost on marriage licenses.

12. A special tax would be placed on having children.

13. Married persons would be taxed more than single persons.

14. Tax exemptions for children would be removed.

15. Additional taxes would be placed on parents with more than one or two children in school.

16. Compulsory education would be extended to the age of 21.

17. No woman would be allowed to have more than two children.

18. All women would be sterilized after having a specified number of children.

19. Paid maternity leave or benefits would be eliminated.
20. Children's or family allowances on government pay or foundation grants would be eliminated.

21. Bonuses would be paid for delayed marriage or greater child-spacing.

22. Women of 45 with less than three children would be eligible for bonuses.

23. Welfare payments would be limited to coverage of no more than two children.

24. The economy would be manipulated to maintain a high rate of unemployment.

25. Women would be required to work outside the home throughout their adult life.

26. Few child care facilities will be provided.

27. Childbearing would be confined to only a limited number of women based on a totally random lottery.

28. Stock certificate-type permits would be required in order to have children.

29. Private home ownership would be discouraged by law.

30. Public housing would cease to be awarded based on family size.

31. Substantial payments would be made to men for being sterilized.

32. Substantial payments would be made to women for being sterilized.

33. Payments would be made for using contraceptives.

34. Payments would be used as an incentive for abortion.

35. Abortion would be made available on demand.

36. Sterilization would be made available on demand.

37. Most contraceptives would be distributed non-medically.

38. Contraception technology would be increased by making research grants readily available.

39. Contraceptives would be made available and accessible to all.

40. Family planning would be used as a core element in maternal health care programs.
Now I would like to ask some more general questions concerning your feeling about family planning and the situation of black Americans. After I have read each statement, please indicate whether you AGREE or DISAGREE with the statement. Your responses should reflect your own opinions.

1. If a woman is pregnant and does not want a baby, an abortion is acceptable.

2. Sterilization is an acceptable method of birth control.

3. Pregnancy and birth control should be taught in a course on preparation for marriage in the junior and senior high schools.

4. Elementary and secondary schools should give sex education as part of their programs.

5. Black Americans should consider themselves members of an oppressed black race all over the world.

6. Blacks can win rights without the use of violence.

7. It is necessary for blacks and whites to work together to bring about a changed American society.

8. The United States will eventually live up to its ideals of equality and justice for all men.

9. Black people must form totally black institutions, credit unions, co-ops, and political parties.

10. Only black teachers should teach black students.

11. Busing black students does more harm than good.

12. Birth control clinics in black neighborhoods should be operated by blacks.

13. No American family should limit its size.

14. Black families should not limit their size.

15. As the need for cheap labor goes down, there will be an effort to reduce the number of blacks.

16. As blacks become more militant, there will be an effort to decrease the black population.
17. The survival of black people depends on increasing the number of black births.

18. Birth control programs are a plot to eliminate blacks.

19. Civil rights organizations in your community do not speak for you.

20. In spite of what some people say, things are getting worse for black people.

21. It is hardly fair to bring black children into the world the way things look for black people.

22. There is little use in black people writing to public officials because often the officials are not really interested in the problems of black people.

23. Nowadays black people have to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

24. These days black people do not really know who they can count on.

25. Black people should gain full control over their communities.

26. Public schools in the black community should be run solely by black educators and black committee members.

27. The answer to the racial problem is the total separation of blacks and whites.

28. Blacks should support only black political leaders.

29. If every American were given a decent way of life, it would solve our racial problems.

30. All businesses in the black communities should be owned by blacks.

31. The position of black Americans is worse than the position of oppressed people all over the world.

32. Do you feel that there is too much crowding in the United States?
   1. YES Do you believe that you should have fewer children to help prevent more crowding?
   2. NO Why do you think other people say that there is too much crowding?

33. Are you in favor of free publicly financed birth control assistance?
1. Yes
2. No. ... Why?

34. How many children, would you say, makes the best family size?

   0. None 
   1. One 
   2. Two 
   3. Three 
   4. Four 
   5. Five 
   6. Six 
   7. Seven 
   8. Eight or more 

Comments:

(D) Now I would like to ask you a few questions about yourself and your role in the ____ organization.

1. What is your age?_______

2. Describe your educational background. (Note degree and College if mentioned.)

3. What is your marital status?

4. In what state did you live during most of your childhood?

5. What is your official title?

6. Please describe your role and responsibilities in the ____ organization.
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INTERVIEWER'S INITIALS ________________________________________________

SUBJECT NUMBER _____________________________________________________

TODAY'S DATE ________________________________________________________

1. Address ____________________________________________________________
   (Interviewer Completes)

2. Name of City ________________________________________________________
   (Interviewer Completes)

3. Sex ________________________________________________________________
   1. Male
   2. Female

4. Would you say that most of the people in your neighborhood are:
   1. Lower income
   2. Middle income
   3. Upper income

5. How many years have you lived at this residence?
   1. Less than a year
   2. 1-5 years
   3. 6-10 years
   4. 11-15 years
   5. 16-20 years
   6. 21-25 years
   7. 26 or more years

6. a. Is this the type of community in which you would like your children to grow up?
   1. Yes
   2. No

   b. Why? ____________________________________________________________
      ________________________________________________________________
7. Which of the following words do you prefer to describe yourself? 

Negro, Colored, Afro-American, or Black 

Answer: ____________________________________________________________________________

What is your 2nd choice? ____________________________________________________________________
What is your 3rd choice? ____________________________________________________________________
What is your 4th choice? ____________________________________________________________________

8. When you came to this neighborhood, what city and state did you move from? 

Answer: ____________________________________________________________________________

9. How would you describe the racial make-up of the community from which you moved? 

1. All Black 
2. Mostly Black 
3. Half Black and Half White 
4. Mostly White 
5. Other: ____________________________________________________________________________

(Instruction, please read aloud) 

Now I want to ask you some questions about your feelings about family size and a few questions about birth control.

10. How many children, would you say, makes the best family size? 

0. None 
1. One 
2. Two 
3. Three 
4. Four 
5. Five 
6. Six 
7. Seven 
8. Eight or more 

Comments: ____________________________________________________________________________ 
____________________________________________________________________________________ 
____________________________________________________________________________________ 
____________________________________________________________________________________ 

11. What methods of birth control have you heard of? (Please check in the first column specifically each methods that the respondents lists.)
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1. Sterilization (vasectomy, ligation "tubes tied")
2. Abortion
3. IUD (intrauterine coil or loop)
4. Contraceptive pill
5. Diaphragm
6. Spermacides (Jelly, foam, cream, suppositories)
7. Condom (rubber, safe, prophylactic)
8. Rhythm
9. Douche
10. Coitus interruptus (withdrawal)
11. Other, specify: __________________________

(Read methods not mentioned by respondent (not checked in first column). Check in second column any of the methods the respondent recognizes as you read them.)

12. (Ask this question if you are not certain that the respondent has had sexual relations. If you are certain that the respondent has had sexual relations, circle "yes" and go on to number 13.)

Have you ever had sexual relations?
1. Yes (Go on to question #13)
2. No (Skip the questions below and ask question #19 next)

13. Have you or your present partner used any methods to limit your family size?
1. Yes (Go to question #15)
2. No (Go to next question)

14. If no (#13), why? __________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

15. (If yes (#13) please circle the period of time over which the respondent used each specific method. If a method was not used, circle "0".)

0 = not used
1 = 1 year or less
2 = 2 years
3 = 3 years
4 = 4 years
5 = 5 years
6 = 6 years
7 = 7 years
8 = 8 years
9 = 9 years or more
1. Sterilization (vasectomy, ligation "tubes tied")
2. Abortion
3. IUD (Intrauterine coil or loop)
4. Contraceptive pill
5. Diaphragm
6. Spermicides (jelly, foam, cream, suppositories)
7. Condom (rubber, safe, prophylactic)
8. Rhythm
9. Coitus interruptus (withdrawal)
10. Douche
11. Other, specify: ______________________
16. (Ask male respondent) Has your present partner ever had an abortion?
   (Ask female respondent) Have you ever had an abortion?
   1. Yes
   2. No
17. If yes (#16), how many? ______________________
18. From what person or source did you first learn about preventing pregnancy?
   1. Schoolmates or friends
   2. Husband, wife, boyfriend or girlfriend
   3. Social worker
   4. Doctor
   5. Relative (mother, father, brother, sister, uncle, etc.)
   6. Public health nurse
   7. Read about it
   8. Other, specify: ______________________
19. Have you ever been to a clinic or doctor to obtain information about preventing pregnancies?
   1. Yes, to a clinic
   2. Yes, to a doctor
   3. No; Why not? ______________________
20. What do you believe is the purpose of birth control centers and clinics?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

21. Would you refer your friends and neighbors to a birth control center or clinic?

1. Yes
2. No

Please explain your answer:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(Instructions, please read aloud.)

Now I am going to read some statements to you. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each one.

22. If a woman is pregnant and does not want a baby, an abortion is acceptable.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

23. Sterilization is an acceptable method of birth control.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

24. If you had all the children you wanted, you would want to be sterilized.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

25. The real aim of birth control programs is to reduce the number of low-income people.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

26. Birth control clinics in black neighborhoods should be operated by blacks.
1. Agree
2. Disagree

27. No American family should limit its size.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

28. Black families should not limit their sizes.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

(Instructions, please read aloud.)

Now I would like to read you a few statements about the situation of black people in this country. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each one.

29. As the need for cheap labor goes down, there will be an effort to reduce the number of blacks.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

30. As blacks become more militant, there will be an effort to decrease the black population.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

31. The survival of black people depends on increasing the number of black births.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

32. Birth control programs are a plot to eliminate blacks.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

33. Most of the people in your neighborhood think the same way you do.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

34. You have never felt that you belonged in your neighborhood.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
35. Civil rights organizations in your community do not speak for you.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

36. There are many good things happening in your neighborhood to improve things.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

37. Your neighborhood is full of people who only care about themselves.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

38. A person who commits a crime should be punished.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

39. It is OK for a person to break the law if he does not get caught.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

40. In court you would have the same chance as a white person.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

41. Nowadays most blacks still look down on themselves and their race.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

42. Black Americans should have a country of their own.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

43. It is wrong for blacks and whites to intermarry.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

44. It is important for blacks to demand and exercise their rights.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree
45. Blacks should continue to integrate American society.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

46. American blacks should proudly accept their heritage and identity.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

47. Blacks should try harder to unify and do things for themselves.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

48. In spite of what some people say, things are getting worse for black people.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

49. It is hardly fair to bring black children into the world the way things look for black people.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

50. Nowadays black people have to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

51. There is little use in black people writing to public officials because often the officials are not really interested in the problems of black people.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

52. These days black people do not really know why they can count on.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

53. Black people should gain full control over their communities.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

54. Public schools in the black community should be run solely by black
educators and black committee members.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

55. The Black Power Movement is important because it has increased the pride and imagination of black people.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

56. Policemen in this city bully and keep blacks down under the disguise of law and order.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

57. The answer to the racial problem is the total separation of blacks and whites.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

58. Blacks should support only black political leaders.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

59. Blacks must arm themselves with weapons and attack white institutions if the racial problem is to be solved.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

60. The Black Muslims are good because they give us a sense of pride and belonging.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

61. If every American were given a decent way of life, it would solve our racial problems.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

62. All businesses in the black communities should be owned by blacks.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
63. The position of black Americans is worse than the position of oppressed people all over the world.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

64. Black Americans should consider themselves members of an oppressed black race all over the world.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

65. Riots should no longer be used as a means of trying to solve the racial problems.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

66. Blacks can win rights without the use of violence.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

67. It is necessary for blacks and whites to work together to bring about a changed American society.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

68. The United States will eventually live up to its ideals of equality and justice for all men.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

69. Black and white youths are more similar in their outlooks on things today than they were a generation ago.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

70. Black people must form totally black institutions, credit unions, co-ops, and political parties.
    1. Agree
    2. Disagree

71. There should be Black Study Centers set up to study and teach all aspects of black culture and heritage.
    1. Agree
2. Disagree

72. All American schools should teach black history and culture.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

73. Only black teachers should teach courses in the field of black studies.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

74. Afro clothing styles are necessary as a symbol of race pride.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

75. Black beauty contests are needed to help replace white standards of beauty.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

76. Blacks should be very proud of their achievements in music and dance.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

77. Only black teachers should teach black students.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

78. Busing black students does more harm than good.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

(Instructions, please read aloud.)

These cards have the names of several groups that are or have been concerned with the problems of black people. Please hand me the cards back, one at a time, in the order of the one that has done or is doing the most to the least for black people.

79. (Hand the respondent the cards with the names of the groups.)

1st choice
2nd choice __________________________

3rd choice __________________________

4th choice __________________________

5th choice __________________________

6th choice __________________________

7th choice __________________________

8th choice __________________________

Others, specify: __________________________

(Instructions, please read aloud)

These cards have the names of several black leaders. Please hand me the cards back, one at a time, in the order of the one who is doing or has done the most to the least for black people.

80. (Hand the respondent the cards with the names of the leaders.)

1st choice __________________________

2nd choice __________________________

3rd choice __________________________

4th choice __________________________

5th choice __________________________

6th choice __________________________

7th choice __________________________

8th choice __________________________

Others, specify: __________________________

81. Would you participate in a race riot?

1. Yes
2. No.

Why? __________________________
(Instructions, please read aloud.)

Now I would like to get some general information about you.

82. What is your present age and date of birth?
   a. Present age in years: __________________
   b. Date of birth: __________________
      Month Day Year

83. In what state did you live during most of your childhood?
   Answer: ______________________________________

84. What was the racial makeup of your childhood neighborhood?
   1. All Black
   2. Mostly Black
   3. Half Black and Half White
   4. Mostly White
   5. Other, specify: __________________

85. How many times have you moved to different cities or towns?
   0. Never
   1. Once
   2. Twice
   3. Three or more times

(Note: If the respondent has never moved, skip to questions #87.)

86. (Do not ask this question if the respondent has never moved.) What is the reason for your move or moves (if for different reasons, take the reason for the most recent move).
   0. Have never moved.
   1. Due to occupational commitments.
   2. Like to move.
   3. Not happy in former community.
   4. To be nearer relatives and friends.
   5. Other, specify: __________________

87. Please give me the names of the people who live in this household, their relationship to you (son or daughter rather than child; mother or father rather than parent), what kind of work they do, and how far they went in school. Start with the head of the household.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>OCCUPATION OR AGE</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88. (If the respondent has children:) How many children did you want when you started your family?
(If the respondent does not have children:) How many children do you want when you start your family?

0. None  
1. One  
2. Two  
3. Three  
4. Four  
5. Five  
6. Six  
7. Seven  
8. Eight or more

Why?

89. How many births have you ever had?

0. None  
1. One  
2. Two  
3. Three  
4. Four  
5. Five  
6. Six  
7. Seven  
8. Eight or more
90. How many children do you have? (If the respondent does not have children, do not ask this question, circle "none" and skip to question #97.)

0. None 5. Five
1. One 6. Six
2. Two 7. Seven
3. Three 8. Eight or more
4. Four

91. Are any of these adopted or foster children?

1. Yes
2. No

92. If yes (to question #91) how many of the children are adopted or foster children?

0. None 5. Five
1. One 6. Six
2. Two 7. Seven
3. Three 8. Eight or more
4. Four

93. a. How many more children would you like to have?

0. None 5. Five
1. One 6. Six
2. Two 7. Seven
3. Three 8. Eight or more
4. Four

b. Why?

94. If you could have controlled your family size, would you have had a smaller family?

1. Yes
2. No

Please explain your answer:

95. Why do you think there is a difference between the number of children you wanted and the number you got. (Ask this question only if there is a difference between the number of children wanted and the number of children they have.)
96. What are the dates of birth of your oldest and youngest children?
   a. Date of first birth: Month_______ Day_______ Year_______
   b. Date of last birth: Month_______ Day_______ Year_______

97. What is your marital status?
   1. Never married. (Go to #102)
   2. Married, living with present spouse. (Go to #100)
   3. Married but not living with spouse, divorced or widowed. (Go
      to next question)

98. If you are separated from your spouse, what is the separation due to?
   0. Does not apply
   1. Divorced
   2. Widowed
   3. Separated for occupational reasons
   4. Separated for financial reasons (welfare, etc.)
   5. Separated for incompatibility
   6. Other reason, specify:_____________________________________

99. What has been the length of your separation from your spouse?
   Years_______, Months_______.

100. How many times have you been married?
   0. Never
   1. Once only
   2. Twice
   3. Three or more times

101. a. What was your age when you were first married?
       _______Years old

   b. When were you first married?
       Month_______ Day_______ Year_______.

102. Are you renting, buying, or do you own your own home?
   1. Renting
   2. Buying
   3. Own
103. How many people live in this home?

Number: __________

104. How much was your total family income last year?

0. $__________ $999 or less
1. $__________ $1,000 - $1,999
2. $__________ $2,000 - $3,999
3. $__________ $4,000 - $5,999
4. $__________ $6,000 - $7,999
5. $__________ $8,000 - $9,999
6. $__________ $10,000 - $11,999
7. $__________ $12,000 - $13,999
8. $__________ $14,000 - $15,999
9. $__________ $16,000 or more

105. How much do you think your total family income will be this year?

0. $__________ $999 or less
1. $__________ $1,000 - $1,999
2. $__________ $2,000 - $3,999
3. $__________ $4,000 - $5,999
4. $__________ $6,000 - $7,999
5. $__________ $8,000 - $9,999
6. $__________ $10,000 - $11,999
7. $__________ $12,000 - $13,999
8. $__________ $14,000 - $15,999
9. $__________ $16,000 or more

106. What is your usual weekly income when working?

0. $__________ $19 or less
1. $__________ $20 - $39.99
2. $__________ $40 - $74.99
3. $__________ $75 - $114.99
4. $__________ $115 - $149.99
5. $__________ $150 - $199.99
6. $__________ $200 - $229.99
7. $__________ $230 - $269.99
8. $__________ $270 - $299.99
9. $__________ $300 or more

107. How many months were you employed in 1970?

0. All year
1. Eleven
2. Ten
3. Nine
4. Eight
5. Seven
6. Six
7. Five
8. Four
9. Three or less
108. How would you classify yourself in terms of the following categories?

1. Very poor
2. Below average
3. Average middle class income
4. Well enough off
5. A very good income
6. Wealthy

109. How far did you go in school?

1. 3rd grade or less
2. 4th to 6th grade completed
3. 7th to 9th grade completed
4. 10th to 11th grade completed
5. High School Graduate
6. At least 1 year college completed (but did not graduate)
7. Junior college, technical school or business school (completed)
8. College graduate
9. Graduate school, professional training (Lawyer, etc.) (completed)

Indicate Degree received: __________
or Profession: ______________________

110. What was the religion in which you were brought up?

0. Baptist
1. Methodist
2. Episcopal
3. Presbyterian
4. Catholic
5. Lutheran
6. A.M.E.
7. Nation of Islam
8. Other, specify: ________________

111. What is your religion now?

0. Baptist
1. Methodist
2. Episcopal
3. Presbyterian
4. Catholic
5. Lutheran
6. A.M.E.
7. Nation of Islam
8. Other, specify: ________________

112. How often have you attended church in the last two years?

0. None
1. Once a year
2. One to five times every six months
3. One to three times a month
4. Once or more each week

(Instruction, please read aloud)
I am going to read you a few statements about sex education. Tell me whether you agree or disagree as I read each one.

113. If the family does not teach the child about sex, then it is the family's own fault if the child gets in trouble (girl gets pregnant or boy impregnates a girl).
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

114. Pregnancy and birth control should be taught in a course on preparation for marriage in the junior and senior high schools.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

115. It is better to learn about sex at an early age, at about the time children begin to ask questions.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

116. Elementary and secondary schools should give sex education as part of their programs.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

117. Parents and all other adults need to have training in how to teach their children about sex.
   1. Agree
   2. Disagree

(Instructions, please read aloud)

Finally, I am going to ask you a few questions about population proposals.

118. Do you feel that there is too much crowding in the United States?
   1. Yes   Do you believe that you should have fewer children to help prevent more crowding?
   2. No    Why do you think other people say that there is too much crowding?
119. Are you in favor of free publicly financed birth control assistance?
   1. Yes
   2. No  Why?

120. If there were a birth control clinic near your home, would you use it?
   1. Yes
   2. No  Why not?

121. Would you welcome someone into your home if she (or he) came to teach you how not to have a baby until you wanted one?
   1. Yes
   2. No  Why not?

122. Would you prefer that this person be black?
   1. Would have to be black
   2. Yes
   3. Doesn't make any difference
   4. No
APPENDIX B

LETTER AND SUMMARY PROPOSAL
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ABSTRACT

The general purpose of this investigation is to determine the attitudes of black American leaders toward specific present and proposed population policies. This investigation is also expected to shed some light on the determinants of such attitudes.

THE GROWING POPULATION PROBLEM

Ehrlich (1968) has presented documentation of a growing concern over the rate of population growth in the United States. With few exceptions (e.g. Coale, 1968) professionals and government officials have largely agreed that there is a serious population problem and that systematic attempts must be made to stabilize the American population (Blake, 1969).

The focus has, therefore, lately turned away from debate about whether a population problem exists to a debate about what the policy of the United States should be in responding to this situation. The increasingly numerous proposals for possible solutions cannot all be classified as proposed "Policies", but all do imply one or another general stance that the federal government should take to stabilize the population (Callahan, 1971).

METHOD OF DETERMINING ATTITUDES

The investigators will construct questionnaires and interview schedules that will tap the attitudes of individuals toward the variety of
population policies.

Two groups of respondents will comprise the subjects of this investigation. The first group will consist of national leaders of organizations, the second group will be comprised of the local leaders of those same groups.

An initial contact will be made by letter to explain the general aims of the research project and to solicit cooperation. An interview with one or more persons in a top leadership position will be arranged.

IMPLICATIONS

Population policies of the future will depend on the attitudes expressed by the citizens of the country. It is possible that population policies of certain characteristics may meet with such thorough resistance as to make them unworkable. If safeguards against overpopulation are to be workable, it will be necessary to construct policies so that individuals and groups will not feel that their well-being is threatened. Therefore, it seems especially important to ascertain the attitudes of black Americans toward the population policies that are under consideration for national adoption.