Some on horseback, some on foot. ... We ran with the children to try to hide them in the long grass but they found us. Some children were as little as seven years old. Some died of thirst ... they were not given any water .... "You might expect that, given the U.S. history of slavery and the guilty conscience about this issue manifested by President Clinton during his Africa trip, the current enslavement of black Africans in Sudan—an atrocity whose bare outlines are suggested by the above report—would merit some attention, especially among civil rights groups. You might expect it. But you'd be wrong.

As Charles Jacobs, the director of the American Anti-Slavery Group, laments, "Every schoolchild in America knows that women have been raped in Bosnia ... Everyone knows the whales have to be saved. But no one seems to realize you can buy a black woman as a slave for as little as $15 in Khartoum.

Jacobs says that almost everywhere his organization has turned in the previous three and a half years—the eminent human rights agencies, the women's groups, the church councils, the civil rights coalitions—they have encountered the same response: Yes, we know about the slaves. No, we're not prepared to fight for their freedom. Augustine A. Lado, president of the human rights group Pax Sudani Network, said the Congressional Black Caucus, Trans-Africa, the Rainbow Coalition, and the Nation of Islam have "forsaken us .... " Charles Jacobs adds "For two years we tried to get Reverend Jesse Jackson on the record against slavery. ... " He "returned our document packages unopened." (In explaining why Jackson wouldn't even give an anti-slavery statement, an aide explained that the Rev. "is busy with affirmative action ... right now slavery is not on his agenda.") We know how affirmative action works. What about modern black slavery? In Sudan the real power is HassanTurabi, leader of the National Islamic Front. The western-educated Turabi is leading a program of Islamization through genocide. The regime eradicates any non-Islamic expressions or people (and Muslims who disagree) and controls the food supply of refugees dumped in the desert. Non-Muslims are given the choice of converting to Islam or being denied food, clothing, and shelter. The unconverted are left to die, naked in the blazing sun. And for the converted there is no turning back: Sudan applies the death penalty to anyone who tries to leave Islam.

Continued on page 8

Futile Care Theory and Medical Fascism
The Duty to Die
by Wesley J. Smith

"My mother's doctor is refusing to give her antibiotics," the woman caller told me in an urgent voice. "Why is he refusing to prescribe antibiotics?" I asked.

"He says that she's 92 and an infection will kill her sooner or later. So, it might as well be this infection."

As disturbing as this call was, and as outrageous the doctor's behavior, I wasn't particularly surprised. I have been receiving such calls with increasing frequency over the last several years. Not every day. Not every week. But with enough regularity to know that something frightening is happening to American medical ethics.

There was the case of the Indiana teenager whose doctor refused to treat the boy's 107 degree fever because he was severely brain damaged from an auto accident. Had the boy's father not been a powerful corporate executive capable of bringing great pressure to bear on the doctor, the boy would have died. Today, the young man is conscious, back home, and slowly recovering.

Then there was the Oregon woman whose nursing home doctor placed a DNR (Do Not Resuscitate) order on her medical chart over her and her family's objections. Even though the patient was competent to decide for herself, it took a lawyer's threat of litigation to get the DNR removed from the chart.

Lawsyers were also required by the brother of a Colorado woman with brain cancer. When he insisted on continuing treatment after the disease went into remission—a decision with which his sister agreed—the health insurer sued to disqualify him as the surrogate decision-maker. Not only that, threats were made to charge the family for the entire cost of treatment. The case ended when the woman died after surgery to repair a severe bed sore.

These cases show that something is rotten in 
Dark Side of Dogpatch

Peter Collier ("The Long National Nightmare," February 1993) reflects a common view that Clinton's strength in his current difficulties is the strength of the economy. It is useful to recall that Hitler's strength in bending the German people to his will was also the strength of the economy, which, with military measures, did pull Germany out of the pit of the Great Depression. In the Clinton situation, however, the President's policies are not obviously major contributors to current economic health. Many very favorable factors are at work for which he has no responsibility. The end of the Cold War bolstered the economy by reducing military expenditures, and gave the entire society a burst of self-confidence. Another sharp boost was due to surging computer use that is permeating the entire economy and stimulating innovation at an extraordinary pace, creating new opportunities, new efficiencies, new productivity, new needs in every direction. Another factor in our affluence is major enlargement of the work force as more women go to work. Of course as more women enter the work force, sexual harassment at work becomes an ever bigger concern, and that is a problem to which President Clinton's contribution is distinctly negative. In fact, it has led one Clinton defender, Gloria Steinem, to assert on the op-ed page of the New York Times that anything sexual can go on in the workplace as long "as there is no coercion." In short, according to Steinem, the sexual ethic of the workplace is the same as the sexual ethic of a bar, bedroom, or dating bureau. So what workplace can Madame Steinem be talking about as a model, where, after all, anything consensual goes? Bordello. Bordello, of course, are just such workplaces. That redacto ad bordello, is where Clinton's allies may eventually find themselves, and when that is finally realized, Clinton may be on his way out. His departure might produce a down-ticket in the stock market, but it won't last, while the up-ticket in the dignity and security of women in the workplace would endure.

Lawrence Crumberg
Austin, TX

You are just a bit off on your target on the Clinton administration, You should lambaste Skunk Hollow, not Dogpatch. The late Al Capp, creator of L'il Abner, would be a bit miffed because he did a number on the S.W.I.N.E. (Students Wildly Indignant About Nearly Everything) back in the '60s. And the letters came to hate him just as they hate you. He lost clients (papers) because of it. See if you can find someone my age (I'm 72) who remembers. You might even find preserved copies of the L'il Abner strips of that time. They were a gas. More power to you.

Dick Mallow
Cinninaminsh, NJ

For the Record

The third column of the first page of Paul Mulshine's article on the School of the Americas, "The War in Central America Continues," in the February issue contains the following, "I make a habit of listening to WQXR, a public radio station in New York City that is retransmitting the Marxist line with a side order of New Age diet and health tips!" For the record, WQXR is the radio station of the New York Times. Its format is classical top 40. The editorial policy is closely aligned with that of the newspaper. They do not read the headlines or the titles of the op-ed page, the radio station and its chief sponsor, Citibank, disclaim any responsibility for those opinions. Although the newspaper of record has declined precipitously over the years, one must be several cans short of a six pack to describe their line as Marxist. The premier public radio station in New York City is WWNYC. This venerable bastion of mayoral patronage is also a classical radio station. Their editorial opinion, as expressed in their AM talk shows, is aligned with that of the Upper West Side Jewish intelligentsia for which New York City is so justly famous. These are the sort of people for whom all weapons may be divided into two categories, assault and nuclear, and for whom any financial transaction in which one of the parties is not the government is immediately suspect. The radio station that Mr. Mulshine is no doubt referring to is WBAI, part of the Pacifica network. Although they receive an ungodly amount of federal funding, they are not a public radio station.

Rebecca Greene
Hawthorne, NJ

It doesn't seem to me that Drudge made a care­less error, rather that he couldn't have cared less if what he had to "report" was true. Other media outlets have also had to pay a price for their own overzealous reporting. A "careless" error would be, say, writing something, not intending to publish it, and accidentally it gets published. What would conserva­tivs think if someone told someone like Drudge that Nancy Reagan was a lesbian and he reported that?

It often times seems, from national on down to local elections, that Republicans are planting false sex stories. Or false stories in general, as inherited from Sen. Joe ("I have a list of names in my hand") McCarthy. You have an interesting take on things, just a little out of step.

Evan Roffheart
Via Internet

Interesting article on Drudge and Blumenthal. The only saving grace here is that with the end of the Clinton administration, in a few years or less, we will no longer have to hear Mr. Blumenthal's presence. What a sleaze!

Carl Gotlieb
Via Internet

In a banana republic the rule of law is inevitably accompanied by a knowing sneer and a hefty transfer of funds. If Clinton continues to operate under the premise that the rule of law does not apply to him, why, pray tell, is the United States of America any different from a banana republic? How can the U.S. ever again have the hope of being the moral exemplar to the rest of the world when, because of Clinton's actions, we now have no legitimate moral grounds from which to preach? Good thing I like bananas on my Grapenuts.

Nancy Morgan
Redondo Beach, CA

1984 on Speed

I am writing to commend you for the 15 Tips on How to Be a Good Leftist. It is hilarious, and oh-so-true. Although I've always been conservative, gravitating to libertarianism in the political sphere, I was a child of the '60s, and Mr. Glasson's description of a Good Leftist left me breathless with laughter. While I am regaining my breath, let me just add that Horowitz and Collier besides being insightful analysts—are really very good writers. As for Judith Weiner: Like all good libertarians I was going to wait for competition to drive the price down of her book Stranger Than Fact. However, her columns are just too darn good. Reading them is like visiting 1984 on speed.

Bryan Tapits
Cincinnati, OH
REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM

BAWANA DEVIL: In his foreign affairs equivalent of a good old fashioned minstrel show, Bill Clinton has felt the pain of Africa. And felt their pain—and felt their pain. He apologized for tyrannical governments. Mandela denounced the hands with Nelson Mandela and smiled as Africans were willing co-conspirators. He—

APRIL FOOLS: Hysteria was unleashed among higher academics on April 1 when UC Berkeley and UCLA, the two “elite” campuses of the University of California system, announced, in black-bordered scrawl language, that there had been a large drop in admissions for the fall semester among “non-Asian minorities.” The Orwellian implications of the term “non-Asian minorities” are obvious. It allows a mixed story—Asian enrollment actually increased—to be played as a monochromatic social tragedy. Moreover, the spin doctors in UC administration, still fighting a rear action against Proposition 209, made sure that a glass that was half full—there was a significant increase in black and Hispanic enrollment at two other UC campuses—UC Riverside and UC Santa Cruz—was portrayed as being all the way empty by the press. (It was left to Ward Connerly to point out the moral. The drop in black and Hispanic admissions, the UC Regent said, shows that instead of just being “a factor,” race has been the dominant factor in affirmative action admissions.) That this was actually a success story rather than a dismal tribute to the racism of those who voted to ban race preferences in 1996 could be seen in the words of students quoted in an otherwise apocalyptic New York Times article about the UC situation. Gabriel Escobar, 18, a Mexican-American, told the Times reporter that he had already been accepted to the University of California at Davis and Santa Barbara but was waiting to hear from Berkeley. “Since I was a little kid I’ve wanted to go to Berkeley,” he said. “With affirmative action preferences, I would have a real chance of being accepted.”

LUNA BEACH By Carl Moore

THE DISMISSAL OF THE PAULA JONES CASE SHOWS OUR SYSTEM OF JUSTICE WORKS.

IN AMERICA, SLEAZY ALLEGATIONS WILL NOT BE REWARDED IN THE END, JUSTICE WILL PREVAIL.

RIGHT, HONEY?

AH!

PERIOD PIECES: Grabbing attention a recent faculty art exhibit at Georgia's Augusta State University were two offerings from art professor James Rosen. One consisted of three rows of sanitary napkins, each festooned with a red dot. It was called "Period Piece." A similar work involving tampons, was dubbed "Blood Sweat & Tears." The works were allegedly an homage to the late French Dadaist Marcel Duchamp, whose "Fountain" (1917) was simply a urinal placed on end. Rosen describes his work under the pseudonym "Melissa Levy," (sic) a play on "c'est la vie" and a reference to the alias favored by Duchamp, "Rosse Selvy" (sic). If Rosen was expecting plaudits from the postmodernist crowd, he must have been disappointed. While most observers might have wondered "But is it art?" some activists on campus took issue with Rosen for being just a little too avant-garde. The works were truly been produced by a woman they would have praiseworthy "feminist" art. Since he was a man, they said, the works were just tasteless.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION: In June the number 226 will join 187 and 209 on the liberals' short list to be demonized as evangelicals demonize 666. Proposition 226, the Campaign Reform Initiative, is shaping up to be the hottest political issue in the country that does not involve oral sex. Dubbed the Paycheck Protection Initiative, Prop. 226 would require unions to get a member's permission before spending his dues money on political activities. It's a simple idea and it seems unexceptionable—it is the individual union member's money, after all. But unions see it as Armageddon. They zealously guard their right to confiscate members' dues for political purposes the same way members of the Ku Klux Klan guard their right to put their mothers in a black robe. While 40 percent of union households vote Republican, but 98 percent of union campaign money goes to Democrats. When a similar initiative passed in Michigan in 1982, 78 percent of union households voted against a similar initiative passed by California's Proposition 226.
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Homophobia Is Not Jim Crow

The Rage of a Privileged Class
by Norah Vincent

Today, most gay men still consider themselves an oppressed minority. Their advocacy groups, in fact, are committed to fostering the belief that gays now live in a world where they are secure in the mainstream of the civil rights movement. Consider, for example, the gay world's most high-profile fund-raiser, the Human Rights Campaign's annual gala held last November in Washington. Headlining this event were President Clinton and Ellen Degeneres, both of whom gave speeches decri ing homophobia and lauding the work of their venerable hosts. Clinton was careful not to pose too close to Ellen, and more careful still to work the crowd's soft spot for the first chief executive who deigned to address them.

But Bennett was right, whatever his motives, and right is right. It's hopeless partisan to deny the truth when you dislike the source. I think that blacks have cause to resent homosexuality as Bennett's, and their views are scarcely more remote from, say, 11 p.m. to 3 a.m.

Representatives of the Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC) were there at the Human Rights Campaign dinner, the ubiquitous sponsors of the best party in anytown, U.S.A. (Miami to New York, Washington to L.A.), that supremely well-endowed AIDS advocacy group just moved into its swank new nine-story Chelsea home on W. 24th St. The GMHC has an overall budget of $35 million, all of which they spend on programs and services, none of which they give for AIDS research.

The American Cancer Society, for purposes of comparison, has a budget of $440 million. If you subtract the cost of the American Cancer Society for the bad behavior of individuals. The same false argument has been made over and over. First they've banished the prejudices from which the rest of us suffer. Witness, however, as I said above, that the queer elite (the attendees of the HRC dinner) is comprised largely of wealthy white men who rarely if ever fraternize with people of color, and who, by and large, have no use for women, except a certain class of divas and vamps, who are redeemed only by their love for men, or, ridiculous as it sounds, by the way they dress. Whether they'll admit it or not, and impolitic as it is to say, a great many gay men are young minorities who run shrieking back to their hermetic world at the mere mention of menstruation.

The notion that blacks have cause to resent homosexuality is a delusion. The same false argument has been made over and over. First they've banished the prejudices from which the rest of us suffer. Witness, however, as I said above, that the queer elite (the attendees of the HRC dinner) is comprised largely of wealthy white men who rarely if ever fraternize with people of color, and who, by and large, have no use for women, except a certain class of divas and vamps, who are redeemed only by their love for men, or, ridiculous as it sounds, by the way they dress. Whether they'll admit it or not, and impolitic as it is to say, a great many gay men are young minorities who run shrieking back to their hermetic world at the mere mention of menstruation.
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The American Cancer Society, for purposes of comparison, has a budget of $440 million. If you subtract the cost of the American Cancer Society for the bad behavior of individuals. The same false argument has been made over and over. First they've banished the prejudices from which the rest of us suffer. Witness, however, as I said above, that the queer elite (the attendees of the HRC dinner) is comprised largely of wealthy white men who rarely if ever fraternize with people of color, and who, by and large, have no use for women, except a certain class of divas and vamps, who are redeemed only by their love for men, or, ridiculous as it sounds, by the way they dress. Whether they'll admit it or not, and impolitic as it is to say, a great many gay men are young minorities who run shrieking back to their hermetic world at the mere mention of menstruation.
STEEL CHAMBER

In the world of affluence, where the rich are greedy for more wealth, and the poor are greedy for more...
Karl Marx at the L.A. Times
by David Horowitz

It is the 150th anniversary year since the publication of *The Communist Manifesto*. To commemorate the occasion, the Los Angeles Times Book Review organized a symposium of experts and asked them to assess its significance in light of all that has happened since it was written. I was one of those asked to contribute and I submitted the following 256-word article. The symposium appeared on Sunday, February 8, 1998, along with half my article: The opening statement of Marx's famous Manifesto, that the history of mankind is the history of class struggle, is really the essence and sum of its message. This message is above all a call to arms. According to Marx, democratic societies are not really different in kind from the aristocratic and slave societies that preceded them. Like their predecessors, liberal societies are divided into classes that oppress them. The solution to social problems lies in a civil war that will tear society apart and create a new revolutionary world from its ruins.

This idea of Marx has proven to be as wrong as any idea ever conceived and more destructive in its consequences than any intellectual failure in the history of mankind: Since the Manifesto was written 150 years ago, 100 million people have been killed in its name. Between 10 and 20 times that number have been condemned to lives of unnecessary misery and human anguish, deprived of the life chances afforded the most humble citizens of the industrial democracies that Marxists set out to destroy.

Marx was a brilliant intellect and a seductive stylist, and many of his insights look reasonable enough, on paper. But the evil they have wrought on those who fell under their practical sway far outweighs any possible intellectual gain. It would be a healthy development for everyone, rich and poor alike, if future generations put Karl Marx's Manifesto on the same sinister shelf as Mein Kampf and other destructive products of the human mind.

The request for my contribution had come from the editor of the Book Review, Steve Wasserman, an old radical friend from Berkeley. Wasserman had been a political protege of Tom Hayden and Los Angeles Times correspondent Robert Scheer when they were leaders of the "Red Family" and were running around quoting Mao Tse-tung and Kim Il Sung, while attempting to organize "guerrilla fronts" in American cities. They hoped to launch a "war of liberation" in America, and Wasserman was one of their foot soldiers. Inspired by texts like the Manifesto, the Red Family practiced with weapons at local firing ranges and planned for the day when they would abolish private property and smash the bourgeois state. It was therefore of some interest to me how Wasserman would treat the Manifesto now that he was an editor of one of the largest metropolitan newspapers in America.

After the failure of the revolutionary hopes that the '60s encouraged, Wasserman had gone into the literary world and become the editor of Times Books, a New York publishing house, before arriving at the Times. I kept in touch with him from a distance over the years. Although chastened by his experience in the revolution, he remained a member of the intellectual traditions and political ambitions that had unleashed its destructive energies. So I was curious and interested when he called me to this task.

Wasserman requested a piece assessing the Manifesto in 250 words. At 256 words, the article I submitted was six over his specification. But when it came to publishing the piece, he cut the first one hundred and twenty-six words, so that the copy available to 1 million Times subscribers began with the sentence in the middle paragraph that reads "Since the Manifesto was written 150 years ago ...". The part of the article that described the sinister message of the Manifesto as an incitement to civil war and pointed out the falsehood of all its major claims did not appear.

Wasserman had not indicated to me his true design, which eventually required that space be taken from my piece and given to others. He had told me that the symposium would include six or seven writers, and I assumed that each would have two hundred and fifty words. Not so. The "symposium" of mini-essays was actually appended to a two-page spread with a picture of Marx and a poem by the German Communist Bertolt Brecht. It featured a 3,000-word essay that celebrated the wisdom and prescience of a prophetic masterpiece. This lead article was written by Eric Hobsbawm, an unreconstructed Marxist who had joined the British Communist Party in the 1920s and remained a member through the 1960s and all the slaughter of innocents along the way. Hobsbawm's worshipful paean to the Manifesto was the real inspiration with which the Times editor wanted to leave his readers.

For leftists like Hobsbawm, the nightmare of Soviet Communism was only "actually existing socialism" and not "real socialism." Therefore, it had little to with Marx. My comments about one hundred million people being killed were obviously beside the point, even though Marxists like Hobsbawm had done the killing and had justified it to fellow travelers and credulous followers in the West. For Hobsbawm, the Manifesto was not really a historical document. It was a living prophecy, correctly analyzing the dynamics of capitalist societies and providing a vision of the social future. The concession Hobsbawm was willing to make was that Marx was not correct in predicting that the proletariat would be the carrier of revolutionary truth: "At the end of the millennium we must be struck by the acuteness of the Manifesto's vision of the then remote future of a massively globalized capitalism..." But, "it is now evident that the bourgeoisie has not produced 'above all, its own gravestenders' in the proletariat."

The error is of no consequence, however. The Manifesto's central theme remains that democratic capitalism must be destroyed or it will destroy us. Even the failure of Communism only strengthens this idea, according to Hobsbawm: "The Manifesto— it is not the least of its remarkable qualities—is a document that envisaged failure. It hoped that the outcome of capitalist development would be a 'revolutionary reconstitution of society at large'; but, as we have already seen, it did not exclude the alternative condition: ruin." Many years later another Marxist repudiated this as the choice between socialism and barbarity. Which of these will prevail is a question which the 21st Century must be left to answer.

In other words the democratic society we inhabit, with living standards higher and living conditions better for the vast majority of its citizens than have been available to any other people since the beginning of time, is no more than "barbarity"—a "common ruin." And the only alternative is the socialism that Marx really envisioned.

This, in 1998, is what the editor of
Los Angeles Times thinks that the epitome of progres­sive thought and useful for his readers to believe. Of course the slogan “Socialism or Barbarism” was first raised by Rosa Luxemburg at the end of the First World War, when Communists like Hobsbawm set out to destroy the liberal societies of the West and to create a Marxist utopia in the ruins of the Russian empire. Seventy years and 100 million deaths later, Eric Hobsbawm and Steve Wasserman have apparently learned little from the experience. Of course, neither Hobsbawm nor Wasserman is going to burst the barricades tomorrow and attempt to implement the vision laid out in this intellectual trash. But might not others, younger than they be tempted to do so? And is not the persistence of the ideas associated with the Manifesto a primary cause of the corrosive cynicism of the intellectual class towards private property, individual rights and the economic market, which are the foundations of our free society?

When the symposium appeared, I did not attempt to phone Wasserman. Instead, I wrote him a note:

February 16, 1998

Dear Steve,

The 75th anniversary of Mein Kampf is coming up. It’s too bad that Heidegger and deMan are dead, but I’m sure you could get David Irving or David Duke to try that French Holocaust-denier, Van Mises and Hayek refuted this assumption theoretically 70 years ago. The history of those 70 years has proved socialism impossible in practice. There is nothing significant left of the Marxist analysis after this. My problem with your editing of the symposium is that you did not give those who have been vindicated by this awful history even a chance to make this case, while you gave those like Hobsbawm, with blood on their hands, a platform to repeat and perpetuate the errors that Marx made.

And they are not just errors. The Manifesto, as I wrote in the part you cut, is not only not innocent of the massacres committed in Marx’s name. It is an incitement to civil war and therefore to such massacres. And you have repeated this “error” in your editing by giving Hobsbawm a platform for the same kind of incitement (although muted by an academic tone). Re-read the piece. What Hobsbawm says is that the Manifesto was right in its analysis of capitalism then and now, and that the choice before us is “barbarism or socialism.” Read his book (The Age Of Extremes) and you’ll find that the thesis is exactly the same. If we don’t destroy American capitalism, it will destroy us. An incitement to declare war on American capitalists may not be equivalent to a call to kill the Jews, but it is not as far removed as you would have it either.

Yours,
David Horowitz

And that seems to have been the end of our correspondence on this matter.

Why Is Race the Problem that Will not Go Away?
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Elsewhere the agent of repression is mob violence, often prompted by radical Islamicist leaders. This is true in Egypt, where the Coptic Church is increasingly subject to church burnings and local massacres. It is widespread in Nigeria, in Liberia, Ghana, and the Philippines. In Pakistan in 1997 one Christian town, Shantinagar (population 20,000), was razed by fanatics. In Indonesia, which has long been a place of toleration between Muslims, Christians, and other minorities, there has been an epidemic of church burnings. There are also direct attacks on religious minorities by radical Islamic terrorists in Algeria, the Philippines, Turkey, and Egypt.

In non-Islamic societies, there is violence and discrimination against minority religious groups in Mongolia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, India, Bhutan, and Kampuchea and in the central Asian republics which were formerly part of the Soviet Union, especially Uzbekistan. It is a growing phenomenon in Burma in the SLORC regime's war against tribal minorities, especially the Rohingya Muslims in the west and the Karen and other tribes in the eastern part of the country, where Christians constitute a large proportion of the minorities.

There is also widespread discrimination and legal control. India has affirmative action laws to ease the plight of the dalit, or untouchables. While groups such as Hindus, Sikhs, and Buddhists are included, Christian untouchables (a majority of India's 28 million Christians) are explicitly excluded. In India, 85 house-church Christians were arrested in two dragnet operations on May 14 in Zhoukou. Christians reported brutal beatings resulting in paralysis, coma, and death. Other methods of torture reported include binding detainees in excruciating positions, hanging them from their limbs, tormenting them with electric cattle prods, electric drills, and other implements, and crushing their ankles while they are forced to kneel. A few weeks before China's President Jiang Zemin made his October, 1997, state visit to the U.S., Xu Yongze, perhaps the most important underground Protestant leader, was sentenced to 10 years in a labor camp. At the same time, Catholic Bishop Su Zhenmin was re-arrested, one of at least four bishops currently under detention.
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The Duty to Die, Continued from page 1

The state of our current medical system and getting more rotten every day. Patients are entitled to make their own health care decisions based on "informed consent," that is, they may accept or reject any medical treatment based on information supplied by the doctor as to its hoped-for benefits and potential risks. Instead they are being precipitously offered the "exit" sign and being urged to take early check-in from life.

If a bunch of little money could be made in medicine keeping people alive on machines, some medical treatment becomes bitterly that their right to reject unwanted medical treatment was violated by doctors who refused to discontinue support when it was no longer desired. This was seen, correctly, as an unwarranted interference by doctors with the personal autonomy of their patients. The problem was addressed by enacting laws protecting people's right to refuse unwanted medical treatment, even if the likely result was death. If anything new of the desires of the other side. The imperative for personal autonomy in medicine has now grown so strong that the feeding tubes of cognitively disabled people who are not terminally ill can (inappositely in my view) be removed at the request of surrogate decision-makers, with the explicit intention of causing their death by dehydration.

If people can say no to lifesaving medical treatment in the name of autonomy, consistency requires that they also be allowed to say yes. But that is not how things are working out. In the emerging brave new world of medicine, personal autonomy applies strictly only when the "correct" kind of life-saving medical care is made. Patients or families who make treatment decisions disapproved of by doctors, government bureaucrats, and health insurance executives—people who choose, in Dylan Thomas' famous words, to rage against the dying of the light—frequently discover to their dismay that personal autonomy has its limits. Futile Care Theory

While society and the media have focused primarily on the importance of personal autonomy in the context of the "right to die," little attention has been paid to concurrent efforts to control life-sustaining medical treatments for the severely disabled. More specifically, the right to choose. The right to choose is the right to refuse unwanted medical treatment. Even if the likely result is death. If anything new of the desires of the patient or family. The personal values and morals of the patient are no longer relevant. End of story.

Futile Care Theory

Futile Care Theory is all about. Rather, as preached by the medical intelligentsia, the notion of futility is based on the perceived subjective value—or better stated, the lack thereof—of the patient's life. In this context, futilityism becomes an excuse in raw social Darwinism in favor of life as applied to patients diagnosed with permanent unconsciousness should be removed so that "deanormalized" care givers won't be forced to provide care they believe is futile or which wastes "valuable resources." How? One way suggested by Dr. Angell would be to change the definition of "death" to include a diagnosis of permanent unconsciousness. (A November 1, 1997, article in the British medical journal Lancet, took the next logical step by urging that such "dead" patients have their hearts stopped by injection so that organs could be harvested.) Realizing the PR difficulties inherent in declaring a breathing body a corpse, Dr. Angell wrote that she would settle for mandatory time limits on providing medical treatment for the unconscious or the creation of a legal presumption forcing families with the "dysnomic view" that their loved ones should be given life-sustaining treatment to prove in court that the patient would want such care.

People with severe brain damage are not the only ones futilityists want to push out of the life boat. In 1993, Daniel Callahan, one of the world's foremost bioethicists, urged in The Troubled Dream of Life that health care be ended for ages. He has since given further arguing that treatment should be deemed futile if "there is a likely, though not necessarily certain, downward course of an illness, making death a strong probability" or when "the available medical treatments for a potentially fatal condition entail a significant likelihood of extended pain or suffering," or when care would "significantly increase the likelihood of a bad death." These definitions are so vague that almost any serious life-threatening medical condition potentially qualifying for "futility." Moreover, they answer the question: what if patients want to assume such risks of treatment in order to save their lives? All of this sounds suspiciously like the creation of a duty to die. Indeed, the idea that people deemed to be worthy of the medical intelligentsia's care have such a duty is under active discussion within medical circles. A per recent article, "Is There A Duty to Die?" in The March-April 1997 Hastings Center Report—one of the world's most respected bioethics journals—is a case in point. According to the author, Hardwig, East Tennessee State University medical ethics professor, among those with a "duty to die" are the elderly above the age of 75 and people whose continued life will "impose significant burdens—emotional burdens, extensive care giving, destruction of life plans." Among those who are expendable are people whose loved ones "have already made great contributions—perhaps even sacrifices—to make their life worthwhile and do not feel guilty about personal autonomy in medicine has now grown so strong that the feeding tubes of cognitively disabled people who are not terminally ill can (inappositely in my view) be removed at the request of surrogate decision-makers, with the explicit intention of causing their death by dehydration.
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brought up on charges of child abuse and stripped of her parental rights. In January 1997, a federal jury in Los Angeles, California, found her guilty of child abuse and sentenced her to 18 months in prison.

In August 1997, in the county of San Diego, California, a jury convicted a 34-year-old woman, Catherine Gilgana, explicitly instructed doctors and family that vigorous efforts be made to keep her alive. After she became unconscious from a stroke in December 1996, for instance, a jury ruled that her hospital's policy was not applicable to her case. The court, however, ruled that the policy was not applicable to her case.

In the state of Washington, another family was turned in for child abuse by a hospital administrator when they obtained a court injunction ordering kidney dialysis to continue for their prematurely born son, known as Baby Ryan. Next, the doctors and hospital administrators vigorously fought the parents in court over who had the right to decide the level of Ryan's care. Doctors even signed sworn affidavits that the child had "no chance" of surviving, arguing that continued treatment was "inappropriate." Happily, the doctors were wrong. Baby Ryan survived when his care was transferred to another hospital.

In Massachusetts, a 71-year-old woman, Jack Pratt, was brought up on charges of child abuse and stripped of her parental rights. In February 1997, the Alexian Brothers Hospital in San Jose, California, instituted a for-profit treatment policy to continue for their prematurely born son, known as Baby Ryan. This is devastating to such people who want treatment. Under the policy, healthy, severely mentally retarded people could be denied CPR that their families want for them as well as other medical treatments such as antibiotics to fight infection and reduce fever. Dying people may be denied the extraordinary weeks or months of life that were concluded to be "beneficial." People who are deemed permanently unconscious (a condition that is usually misdiagnosed) will have tube- and fluid-filled mouths, but no longer receive anything.
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Obstetric Lunacy

Childbirth and Authoritative Knowledge: Cross Culture Perspectives
Edited by Robbie E. Davis-Floyd and Carolyn F. Sargent
University of California Press
510 pages. $19.95

Reviewed by John Ellis

You can learn a great deal from this book about the nature of present-day feminism, the state of American medicine, and the changes in modern university; but not very much about its ostensible subject—childbirth.

Anyone who was born before the second world war will probably remember that the birth of a child was awaited with some foreboding. Many in that generation had somewhere in their recent family history a female relative who had died early in her adult years, in childbirth. In the 19th century, even in the most medically advanced societies, childbirth took an enormous toll on the lives of women. One of the stories from the history of modern medicine is the life expectancy of men and women was roughly the same. At the present time, by contrast, the life expectancy of women is about seven years longer than that of men—but only in those countries that have access to modern medical knowledge. This gift to women of (on average) the best part of an extra decade of life is due in large part to the successful management of childbirth on the part of Western doctors and medical scientists. Modern medicine is good for all of us, especially for women.

This, one might think, would make femi

nist rejections. It doesn’t. The problem is that childbirth is one of the best examples of where it is clearest that feminism and reality can not coexist. Like a religious cult whose beliefs cannot be shaken by any test of experience, campus feminists are convinced that the West oppresses women, that its scientific knowledge is just one discursive practice among others, and that science is really all about power and is just a system that is set up to pick out just this book curiously to see how far feminists writing about childbirth would push their dogmas—could these student midwives claim the standard campus feminist treatment? Would they actually denounce and dismiss as just more patriarchal oppression the very aspect of Western knowledge and care for the lives of women to the tune not just of hundreds and thousands, but millions—giving them in the process a life expectancy far in excess of men’s?

But the context between feminist ideology and reality is no contest: the ideology wins hands down. Western childbirth, we are told, must be seen as "just another etho-obstetric system" among others. In case you think that doctors can only do the work they do because of their long training, experience, and skill, this book will see you straight: the "authoritative" knowledge claimed by doctors isn’t produced simply by access to complex technology. It is a way of organizing experience, which is a way to make the world easier to understand. In the context of childbirth, the question is, as one handy little phrase has it: "What is the discrepancy between the rich and the poor?"

Buried in the footnotes, however, always related never to the main thrust of the book, is a brief reference to the statistics on maternal deaths in childbirth. As a reference to the "medicinal childbirth" as opposed to the feminine "Ideal"—Surely we should think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) to dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) to dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theories. How many lives will it cost if we are going to present all children with the same dignity (as defined by feminists) by dumping doctors and letting women go it alone? Amazingly, this obvious question is left by the wayside. Birthing systems are being compared without regard to what for any sane person will be the very first point of comparison—the rates of maternal mortality in any situation, we are told, and we should not let us come up for air again. Doubtless you are by now thinking, as I was when reading this book: there is someone going to drop some knowledge about the comparative statistics for maternal and child deaths in "medicalized childbirth" as opposed to the feminist "Ideal." Well...Surely one would think, even feminist ideologues are going to have to talk about the practical consequences of their theo...
woman gives birth, but rather leading up to the entrance of the physician without whom the delivery literally cannot proceed...she sweeps in leading up to the entrance of the physician without whom the delivery literally cannot proceed...
They note that economic development and med­ical treatment are far more important than climate in the spread of disease. While Gelbspan wants to attribute Mexican dengue epidemics to changing climate, the CDC and Pan American Health Organisation blame insufficient mosquito eradica­tion efforts. Gelbspan also attributes a massive outbreak of cholera in Peru to changing climate. Yet the scientific journal Nature reported that a reduction of water chlorination was the primary culprit. The outbreak spread throughout South America not because of changes in climate—the satellite and weather balloon data cannot find the warming necessary to support Gelbspan’s thesis—but to poor sanitation.

But what if the climate warms? Will dis­ease follow warmer temperatures into North America? Don’t bet on it. The CDC’s Duane Gubler told Science that predictions of the sort relied on by Gelbspan show “probably the most blatant disregard for other factors that influence disease transmission.” When dengue rolled through Mexico in 1995, Gubler notes, it stopped at the Rio Grande. There were over 2,000 cases on the Mexican side of the border, but only seven in Texas. This cannot be explained by a stark change in climate at the U.S.-Mexican border. Can, how­ever, be attributed to superior pest control, sanita­tion, and health care in the wealthier U.S. Thus, even if the world did warm significantly, it is doubl­ely that disease outbreaks would follow.

Some of Gelbspan’s policy prescriptions are “draconian”; others range from fanciful to insane. For Gelbspan, the ultimate policy goal must be the complete abandonment of fuel oil—coal, even natural gas—over the next decade! In his “ideal” scenario, the government would assemble a Manhattan Project-style “brain trust” composed of “industrial leaders, engineers, government officials, energy specialists, and par­ents” to “decide which kinds of renewable, cli­mate-friendly energy are appropriate for different uses and different settings.” The transition would be guided by an “international enforcement agency” and funded by “oil and coal industry prof­its.” “We do not need to cede our sovereignty,” Gelbspan insists, for “International governance is far different.” Economic central planning failed, but Gelbspan calls upon ecological central plan­ning to save the earth.

Of course, such a plan would be disrup­tive, and not just for the fossil fuel industry. Even though Gelbspan assures that the necessary alter­native technologies necessary to meet the world’s energy needs without fossil fuels are readily avail­able, the basic economics might not be so convinced. (Tried a “water-efficient” toilet recently?)

Therefore, true to the Soviet model he proposes, “the public relations industry would put its extra­ordinary expertise to positive use to promote the acceptance of renewable energy around the world.” Of course, it will also be forced to feed the sense of urgency, and “put the climate crisis—at all its massive dimensions—at the center of the public stage.”

For Gelbspan such dire steps are neces­sary because the earth is in extreme peril and a powerful anti-environmental cabal is conspiring to bring about a new era of “dirty energy.” Not only will this conspiracy cause the earth to overheat, but that in turn will trigger societal unrest. According to Gelbspan, “the bombings in Oklahoma City and Centennial Park during the Olympics in Atlanta may pale before the violent social upheavals that will be triggered by climate change.”

To believe Gelbspan, the oil and coal industries, by funneling a few hundred thousand dollars to a handful of academic scientists and sup­porting a brief ad campaign on climate science in the early 1990s, have been able to create a scientifi­cally valid consensus supported by no less than $2 billion in research grants from the federal government and the combined efforts of America’s multimillion dollar environmental establishment.

Gelbspan is just shocked, shocked that Dr. Patrick Michaels received more than $165,000 in industry-funded grants to help him support his research. Michaels, an ardent critic of the greenhouse­house apocalypse thesis, scoffs at the idea that a lit­tle over $30,000 a year could control the research he conducts with his colleagues at the University of Virginia, particularly when the vast majority of Michaels’ funding comes from the government. Gelbspan acknowledges that such skeptics, such as Dr. Richard Lindzen of MIT, have “unassail­able” credentials, so he tries to write them off as ideologi­cal extremists. In the world according to Gelbspan, the portions of the conspiracy not pur­chased with industry dollars are the product of a right-wing fanaticism.

Gelbspan himself is no stranger to con­spiracy theories, having written about them before. His book, Covert Break-Ins, Death Threats, and the CIA: The Covert War Against the Central America Movement, portrayed a radical conspiracy not pur­chased with industry dollars are the product of a right-wing fanaticism.

Gelbspan’s penchant for painting a picture of climate catastrophe would be of less concern were it not both influential and symptomatic of a larger problem; this year’s visitation of a Pulitzer Prize for Gelbspan’s first book. The is the story of how a book that was enhanced by claims that he won a Pulitzer Prize. The dust jacket to The Heat Is On states that Gelbspan is a “Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist,” and similar claims were made by more than a few others who, in the name of science, and others seeking to publicize the book.

The only problem is that Gelbspan never won a Pulitzer. In 1984, Gelbspan helped edit a series at The Boston Globe that ended up winning a prize. But the award went to the Globe reporters that actually wrote the story, and the Pulitzer Board listed one of them by name. According to Columbia University’s Seymour Topping, who administers the Pulitzer awards, “Only individuals specifically named in an award citation by the Pulitzer Board can qualify as Pulitzer Prize winners.” Gelbspan was not named in the citation, thus he did not win the award.

Gelbspan’s take on the climate contro­versy is similar to that espoused by Vice President Al Gore in Earth in the Balance—capitalism is destroying the world. For Gore, President Clinton seems to be adopting this line too, as he endorsed the United Nations treaty on climate change proposed at the December UN summit in Kyoto, Japan. Last fall, the President was seen carrying a copy of the book in Martha’s Vineyard. Somewhat, the wacky views of Ross Perot seem to have infected U.S. poli­cy. Now that could be a conspiracy worth getting all hot about.
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Sex-Change Woman Seeks to Bear Child

By Judith Schumann Weizner

Bobbie Prettyman, a 39-year-old resident of the Women's Section of the Rolling Hills Correctional Facility in the foothills of the Ozarks, has petitioned authorities at the institution for permission to undergo a new procedure, just approved by the FDA, which makes it possible for the first time for female transsexuals to "give birth." Although Ms. Prettyman would be the 84th resident to make use of the facility's birthing room since its establishment in 1996, she would be the first to do so after having been surgically changed from a man to a woman.

Ms. Prettyman is serving a four-year term for a crime she committed while she was still a male. Then known as Bobby, Prettyman was arrested for the sexual harassment of a 22-year-old female parking lot attendant after he said that her choice of occupation was not a fitting one for a woman. Due to the thought-provoking nature of Prettyman's remarks, the attendant subsequently became a male and asked that the charges be dropped. Citing section 12.C of the 1998 Women in the Workplace Protection Act, the prosecution refused: since the victim had been a woman at the time of the crime, the state could not properly be a party to any action that might appear to diminish the seriousness of crimes against women.

In order to get a reduced sentence, Prettyman had pleaded guilty and agreed, as part of his bargain, to undergo psychological counseling with Dr. Henry Montebanque, the chief of psychiatry for the state's corrections system. At the end of this therapy, the attendant subsequently became a male and asked that the charges be dropped.

Citing section 12.C of the 1998 Women in the Workplace Protection Act, the prosecution refused: since the victim had been a woman at the time of the crime, the state could not properly be a party to any action that might appear to diminish the seriousness of crimes against women.

Prettyman had pleaded guilty and agreed, as part of his bargain, to undergo psychological counseling with Dr. Henry Montebanque, the chief of psychiatry for the state's corrections system. Shortly after he began his therapy, he achieved what Dr. Montebanque termed "remarkably penetrating insight" into his actions, realizing that the harassment had been merely an expression of his secret desire to become a woman. Dr. Montebanque agreed that if Bobby were to change his sex it would substantially reduce the likelihood that he would ever repeat his previous behavior.

With Dr. Montebanque's full support, Prettyman petitioned the state to allow him to undergo a sex change operation as part of his rehabilitation. Pointing out that denying him this opportunity could expose the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to charges of cruel and unusual punishment, he prevailed upon officials to allow him to set aside time from his daily self-Exploration Workshop to conduct research into the requirements for a sex change.

After several months of conversations with transsexuals via the Internet, he was satisfied that he understood the ramifications of the procedure, and petitioned the state for permission to begin preparatory hormone injections, but the State Commissioner of Corrections and Rehabilitation refused the request, citing four pending cases brought against his department by Citizens Against Government Lunacy.

Prettyman appealed, arguing that the state's refusal to accommodate him violated his First Amendment right to free expression. When the Court of Appeals agreed with him, the state petitioned the Supreme Court, which refused to hear the case, thus guaranteeing Prettyman's right to a sex change.

Prettyman began a course of hormone therapy, traveling three times a week to Little Rock to receive his biweekly injections. After a year and a half of hormone injections, Bobby was deemed ready to become Bobbie and, following surgery, she relocated to the women's annex.

Within a few months, Bobbie sank into a deep depression. She told Dr. Montebanque that now she was a woman she was gripped by an overwhelming desire to become a mother; that she was tormented by the idea that her record might hinder any attempt at adoption after her release, and that she feared she might find herself unable to resist the temptation to kidnap an infant to satisfy her newly discovered urge. Impressed with the depth of her self-awareness, Dr. Montebanque agreed to consider a new course of treatment that had been approved by the FDA just one week earlier, and advised her to apply to undergo it.

Called In-Vitro Fertilization and Implantation with Subsequent Re-Implantation and Non-Vaginal Delivery (IVFSRINVD), the procedure was developed under the aegis of the Federal Fertility Administration following passage of the Equal Rights Act of 1997, which forbids the exclusion of female transsexuals from any experience available to women who acquired their female characteristics by accident of birth. The procedure consists of an in-vitro fertilization with the resulting embryo implanted in a surrogate mother, and that it develops almost to term. It is then removed from the surrogate womb and reimplanted in the transsexual's artificially created womb for a 20-minute period after which it is delivered by Caesarian section. Because the fetus is actually delivered from the transsexual's body, it is not necessary for her to undergo the close pre-adoption scrutiny required for other prospective adoptive parents.

Prettyman is currently awaiting the final word on her application, but she says she does not anticipate any snags, since Dr. Montebanque has already testified as to the beneficidal effect it will have on her psyche and, therefore, on society.

Both the cost of the procedure and subsequent expenses related to rearing the child will be covered under a special program that is specially tailored to the needs of transsexuals in the nation's correctional facilities.

If you like this article, ... get the collection,

Stranger Than Fact

Judith Schumann Weizner's tales of legal perplexity, political correctness, & cultural mayhem for only

$3.00

Please call (800) 752-6562 ext. 209 to order.
Visit our website at www.cspc.org.