

The Fundamental, Inalienable, Universal Right of The Child
To the Married Love of Its Parents

Patrick F Fagan
William H.G. FitzGerald Fellow in Family and Culture Issues
The Heritage Foundation

Nairobi Kenya
August 21, 2005

Today in Japan a growing phenomenon called “hiki-ko-mori” describes about 1 million teenagers or young adults who withdraw completely from society for months and even years, refusing to leave their homes or even their bedrooms. According to some estimates, more than one million young Japanese have cut themselves off from the world and barely communicate. Most of them are male, and many of them are the first born son in their family.

In April 2002, in Erfurt, Germany, thirteen teachers, two students (a 14-year old girl and a 15-year old boy) and a police officer were shot and killed by Robert Steinhäuser who said, “For today, its enough,” and then shot himself.

In April 1999 in Columbine, Colorado, two teenaged students, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, executed a planned killing of 12 students and a teacher before committing suicide.

The highly developed economies of the world are yielding some very disturbing fruit, and as I hope to demonstrate today, at the heart of this issue is a crisis in marriage.

The Risk to Children Posed by Out-of-Wedlock Births, Cohabitation, and Divorce

From birth to early adulthood it is clear that children are dependent on the care of others. Children need the love of each parent and also love between their parents in order to achieve their full potential as persons. The child denied their parents’ love is at risk, and more of these children see negative outcomes intellectually, educationally, emotionally, or socially. More of them will see their own marriages fail and never be a part of a healthy family. They are less likely to succeed in school and in the marketplace and as citizens and members of society.

Everyone acknowledges that the family is the building block of every society, but the strength of this building block depends on the stability of the marriages that form it. The family is the place where everyone begins life, and thus is the place in which everyone finds belonging. The more that members of a family belong to each other, the more each member thrives.

When rejection occurs in the family, especially between the parents (such as when they do not marry or divorce) the entire family suffers.¹ All family forms other than the always-intact married family have a history of rejection. (The widowed family is an exception). This rejection has severe effects that can be demonstrated. The fundamental causes of a family's thriving or wilting are either belonging or rejection: love or alienation.

The following charts illustrate the dynamics of belonging and rejection. They are derived mainly from U.S. federal government surveys and give a snapshot of what is occurring within America's families. (British data are used when there is no corresponding U.S. federal survey.) They illustrate powerfully the impact of belonging, rejection, and indifference on children, the family, and society.

In each chart we see positive outcomes consistently appear in the always-intact family, where the parents have always belonged to each other and to their children.

These families are less likely to live in poverty, less likely to depend on welfare, most likely to be happy, most likely to do well at school, most likely to be both physically and mentally healthy, and most likely to have healthy marriages and not to divorce. They are the least likely family type to have children involved in criminal activity, drugs, binge drinking, or out of wedlock sex. The children from these families are also the least likely to have STDs, be depressed or suicidal, fail in school, be expelled, run away from home, be abused, or to engage in violence.

To the extent it has been investigated, this pattern is repeated across all cultures and does not just apply to the US or the UK. Belonging and rejection emerge as the fundamental cause of thriving or wilting among children worldwide. As we work through the following charts, try to apply them to your country, as I suspect you will come to similar conclusions.

Chart 1: Poverty. Chart 1 shows the relationship between children in poverty and the dimensions of belonging and rejection in the family structure. The family where the mother and father formally belong to each other in marriage is least likely to be found in poverty. At the opposite end of the graph, the always-single mother family has the highest level of poverty; in this family structure the father has never belonged to the mother or the children (in many cases it is the mother who has rejected the father).

¹ See www.heritage.org/About/Staff/PatrickFaganpapers.cfm for the following papers which review the significant literature on these topics:

Effects of Divorce on America

Effects of Out of Wedlock Birth: Great Benefits of Early Adoption

How Broken Families Rob Children of Their Chances for Future Prosperity

Marriage Preparation Works

Marriage: the Safest Place for Women and Children

Promoting Adoption Reform

Real Root Causes of Violent Crime

The Child Abuse Crisis: The Disintegration of Marriage, Family and the American Community

The Effects of Marriage on Child Poverty

Chart 2. The reverse holds for family income. The family where the mother and father do not formally belong to each other in marriage is most likely to be found in poverty.

Chart 3. Chart 3 illustrates part of the reason that families of rejection are more likely to be found in poverty. This chart shows the median number of hours worked in the marketplace each year by different configurations of the family with children.

The never-married single parent family has the lowest number of hours at 1,279 hours worked per year; the separated single parent is next at 1,620 hours per year; the single-parent family is next with 1,891 hours per year. All of these configurations of the family are single-parent family structures. When we move to the two-parent family configurations, there is a significant jump, but with interesting differences. The cohabiting family is the lowest of the three with 3,227 hours worked per year, but within this family, the male head of household works the least of the three at 1,835, and the female works the most at 1,391. The stepfamily works the highest number of hours in the marketplace per year at 3,519 hours annually. The head of household in the always-intact married family works the longest of all at 2,213 hours per year, while the wife works the least of the three at 1,199. Clearly, the stronger the mother and father's commitment to each other, the stronger they are in the marketplace and the more adaptable they are to family needs, including the needs of the children.

Chart 4. Chart 4 illustrates the size of the drop in income when a family moves from being intact and married to fractured and divorced.

In this particular study—which is fairly representative of this body of research—the drop in income is 42 percent, a drop greater than that experienced by the United States during the Great Depression. Children of divorcing/rejecting parents go through a “Great Depression” in their family income during and following the divorce.

Chart 5. Belonging and rejection have massive impacts on the accumulation of wealth.

This chart illustrates accumulated family wealth for families with children under age 18 in the year 2000 (mainly in the form of home ownership and retirement savings). That there is a huge difference between the married family structures and all other family forms is clear. The always-intact, always-belonging married family with children has 343 times more wealth than the never-married, single-parent family with children under 18.

Chart 6. People who are married are much happier, in general, than either divorced or always-single parents.

This is understandable if we remember that married people belong to each other, whereas the single parent has experienced the pain of rejection from her husband or the father of her children. Rejection never leads to happiness.

Chart 7. This chart on emotional/mental disorders of children comes from data that is nationally representative of the United Kingdom (we do not have similar data for the United States). Children from married families have the lowest level of emotional disorders.

In ascending order, children of cohabiting parents come next, followed by always-single parent families, and finally the widowed, divorced-single-parent family. Normally, children of always-single parents do not experience firsthand the rejection of the absent parent. That event happened early in their life. Children of divorced parents have often lived through the pain of that rejection, and it is reflected in this measurement and in a few other emotionally sensitive outcomes. In conduct disorders the picture is slightly different: the lone parent (always-single mother) family has the highest level of that disorder among children.

Chart 8. Again, drawing from British data because there are no similar data for the United States, we get a picture of the different levels of serious child abuse across family structures.

The lowest level of serious abuse occurs in the always-intact, married family. In Britain the levels of stepfamily abuse are six times higher; 14 times higher in the always-single mother family; 20 times higher in the cohabiting family; and 20 times higher in the single-father family. The most dangerous family structure is when the mother cohabits with a boyfriend who is not the father of the child. Rates of abuse are 33 times higher than in the intact-married family. When the mother is cohabiting with a boyfriend who is not the father of the child, the father belongs neither to the child nor to the mother.

Chart 9. When a mother cohabits with a man who is not the father of the child, fatal abuse (child homicide) is 73 times (7300 percent) as likely as in the intact married family. Without using more charts, we can summarize the effects of rejection. (Women are abused more in separation and divorce than in marriage. Women are abused least in marriage than in any other station in life, and they are abused most in cohabiting situations.)

Divorce affects children by:

- increasing the likelihood of their divorce when they are adults;
- decreasing their educational attainment;
- increasing the likelihood of growing up in poverty;
- increasing the likelihood of being depressed;
- increasing the likelihood of living shorter lives by about 4 years;
- increasing the likelihood of having more accidents as young adults;
- increasing the likelihood of cohabiting (almost universally for daughters) before marriage;
- and increasing the probability of having a child out-of-wedlock.

Divorce affects adults in similar ways:

- they will not likely be happier in their new marriages;
- second marriages break up even more than first marriages;

- men die earlier;
- women and children are more likely to enter poverty;
- mental health decreases;
- suicide increases, especially for men;
- alcoholism increases, especially for men;

Out-of-wedlock births are no blessing for children. The widespread out-of-wedlock births:

- increase the societal level of infant mortality and peri-natal trauma;
- lower physical health development;
- lower intellectual (especially verbal) IQ;
- lower mental health;
- lower educational attainment;
- lower income in adulthood;
- increase the likelihood of juvenile delinquency, especially violent crime;
- increase drug use and abuse;
- increase alcohol use and abuse;
- lessen likelihood of marriage;
- increase out of wedlock births;
- increase cohabitation;
- increase the number of sexual partners and the likelihood of the contraction of STDs;
- shorten the life span;
- and increase the likelihood family fragmentation among immediate descendants.

Stated in the positive, on all social policy outcomes for which government spends billions of dollars each year children do best in health, longevity, education, mental health, present income, future income, future marital stability, and are more likely to worship regularly when raised by married parents. In terms of negative outcomes, children of married parents are the least likely to engage or suffer from delinquency, drug and alcohol abuse, premarital sex, out-of-wedlock births, and rates of cohabitation.

Children adopted in infancy do better on almost all outcomes than even biological children who are raised in an intact-married family by their biological parents.²

On all social policy outcomes for which governments also spend billions of dollars each year, adults who are married see the most positive outcomes: They are happier, live longer, have greater income, have greater wealth, are healthier, have better mental health, and are experience more sexual fulfillment.

On all social policy outcomes for which governments spend billions of dollars each year, adults who worship weekly or more already achieve them. They are happier, have more stable and life-

² Patrick F. Fagan, "Promoting Adoption Reform: Congress Can Give Children Another Chance," The Heritage Foundation *Background* No. 1080, May 6, 1996, available at www.heritage.org/Research/Family/BG1080.cfm.

long marriages, like their partners more, find more sexual fulfillment, live longer, have greater income, have greater wealth, are healthier, and are in better mental health.

On all social policy outcomes for which governments spend billions of dollars each year, *children do best if they are raised in an intact family that worships weekly or more*. They are healthier, tend to live longer, and see better educational outcomes. These children are healthier mentally, both as children and later as adults, earn and save more, are more likely to worship regularly, and have a higher probability of future marital stability. On all negative outcomes, children of married parents are the least likely to engage in or suffer from them: delinquency, drug and alcohol abuse, premarital sex, out of wedlock births, or cohabitation.

Chart 10: GPA. For instance, looking at education performance, children from intact families that worship regularly and often have higher GPA's than their peers.

Chart 11: Hard Drugs. On use of hard drugs, the same family forms yield the lowest level of trouble:

How many children have been affected by rejection in the family?

Chart 12. Consider the United States shortly after World War II, in 1950. For every 100 children who were born, 12 entered a broken family (4 by being born out of wedlock and 8 from the divorce of their parents).

Today for every 100 children born in the United States, 60 enter a broken family because their parents reject each other.

Chart 13. When we rate nations of the world on how well their families are doing in providing a place where their children can belong we get something akin to this Index of Rejection between the parents and rejection within the family (or, looking at it from the positive, an Index of Belonging) for the nations of the world.

The United States is not alone, nor the worst in rejection between parents. By my estimate, from UN demographic data (which is incomplete) Russia likely has the most dangerous culture in which children can be born, with Greece having the best, and other nations scattered along the continuum in between. Sweden and several other European countries rank close to the United States.

The greatest economy in the world (the US) and the country that touts itself as having the greatest social policy in the world (Sweden) are some of the most dangerous places in history into which a child can come into existence.

I propose that the UN begin compiling an "Annual Index of Belonging and Rejection within the Family." This Index could have a significant impact on the global debate regarding children's wellbeing. The United Nations will have to develop a data capacity that makes this index

accurate. Until that day arrives, I propose our own network of family scholars develop and promulgate an index such as this.

The Death of Children

World War II resulted in 53 million deaths: 17 million soldiers³ and 36 million civilians.⁴

The deaths of 17 million more people are attributed to Stalin's purges in the 1930's and later,⁵ while Mao's so-called "Great Leap Forward" caused the deaths of an estimated 30 million Chinese through starvation. Mao's "Cultural Revolution" that followed the "Great Leap" resulted in the deaths of at least one million people.⁶

Add these together and there are over 100 million dead as a result of Hitler, Stalin, and Mao, the 20th Century's three giants of horror and terror.

However the horrors of the 20th century did not end with these three, nor even reach their apex. A silent genocide occurred in both democratic and totalitarian states throughout these past 100 years. During the 20th century (from 1920-2003) somewhere between 729 million to 924 million abortions are estimated to have occurred worldwide.⁷

Chart 14. If the experience of the United States can be any guide, it can be estimated that about 82 percent of these abortions were to mothers who were not married.

Applying this statistic to the rest of the world (in the absence of better data) this would translate into about 750 million deaths by abortion resulting from sex outside of marriage, or about 46 million abortions each year around the world⁸ (equal to the combined populations of The Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal and Greece)—or an annual death toll that is close to the total killed in all of World War II.

Chart 15: The Full Rejection Ratio in the United States.

³ Stokesbury, James L. "World War II." *World Book Online Reference Center*. 2004. World Book, Inc. 21 Oct. 2004. <http://www.worldbookonline.com/wb/Article?id=ar610460>.

⁴ Prof. Joseph V. O'Brien, Department of History, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, "WWII: The Casualties," available at <http://web.jjay.cuny.edu/~jobrien/reference/ob62.html> (October 21, 2004).

⁵ Courseworkbank, "Causation of the Purges," available at www.courseworkbank.co.uk/coursework/causation_the_purges_1708/.

⁶ Lee Edwards, "Where Mao Lives," *National Review Online*, December 10, 2003, available at www.nationalreview.com/comment/edwards200312100925.asp.

⁷ Johnston's Archive, "Summary of Registered Abortions Worldwide, though 2003," available at www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/wrjp335sd.html.

⁸ S.K. Henshaw, et al., "The incidence of abortion worldwide." *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 1999; 25 (supplement): S30--S37. (Cited in Ref. 1); and "Therapeutic abortions, 1996 and 1997," *The Daily Statistics Canada*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry, (2000).

When the abortion numbers are added to other rejection numbers for the United States we get the following picture: For every 100 children conceived, 29 do not make it outside the womb. Of those who do, 33 are born outside of marriage, and of those born into marriage, 40 will see their parents split before they reach adulthood. Thus, for every 100 conceived, only 28 reach age 18 living with their mother and father. Truly Americans have built a culture of rejection deep within the family in the United States.

Before addressing solutions, other dynamics of this onslaught deserve attention.

Diagnostic: Some of the Main Threats to Children, Marriage and the Family

This quotation from a paper delivered recently at a major European Union social policy conference at Oxford University,⁹ is reminiscent of the Japanese “hiki-ko-mori” discussed earlier:

”Individualism is becoming the social structure of the second modernity itself... The do-it-yourself biography where the individual has to (and must) choose how to build his or her own life is the hallmark of modernity...”¹⁰

“Individualism is a social condition, which is not derived at by a free decision of individuals, and they are forced to construct their own biography whereas in previous times life followed a normal standard biography.”

“Now all these elements have to be chosen deliberately—to live together or not live together; when to marry, if to marry; when to have children, if to have children, the latter being facilitated by the development of contraception. Thus, the chaotic love is the non-linear love parallel to the non-linear individualization.”¹¹

“Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, two leading sociologists, have devoted much time and talent to describing the “Normal Chaos of Love” as conceived by moderns. Love has become an empty category, which lovers must fill themselves in relation to their own biographies and emotional lives. Love becomes more important than ever before at the same time as it becomes more elusive. The struggle to harmonize family and career, love and marriage, “new” motherhood and fatherhood has today replaced “class” struggle... On the one hand, there stands the possibility of creating forms of democracy in personal life which parallel those achieved in the public sphere; on the other, there is the potentiality for chaos.”¹²

Contraception is at the heart of this modern individualization and chaotic social arrangement.

⁹ ESPAnet Conference Oxford, Sept 9-11, 2004.

¹⁰ Cecilie Wehner and Peter Abrahamson, “Individualization of family life and family discourses,” ESPAnet Conference, Oxford, Sept. 9-11, 2004 (Dept of Sociology, University of Copenhagen). p. 4-5, 10-11.

¹¹ Wehner drawing on the work of Beck & Beck- Gernsheim, 1995.

¹² Wehner and Abrahamson, 2004.

The Public Solution: The Right of Children to the Married Love of Their Parents

In all of their deliberations on sexuality and marriage, courts and international treaties have focused on adults' well-being. They neglect to consider the child, particularly within the context of marriage. As argued here, though, the data on this subject are writ large.

From these charts (and the myriad more that could be shown) it is clear that a child thrives best when the mother and father are married to each other and stay married. "Belonging always to father and to mother, who belong to each other" is the lifeblood of the growing person.

For example, consider the effect of a warm, loving father on the sexuality of his child. :

Chart 16. The likelihood of being chaste is directly related to a teenagers' rating of their father's level of warmth and affection.

Consider, though, where such a father's love is most likely to be found.

Chart 17: Family Structure and likelihood of father being rated warm and loving.

Even though the married father does best in the rates of being warm and loving, there is much work to be done in married families. They are far from perfect

Notice the effect rejection between parents (or family structure) has on the likelihood that a child will have a warm father. The chance that a teenager of an always-single-mother-family will rate his father as warm and loving is only three percent. In turn, the absence of this affect will lessen the likelihood of the child's capacity to have a full relationship with a future spouse.

Rejection between the parents cuts to the quick, and diminishes the capacities of the person. Therefore the body politic needs to proclaim and protect the love that children need: the married love of the father and mother who brought him or her into existence. Without that mutual love of the parents, the child is grievously at risk of not reaching his or her potential and is likely to pass on their weakness to his or her children, in an ever-widening circle of suffering and wasted human capacity.

If the infant child could speak, he or she would be justified in saying to the mother and father: "You owe me your love, your married love, for without it I will not become the human being I could become."

Furthermore, the newly conceived human being, could they speak, would say: "To thrive in the womb I need the protection of your married love. To survive in the womb I need the protection of your married love."

For the sake of children, it is time for the United Nations to claim this right for all children.

Every child ever born has the right to demand that his parents not only love him but that they love each other. Anything less is a grave injustice to the child, and threatens his very existence.

This right, this justifiable demand, exists for all children always, in all countries, in all times, in all races, in all religions, in all social orders. The love of parents is a universal need.

With this love children thrive, and without it they wilt, no matter where they are born—in the modern nation state or outside it, whether born today, a century ago, or a millennium ago, or at some point in the future. Many things will change in the course of human events, but the need for married love never will. Where man is, married love is needed—just as much as the air he breathes. Without one his body dies; without the other his spirit is weakened.

Put another way: no father has the right to walk away from his children. No mother has the right to walk away from her children. Neither does any mother or father have the right to deprive a child of a father or a mother and the love between them. Whenever this happens a grave injustice has been done to the child.

This right to the married love of their parents is not tied to a right given children by the state. It is a fundamental right that comes from the nature of being a child, of being brought into dependent existence by the cooperation of the father and mother. This right exists before the state, after the state and during the state, before the U.N., during the U.N. and after the U.N.

Fundamental rights may be enshrined and further protected by political rights but they derive their force not from that benefit but from being posited in being human. The child's right to the married love of parents is a priori to the state and therefore is a right to be protected by the state.

In the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this right was not articulated, though it was discussed, because at the time it was felt that it would be stigmatizing those who do not have the married love of father and mother, and the articulation would add to the burden already being borne by such children then called “illegitimate” children.¹³

However the stigma of illegitimacy is no longer a threat. Instead, the very lives of children, as well as the development of their human capacities, is threatened by massive levels of rejection between their parents.

The drafters of the Declaration would have better served children by listening to those present at the discussion who foresaw the dangers to family that have now come to pass in even greater proportions than were feared.¹⁴

¹³ See Don Browning paper of Kuala Lumpur, October 2004, at the Asian Pacific Dialogue on Family in preparation for the G-77 Doha Conference of November 2004.

¹⁴ However as Charles Malik, chairman of the drafting committee stated: “Actually where and when are we really free and human? Is it not rather the case that we enjoy our deepest and truest freedom and humanity in our family, in the church, in our intimate circle of friends, when we are immersed in the joyful ways of life of our own people,

There is a need to expand on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by modifying the Convention on the Rights of the Child and adding and articulating the right of the child to the married love of his or her parents.

This is key work for global leaders; however, practical work beckons all of us, as well.

Personal Solutions: Communities

First: Becoming More Expert on Marriage, Family and Parenting

Couples must invest time and energy in their roles as parents, and they must also invest in their roles as spouses, seeking to build those habits and skills that increase belonging.

Individuals must learn these skills deliberately for modern society no longer provides a stable, intergenerational community in which individuals are steered toward habits of faithful spouses, as laid down by previous generations. Today, modern couples must consciously learn and become “professionals” at marriage, family and parenting.

Couples need to learn how to date, how to select a spouse, how to be engaged, when and why to consider breaking an engagement, what to expect after marriage, and how to deal with adversity in a relationship.

Couples need to learn to be adept at

- communicating about feelings;
- making decisions;
- negotiating conflicts;
- and how to distinguish between what must be shared or can be shared; what must be an area of individual freedom and can be an area of individual freedom.

Today, there is no couple that can do without these skills or without this knowledge.

On top of these skills, couples need to learn how to parent. Beyond these skills, couples need to set about building a community.

Second Task: Developing a Local Neighborhood of Friendships

when we seek, find, see, and acknowledge the truth?... The tragedy of the (1947) modern world is that these real grounds of freedom are in danger of decay. The family is subject to terrible strains, the church is on the defensive, modern man has no friends, truth has become a matter of pragmatic convenience. But unless the proposed Bill of Rights can create conditions, which will allow man to develop ultimate loyalties with respect to these intermediate sources of freedom, over and above his loyalty to the State, we shall have legislated not for man's freedom but for his virtual enslavement.” Charles Malik, August, 1948, *The Rotarian*.

“For the family to be family, the community needs to be a community.”

Without a network of friends the life of marriage and family will be much more stressful and for many will break down, for man is an intensely social being who thrives on deep social interaction and friendships, and marriage alone cannot provide the benefits of community life that is so helpful to man.

The world will be saved from “hiki-ko-mori” by young couples who commit to building communities of friendship, for they know that without this their lives will be much emptier even if they love each other and their children with all their hearts.

Those who choose to form such communities will self-consciously become the new urban pioneers cognizant of and accepting of the limitations of long-distance friendships, which cannot be as nurturing as needed because of physical distance. They will instead build tangible neighborhood communities of friendship.

In other words they will choose to love *their* world, which is their local neighborhood. Where healthy communities abound, “hiki-ko-mori” will not come into existence.

Protecting the Community from Technological Sex

Another reason for developing community is that young couples have major decisions to make.

They have before them the allure of both good and evil in the dimensions of the sex, marriage, family, children, and old age.

They will have to choose, as Wehner and Abrahamson pointed out, from what world has to offer: well-paying jobs, vacations, recreation, retirement, and leisure—all beyond what kings and queens could enjoy through most of human history.

Such a reality beckons them, but (again, as Wehner and Abrahamson point out) with the price tag that sexuality be blocked and controlled with the myriad forms of contraception.

Couples have another choice. There is another path to walk that involves a reliance on the fullness of human nature, a fullness in the sexual, a fullness in family life. Though choosing generous family life does not involve rejecting modernity it does have its price tag: less vacations, less material good, but more children.

To achieve the fullness of love between man and woman, to achieve stable marriage, to build families on belonging, neighborhoods, and friendship, a certain protectiveness is necessary—the rejection of all forms of technological sexuality (contraception).

Today, even the temptation of technological sexualities (non-human sexualities—or at least, partially non-human sexualities) are now unnecessary given the developments in biological knowledge granting couples the power to choose when to have children. The only temptation

that technological sexualities now have is the temptation to sexual pleasure without love, marital unity, or commitment. Given the ever-increasing superiority and effectiveness of natural family planning—our knowledge of the body’s own ways—there are no valid reasons for contraception.

Abortion is not the great dividing line that comes later in the life cycle as the ill-begotten fruit. The great dividing line is contraception, technological sexuality. Contraception brings with it a change in the internal psychological make-up of the woman and the couple¹⁵, inverting the sexuality from other-oriented to self-oriented,¹⁶ changing the community culture from exclusivity of sexual relationships within marriage to sex-outside-of-marriage, as well as other negative outcomes such as sexually transmitted diseases, cohabitation, divorce, and death in abortion.

If abortion, divorce, violence, suicide are all fruit of the culture of death, then contraception is its seed. This was predicted clearly in 1968 in *Humanitae*—so clearly that it could be called the greatest social science document of the twentieth century, though no high-ranking secular social scientist of the time agreed with it. Were this document to be published for the first time today with current demographic data the numbers are so overwhelming that the findings would be called mild.

The future of society now depends on young adults who will choose sexuality in its fullness. The future depends on individuals choosing marriage and preparing appropriately for it, understanding the intimate connection between the sex, love, the future, their happiness, their marriage and their children’s happiness. The social problem with contraception is that it not only blocks the child, but it changes human hearts so much they no longer can take on the task of more children. Nations that have achieved an almost universal practice of contraception are dying demographically. This is not a “family planning” problem. It is a problem of a deeply altered human spirit—altered by altering the sexuality of the body. Communities that embrace technological sexuality are unsustainable over time.

Couples that commit themselves to a life of chastity until marriage and thereafter to children according to their capacities, commit also to their greatest happiness and to a greater capacity for friendship in marriage, the family, and their community, as well as to their own greatest enjoyment of their sexuality.

Such couples will learn to preserve the integrity of the sexual act in their thoughts, and they will have a firm commitment to “natural family planning” (a rather sterile phrase for a commitment to the fullness of human sexuality).

These couples will study to develop a full understanding of the sexual nature of both sexes¹⁷ so that their sexual ideas and behavior keep them ever “other-oriented.”

¹⁵ See the first third of Lionel Tiger, *The Decline of Males*, New York: St Martin’s Press, 1999.

¹⁶ See Patrick F. Fagan, “The Inversion of Heterosexual Sex,” *Same Sex Matters*, [CITY]: Spence Publishing, 2000.

¹⁷ See Stephen Rhoads, *Taking Sex Differences Seriously*, (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004).

Their neighborhoods of friendship will quietly but firmly keep technological sexualities and sexualized technologies outside community boundaries as though they were contagious diseases.

Because there are many people of tremendous goodwill who are not yet aware of the effect of technological sexuality on persons and communities, there is much work to be done in educating them. The world can gradually learn this lesson by seeing that it is possible to create a community on friendship, marriage, family, and love involving an embrace of full sexuality.

Conclusion

Modern economies demand that man increasingly invest himself in the marketplace, even as he must simultaneously manage family, friends, and his community.

If he builds communities of friendships in his home neighborhood he and his family have the potential to live much more fully.

To achieve a social order where all this is possible, our generation, our children, and our grandchildren sets certain tasks before us:

- ensure a unity in the trinity of father, mother and child for every new person who comes into this world;
- obtain in international positive law the protection of the child by articulating the universal, inalienable, and fundamental human right of the child to the married love of his or her father and mother;
- develop professional expertise for couples in marriage, family and the raising of children;
- and build local communities of friendship that are needed for the success of marriage and family life.

Now it is time for us to find the friends we need to make this happen, for our own welfare and especially for the benefit of our children and grandchildren. The world is starving for love and young people cry out for it. The hiki-ko-mori teenagers of Japan think it is not possible. They have not met all of you...yet .

Let us pray, let us love, let us work, and let us build.