

And as Lenin's abortion program presaged the later genocidal programs, had we better not contemplate the consequences? And to identify these consequences, we had better take a look at and attempt, briefly, to tag the reasons.

We must recognize initially the fact that abortion has become monstrously casual. A New York hospital's ObGyn section has a cheery receptionist who answers the phone, "Hello, Pregnancy Interruption Service." Thousands of American women stroll nonchalantly into abortion clinics, have a baby yanked from their insides and then proceed home to cook a delightful meal for their ideal two-child family that evening. It is nothing more to them, one suspects, than spending a few desultory hours under their hair dryers.

One explanation advanced with some plausibility for this perfunctory killing is economic; i.e., decisions concerning family life--moral decisions--are now being made in America with all the pecuniary concern of shopping for a can of cut-rate peas. An economically rationalized society arrogates its exchequer morality to the sphere of human life, and questions of life and death come to be dictated by what Joseph Shumpeter called "an inarticulate system of cost accounting." That is to say that even babies are now subjected to fluctuations in supply and demand, and that their lives are literally dependent on the vagaries of the Dow Jones 40 Industrials.

Another, and related, explanation is that America's divorce from Christian morality has proceeded so far that convenience, i.e. a grotesque perception of the nature of leisure, wills that no children are to be allowed to interfere with *carpe diem*.

The principle of *non serviam*, or a desire to evade responsibility for the consequences of one's actions, has been noted before (cf. Dr. Charles Rice, *The Vanishing Right to Live*). In this regard, the now-descredited shuck of "population explosion" provided a convenient public-spirited mask for avoiding the natural ends of sex--babies. Now that this particular evasion has been debunked, we look to find, not a "population explosion" but a "copulation explosion," whereby couples freely employ sexual acts as mechanisms of mutual masturbation--indulging in the pleasure (and it is pleasure), but then proceeding to scrap the attendant responsibility.

Our Puritan heritage is far from dead. The same mindset which cringes at the thought of untrammelled breasts bouncing joyously down a campus sidewalk sees something deplorable in earthy, human things. On the other hand, Women's Lib--which purports to emancipate females from artificial convention--at the same time advocates the most unnatural stance toward human life, favoring artificial contraception and abortion. Women's Lib, indeed, could be the surreptitious arm of the Puritan auxiliary. Today devotion to the work ethic, a utilitarian outlook on family life and a tendency to see the world as the repository of all things bad are inherent in what Paul Cole Beach calls the "New Manicheism." This particular heresy--one which becomes more evident in America every day--posits the eternal conflict between spirit and matter--with

the bad guys (matter) frequently coming out on top. Thus, by this reasoning, life is so bad that it is to be avoided at all costs. Conception, babies, sex, all of these are to be run from as the plague because to bring life into a world so preternaturally malevolent would be--by the rationale of today's implicit Calvinists--the highest sin.

What we have, in sum then, is a hatred of life in America which springs, implicitly and explicitly, from a convergence of the above-mentioned and diverse factors, and which is translated even into public policy via the claptrap machinery of the democratic political process.

From whatever combination this loathing of life emerges, it can only be Bad News for Modern Man. But culpability for the Bad News will not be laid at the feet of any particular political cabal. The Nixon Administration presently is pursuing a

vigorous anti-life policy (witness the imminent 1.1 billion dollar "birth control" bill, the population commissions, Dr. Roger Egeberg's abortion statements, *ad infinitum*). But Nixon's support in this ghastly endeavor comes from Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, liberals and you name it.

The attack on life is, in short, broad-based and ferocious.

The response to it must of necessity be no less ferocious, and perhaps tactically unconventional. □

Bradley Warren Evans graduated from the University of Louisville in 1968. He is presently doing graduate work at Georgetown, and serves on the national board of Young Americans for Freedom.

The Unheavenly City

by Edward C. Banfield

Little, Brown, \$6.95

Recent years have witnessed some pleasant developments in the field of urban study, to wit the emergence of revisionists. As a matter of fact their growth in a field which had early been dominated by evangelizing charlatans almost renews my faith in the intellectual process. The city had long been the special demesne of Liberal ideologues who extinguished every problem in a gush of cool cash-money, generally from someone else's pocket. This technique has for years sustained vast populations of loving social workers inspired by self-images of the Good Fairy and offered security to big city politicoes who--in the words of Boss Plunkitt "seen (their) opportunities and took 'em." Unfortunately it failed to solve many social problems, and when in the early fifties Liberal urban planners made urban studies a profitable field for research at the major universities every intelligent taxpayer despaired for the city and prepared to move to South Dakota. Not only would our urban slums cost more but so would out academic slums. The professors proved us right. They fashioned urban renewal, model cities and all sorts of hair brained housing projects and transportation mazes until their more successful cities looked like gigantic jungle gyms with the emphasis on jungle.

But now the genius of the social strategists is under attack from revisionist scholars like Daniel P. Moynihan, James Q. Wilson and Edward Banfield. In *The Unheavenly City*, Banfield captures at least two laurels: A) he has antiquated much of the tommyrot once fatuously accepted as conventional wisdom, and B) he has vindicated much of the earlier conservative scholarship attracting long overdue prestige to the authors of this scholarship. In *The Unheavenly City* Banfield exhibits more coherent knowledge of modern urban problems than any single author has ever shown in one volume. The only book even approaching Banfield's erudition, thoughtfulness, and coherence is Daniel P. Moynihan's *Toward a National Urban Policy*.

Early in his study Banfield endeavored to think about "the problems of the city in the light of scholarly findings," whereupon he tripped across the embarrassing discovery that "the overwhelming majority of city dwellers live more comfortably and conveniently than ever before." Even the most impecunious city dwellers live more comfortably than in the past and indeed could live better still were it not for their being inflicted with the many imbecilic government programs dreamed up by persons of the middle and upper classes who wish to "do good" regardless of consequences. In asserting that most urban problems (at least those not arising from racial injustice, poverty and ignorance) are not serious (merely questions of amenity) and that society is unlikely to solve them because it simply does not want to solve them. Banfield, I believe, is subjecting Liberals to cruel and unusual punishment while nevertheless sounding an essential conservative theme--a theme sorely needed in a society psychically frazzled by its inability to feed the hungry, calm the waters and all that.

Banfield's argument is compelling. For instance today we gnash our teeth over congestion and air pollution yet blithely run about clogging the cities and fouling the atmosphere. The only way to ease urban congestion is to disperse the population, but most people do not want to live in Dog Patch. They want to live in cities where the action is, where multitudinous opportunity abounds...where congestion abounds. The same problem underlies pollution. Pollution is not caused by fate or the turning pages of history; a city's pollution is caused by the consumption of its private citizens. They can lessen pollution by giving up their automobiles for mass transportation or bicycles, paying a little more for utilities, exercising more responsibility in their purchase and use of consumer goods. But automobiles are a positive necessity in many persons' lives; the cost of living is high enough in cities already and responsibility is the concern of govern-

ments and corporations not of the average citizen. Obviously these urban problems will only be solved when people want to solve them.

Most urban problems exist because Americans judge their environment today by standards elevated over what they have been in the past. There was more crime, more poverty, and more drug addiction at the turn of the century, but people expected it. Today politicians and social reformers have induced a delirium of rising expectations amongst the citizenry and this is the most serious urban problem—people think there are dangerous problems and as with so many other problems “thinking may make it so.”

Banfield has researched his subject thoroughly using state and federal commission reports dating to the last century and a vast collection of articles and books by the most sophisticated economists, sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists and so forth. His careful research impels him to distinguish these urban problems from what he terms the urban crisis—a most troubling phenomenon and no less resistant to solution. To understand the urban crisis one must understand that the city has grown according to three imperatives: demographic, technological and economic. But the disfigured remains of this growth—slums in which “the style of life is squalid and vicious”—were not prefigured solely by these “growth imperatives” nor by radical and economic dissimilarities, but by the presence of four cultures within the city—to wit: upper class, middle class, working class and lower class. Delineating these

cultures by their inhabitants’ psychological orientation towards the future, Banfield shows that all four classes are equally disgusting; one class causes the “urban crisis.”

According to the author, a member of the upper class, the class most future-oriented, looks ever to the horizon planning for “the future of his children, grandchildren, great grandchildren....” Expressing concern for “the future of such abstract entities as the community, nation, or mankind...,” he is confident he can “shape the future to accord with his purposes.” Here the thoughtful reader will be reminded of the late Joseph P. Kennedy and his apparent purpose of transforming the American republic into a monarchy. Frankly I was reminded of John Lindsay, Lord Mayor of New York, whose “purpose” it seems is to turn New York into a grand rest and rehabilitation center for idealistic young revolutionaries (sort of the Havana of North America), and whose success would be at hand were it not for the idealism of what must be the finest young generation of hard hats in American history. Successively Banfield describes the less future-oriented middle class, a class that is conscious of the future and confident of its influence on it. Then, the working class which—though even less future-oriented and not likely to “invest as heavily in the future”—appears from Banfield’s description the least disgusting. And finally Banfield describes the most disgusting class of all—the lower class which lives “from moment to moment,” unconcerned about providing beyond immediate bodily needs, incapable of

skilled or routine work, burdened with self-contempt, anti-social and often mentally ill. This is the class which provides the city most bountifully with its crimes and disorder. It is the source of the “urban crisis.” Every time Banfield mentioned this lower class my mind beheld visions of David Brinkley and teeming tenement houses infested with network news commentators contributing to delinquency of every sort. In fact the life led by a member of the lower class is so chaotic, with a system of values so primitive and anomalous that Banfield considers members of all the other classes “normal” by comparison.

All other assertions in *The Unheavenly City* revolve about this axis. Urbanologists must understand the intransigence of present-oriented persons if they are ever to solve the urban crisis. Yet as most urbanologists come from future-oriented cultures, they cannot imagine its lifestyle and assuredly will not recognize it. Hence the urban planner will have very little success easing the urban crisis, and urban problems will probably be around for as long as the lower class multiplies and continues to set up office on street corners and sagging front porches.

Our cities have always contained persons of the lower class whose primitive lifestyles were never consonant with the majority’s “future-oriented virtues of self-discipline and denial, industry, thrift, and respect for law and order.” Tumult has always existed in the “squalid and vicious” neighborhoods (slums) of the lower class. But it is only recently with the continuing middle-class-ification of American life and its concomitant “elevation of standards” that the harshness of present-oriented lives has attracted so much flabbergasted concern.

Now concern for one’s fellow man is admirable and even socially necessary, but we should not confuse concern with wisdom much less with virtue. Often those who pour forth most profusely on urban problems are pathological reformers and political mountebanks. The solving of urban problems depends first on sound analysis and then on the capacity to act on that analysis. As earlier implied, Banfield finds the contemporary analysis of urban problems invalid and often arrantly tendentious. Neglecting the significance of the urban population’s cultural differences, most analysts fail to account for the three “conceptual distinctions” characteristic of the lower class which Banfield calls: cognitive, situational and volitional.

Cognitively present-oriented persons lack even the concepts by which people anticipate or prepare for a future. Such persons are not only psychologically unable to conceive a future but are also incapable of controlling their impulses. On the other hand a situationally present-oriented person can control his impulses and conceive the future, but he feels his present situation renders investment in the future unprofitable or impossible. A volitionally present-oriented person is disciplined, able to conceive a future, and lives in a situation where investment in the future strikes him as both possible and profitable. Nonetheless he prefers the present-oriented life. On the streets



present-oriented persons generally mix these three analytical classifications, making the task of the urban planner about as feasible as that of Sisyphus. In fact Banfield feels that the more ambitious urban planners have undertaken a labor unto eternity, for "so long as the city contains a sizable lower class, nothing basic can be done about its most serious problems. Good jobs may be provided for all, still some will remain chronically unemployed. Slums may be demolished, but if the housing that replaces them is occupied by the lower class it will shortly be turned into new slums." Misery will endure the increase of welfare payments or the cunning of the negative income tax, and ignorance will prove immune to the most advanced educational concepts. Violence will exist amidst whole armies of armored gendarmes.

The real tragedy is that the working-class people (the people intent on providing a future for their families) must--often due to racial prejudice or misfortune--live in fear in neighborhoods shared with the lower class. Apparently the present-oriented you always have with you. Our only hope lies in Mrs. Robinson, Mr. Jones and the continued "middle-class-ification" of America.

Great American Series

It has been the unfortunate weakness of both liberalism and liberal Christianity that they have easily degenerated into sentimentality by refusing to contemplate the tragic aspects of human existence honestly.

Reinhold Niebuhr

And what of the "massive programs," the "dream cities," and the grand strategies of Washington's urban planners? Well as the saying goes, you cannot build a highrise Utopia on faulty analysis. Stating at the outset that most analyses of the urban problem are unsound, it should surprise no one that Banfield considers our present programs ineffective. But the irrepressible Banfield goes further, insisting that the present programs actually exacerbate urban problems and contribute to the urban crisis. Minimum wage laws force low productivity and unskilled labor out of work. Unions which coerce business to employ low-producing labor at more than it is worth cause diminution of job opportunities for unskilled labor. Local, state and federal agencies which driven by ideology--set "enlightened wage policies," pay labor more than it is worth thereby attracting skilled labor and prompting unskilled labor from simple jobs--often the only jobs an unskilled laborer is capable of holding. Ultimately all that these programs harvest is inflation, unemployment, unbalanced markets and unrest.

Even our educational programs are more likely to produce urban problems than to eliminate them. Banfield feels that educators must distinguish between intractable, present-oriented students and normal students. When students lack motivation to learn they are as likely to learn as a snake is to strut. Motivation to learn is not characteristic of the lower-class student, and he is less educable than

is his classmate of another culture. Sociologists have found that education "does not liberate the child from his class culture but instead confines him in it more securely." Thus in slum schools where lower-class children (often blacks) are, until age sixteen, meaninglessly incarcerated with the more future-oriented working-class students, the lower-class students grow frustrated, psychologically isolated, and--in spite of education's reputed magic--they become nuisances to serious students, ultimately becoming social problems.

And there are other programs which usher in more problems than they resolve. Urban renewal, designed to create cheap housing, has created the cheapest housing of all--no housing. For though urban renewal is wondrously efficient at bulldozing housing, it has not been very provident in replacing that housing, and what housing it does replace is inevitably more expensive. Then too the FHA, the VA and the highway construction program have aggravated urban problems, making the life of the poor just that much more unpleasant. If the demagogic politicians who thunder about hungry children would attempt to understand the peculiar kind of poverty existing in our cities, some progress might be made. But this is unlikely. The Americans who once loved a circus now love a crisis. Nowadays it is almost impossible to discern which "crisis" is a crucial turning point for society and which is merely another opportunity to sell more newspapers, peddle more moonshine and stick one's snout into another man's business.

Consider the "drop-out crisis" which Banfield alludes to but does not elaborate on. In 1900 almost everyone "dropped out" of school, yet no one considered it a crisis. In the sixties the majority of boys and girls graduated from high school; almost everyone received some high school education. Throughout the sixties the

situation continued to improve while every newspaper in the land roared luridly about the "drop-out crisis." So we fashioned all ilk of programs to meet the drop-out crisis and are finally turning the corner on it, filling the high schools with every species of scoundrel and jackass, and behold now we are told America is in the dawn of a new crisis-- "Crisis in Our High Schools."

Banfield stresses that Americans have always had to fuss about one thing or another. If they are not making the world safe for democracy they are prohibiting ardent spirits, fashioning world governments, begetting a nation of saints or attempting to legislate away Original Sin. Banfield plots America's obsession to "do good" back to its origins in the upper class's service mentality. These are the persons who originally relieved their anxieties by reforming penitentiaries and laughing farms, and who now wish to initiate the censorship of breakfast cereal packages while plunging into the urban crisis by sipping cocktails with idealistic Black Panthers. As Banfield cogently argues, this obsession to "do good" often does "bad" at everyone's expense.

In the case of the cities the upper-class do-gooders will be doing it for years to come. Every conservative should read Banfield's book as a program for urban chaos. And if you are unable to arrest the bungling progress of your do-gooder neighbor, well read Banfield again, pull up your chairs and devour the show. Our urban crisis will be with us for several more seasons and Banfield knows its plot thoroughly.

R. Emmett Tyrell, Jr.

R. Emmett Tyrell, Jr. is an itinerant golf caddy and political editor of THE NATIONAL TATTLER. He has recently written a long, dreary essay published in some book called Youth Manifesto (Macmillan).



THE INTERCOLLEGIATE REVIEW

Contributors to recent issues:

- Raymond Aron
- William C. Bark
- General Andre Beaufre
- Louis I. Bredvold
- Yale Brozen
- Lev E. Dobriansky
- M. Stanton Evans
- Lawrence Henry Gipson
- Ernest van den Haag
- Will Herberg
- William R. Kintner
- Russell Kirk
- Wm. Oliver Martin
- Ludwig von Mises
- Gerhart Niemeyer
- Stefan T. Possony
- Leo Strauss
- Robert Strausz-Hupe
- Frank N. Trager
- Eric Voegelin
- Simon N. Whitney
- Francis G. Wilson

A journal of scholarship and opinion publishing articles in the fields of philosophy, political science, economics, literature and social criticism. THE INTERCOLLEGIATE REVIEW is made available free of charge to faculty and students four times during the academic year by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute. Subscriptions are invited from those outside the academic community: one year, five dollars; two years, eight dollars; three years, eleven dollars. Subscriptions and inquiries should be addressed to: ISI, 14 South Bryn Mawr Avenue, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010.

The Sham of the Cities

Toward a National Urban Policy

edited by Daniel P. Moynihan

Basic Books, \$7.95

Now as the responsible editor that I am, I must caution my fellow students against leaping impulsively into Banfield. Bearing in mind the warm bath of platitude and fatuity which our professors have prepared for the discussion of social problems, an unconditioned reading of Banfield would be like a reckless plunge into icewater—it could place a perilous strain on one's system. Thankfully, *Toward a National Urban Policy*, edited by Daniel P. Moynihan, will acclimate students for Banfield.

It is an admirable collection of essays embracing every aspect of urban life. Population trends, housing, crime and the problems of local government are but some of the subjects discussed in the book's twenty-five essays—though not all the essays are of symmetrical quality, and some are redundant.

There is the ever-engaging Mr. Moynihan, who writes poignantly about the hysterical rhetoric of "crisis," and the lingering "Themes in Urban Experience" of violence, migration, wealth (relatively speaking, everyone's), mobility, intellectual disdain and ugliness. Moynihan discusses the ambiguous patrimony of technology, which brings us more rapid personal transportation, more comfortable housing, dilated opportunity...pollution. Sounding—in his preliminary essay—many of Banfield's contentions, Moynihan disagrees with Banfield on others. He exhorts Americans to develop a "national urban policy," for "ought not the vast efforts to control the situation of the present, be at least informed by some sense of goals for the future?" As always Moynihan is provocative.

Another first-rate essay in this collection is that of James Q. Wilson, whose clinical analysis of urban crime will both silence the shrieks of those crime fighters whose comfort depends on evermore lush governmental subsidies, and agonize the thalidomide intellectuals, who from their sanctuaries at Berkeley or Ann Arbor or his own Harvard, are eternally confusing the criminal with the criminal's victim and playing make-believe with the lives of urban folk. Wilson's essay is a masterful composition of profundity and compactness, eloquence and good sense. He is about the soundest student of urban crime and crime prevention writing from the campuses today. And if you doubt my claims to his intelligence, I refer you to *The New York Review of Books*, 5 November 1970, where his latest book (*Varieties of Police Behavior*, Atheneum) brought tears to the eyes and water to the pen of that iron-jawed realist, Mr. Murray Kempton.

As always Nathan Glazer and Martin Meyerson are thoughtful and engaging. But as I said at the outset, this collection has just enough cool revisionist thought to stimulate serious students, while its

discussion of poverty, education, racism and economics is warmed by the familiar academic nonsense which suffuses so many classrooms and editorial tabernacles these days.

Take Lee Rainwater's essay, "Poverty in the United States." In discussing the reality of American poverty, he admirably refrains from *The New Republic* editorialists' technique of going for the reader's funny bone, and instead intelligently concludes that "what is called poverty in the United States is a relative matter—relative to time and place and how well off the rest of the population is—and not a question of some absolute level of subsistence..." which is to say that contrary to the fabulists of poverty, American poverty is a matter of relative deprivation not destitution.

Further he exonerates American capitalism at least by implication in admitting that over the past twenty years the proportion of families who would be considered poor (in absolute terms) has been cut in half. When we lament poverty in America we are not—if we know what we are talking about—lamenting a social injustice; we are remarking on a social problem, or rather congeries of social problems. For what frustrates and perplexes the liberal and the Middle Americano is the lower-class individual's deviant behavior (crime, illegitimacy, disease). Clearly Rainwater knows what he is talking about. But the rub comes over what he is talking for. Rainwater's vision has fixed on *The Solution* to poverty, and as he leads us through his essay his discussion evolves into an argument, thence a screed. Rainwater realizes that the greatest problem with a poverty of relative deprivation is not that babies are suffering the distended bellies of the Ibo, but that "the poor and near poor (lower class) live a life somewhat separated from that of the stable working- and middle-class members of the society." *The Solution* to this separation is socioeconomic "Togetherness"—variously called, in lands across the sea, "socialism and communism." But supposedly everyone lives equally well. The only trouble is that some live a little more well, namely the politicians, bureaucrats and police. And the rest live less well; bureaucracy—as the Russian communists and the British socialists have proven—is ignominiously inefficient.

Now as the British are dismantling their socialistic contraptions and the crafty Russians are quietly switching over to free enterprise, proponents of socialism have a difficult task. And not surprisingly Rainwater's argument becomes a little tacky and even evasive towards the end. He asserts that studies during the Depression found that families in which the husband was not a stable wage earner showed a high incidence of desertion and divorce. Thus he concludes that impoverished families dissolve because of lack of income. Unfortunately more recent studies of slum life in New York discovered that when impoverished families enjoyed income accretions either from welfare or wages, the rate of desertion was even higher. Now I cannot believe Rainwater is unfamiliar with such studies. Rather the author—like the saints

—has beheld a revelation (this time concerning poverty) and is duty-bound to convert us to his brand of swamp root. Unfortunately I fear poverty is more difficult than Rainwater's spirits would have us believe.

Another essay in this collection whose rhetoric will have a familiar smack is Mr. Robert Dentler's "The Challenge of Urban Education in the United States." Early in his essay Dentler states that some of the obstacles to better urban education have been bureaucracy and the inability of school systems to show tolerance for different approaches to teaching.

Several pages later Mr. Dentler spies the answer to improved education: that is, the "gradual emergence of a national coalition pressing for a system of education with relatively uniform standards of excellence but with a high tolerance for different approaches to teaching and learning," which is to say a bureaucracy which does not act like a bureaucracy. Oh well, perhaps Mr. Dentler will find his beautiful beast atop the snowy reaches of the Himalayas.

At any rate this collection will give you a glimpse of an enormously complicated network of problems. If nothing else it will give you an appreciation for the orneriness of urban problems and maybe a sympathy for those who have tried to deal with them in the past.

R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.

Mrs. Robinson in '72

The Real Majority

by

Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg

Coward-MacCann, \$7.95

The election of 1970 was preceded by a number of interpretive works on the American electorate. Kevin Phillips articulated the conservative dream in *The Emerging Republican Majority*. Samuel Lubell updated his *Future of American Politics* with a *Crisis of Confidence*. Professor Galbraith asked us *Who needs the Democrats*, and proceeded to sketch his new majority several degrees left of the present national Democratic party. Finally, Richard Scammon, probably the country's foremost psychologist, combines with Ben Wattenberg to set up straight on what really is *The Real Majority*. It has been a remarkably influential book.

The central thesis of the book rests on the premise that if the President is able to wind down the war and relatively stabilize the economy, Presidential elections throughout the coming decade will turn on the "social issue." First discovered by Goldwater and Wallace, the social issue is now the issue on which Middle America will vote, provided one candidate is on the "wrong" side. This social issue embraces drugs, demonstrations, pornography, riots, "kidlash" and crimes. The authors hold that voters will not tolerate a "liberal" on these issues, and will vote against soft candidates—a truth amply demonstrated by Daley in Chicago, Maier in Milwaukee and most notably Stenvig in Minneapolis and Yorty in Los Angeles.

The *Real Majority* we are told is "in