

Unselfish.Org Newsletter

Dedicated to eliminating social problems and bringing about world peace by educating people about the benefits of putting others first, loving your neighbor, doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, and being unselfish rather than pro-choice in decisions affecting other people and society.



<http://www.unselfish.org> • #5 - May, 2009

Four Questions that Can Eliminate Abortion and Most of Our Social Problems

by Larry Plachno

For those of us who have spent many years researching social problems, the situation we are dealing with is actually very simple and very easy to understand. Our society has been moving away from evaluating the good or evil of actions and decisions based on their impact on others and society. It has been moving towards permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism. Everything is interconnected. We do not have hundreds or thousands of social problems, instead we have one major social problem variously known as permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism. Instead of looking for their impact on society, people try to justify their pro-choice actions by using cafeteria morals. This permissiveness, pro-choice attitude and moral relativism moves through our society much like germs and pollution by a process called desensitization.

The solution to our problem is just as easy to understand. What we need to do is to have people go back to the basis of Christianity by evaluating all of their actions and decisions as good or evil based on their impact on others and society. We need to make people understand the evils of using cafeteria morals to justify pro-choice actions. In addition, we need to make people understand that all pro-choice actions, particularly those in public, desensitize others and spread moral relativism through our society.

Thousands of individuals and organizations work long and hard on abortion, marriage, family and on reducing social problems. Some have substantial success while others do not. For many of them, their effectiveness is greatly diminished because of their approach to the problem.

Featured Quotation

“Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters.”

Matthew 12:30

❑ Some of them work on the effect of the problem instead of working to eliminate the cause. This situation is similar to people working very hard to mop water off of the floor while ignoring the open faucet responsible for the water. With many years of research and statistics on social problems, we know that pro-choice actions, particularly public pro-choice actions, desensitize people and spread moral relativism.

❑ Some of them get confused because they fail to adhere to a basic requirement of Christianity that we evaluate ALL of our actions and decisions as to whether they are good or evil and avoid doing evil.

❑ Some of them contradict themselves by using cafeteria morals to provide one criterion for good and evil for themselves and a different criterion for good and evil for others.

❑ Some of them even encourage the spread of moral relativism by condoning or encouraging people to embrace and spread the pro-choice attitude in public.

Having spent nearly 20 years researching social problems, it is easy to see how we got into this situation. I agree with Pope Paul VI who said in *Humanae Vitae* that

contraception was the start of a great deal of evil. Birth control pills allowed people to become pro-choice on conception. This, in turn, prompted people to become pro-choice on the family wage, marriage and stay-at-home mothers. Since they are very public actions, being pro-choice on marriage and stay-at-home mothers spread moral relativism through our society by a process known as desensitization. Being pro-choice on abortion, euthanasia and other evils soon followed.

Here are some very simple questions that help clarify our problem with permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism. Answering them will provide some simple answers.

Question One: Should we judge all of our actions and decisions as to whether they are good or evil?

Jesus Christ came to our earth to suffer and die to atone for our sins. God is not only telling us that there is a good and an evil but that there must be some atonement for evil. Hence, the first obligation of a Christian is to determine good and evil with every decision and action, and to avoid doing evil.

We have fallen flat on our face with that obligation. Christians and Catholics are avoiding thinking about good and evil wherever they can. Our confessionals are empty. Our priests no longer give fire and brimstone homilies on divorce and single parenting. When we stop thinking about good and evil, then the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism comes into our society.

From a secular and statistical standpoint, we need to judge each and every action or decision that can impact others because everything is interconnected and pro-choice actions breed moral relativism. We do not have hundreds or thousands of social problems . . . instead, we have one major social problem variously known as permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude or moral relativism. Each of our social problems are simply a different manifestation of that one problem in different areas.

I am personally horrified at the intrinsic evil of abortion. However, the reality is that abortion is still only one manifestation of the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism in our society. Statistically, it is linked to other social problems and other pro-choice decisions.

Even brief research will show that our social problems are interconnected. People who are pro-choice in one area are statistically more likely to be pro-choice in other areas. People who are pro-choice on marriage, who are pro-choice on attending church regularly and who are pro-choice on stay-at-home mothers are statistically more



likely to be pro-choice on abortion. It all depends on the degree to which a person has accepted permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism.

Question Two: Should we judge all of our actions and decisions based on their impact on other people and society, or can we invoke cafeteria morals to justify our pro-choice decisions?

We, the good guys, have the high ground. Permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism are not logical nor tenable. However, we are doing little or nothing about it.

When faced with a decision or action that could impact other people or society, we have only two choices. We can be unselfish and pro-society and base our evaluation of right and wrong on the impact of our decision or action on other people and society. Or, we can be selfish, permissive and pro-choice and base our evaluation of right and wrong on what we want to do regardless of who gets hurt. Hence, we pick our criterion for right and wrong and then use it as a guide to tell us whether a particular action or decision is right or wrong.

People who subscribe to cafeteria morals, whether they consciously understand what they are doing or not, do things in the opposite way. They first decide the answer they want as to whether their action or decision is right or wrong. And, then, they pick the appropriate criterion to justify the answer they want.

Typically, if they want a “no, that is wrong and you cannot do it” answer, they pick the unselfish and pro-society criterion and base their evaluation of right and wrong on the impact of the decision or action on other people and society. However, if they want a “yes, you can do that” answer, they pick the selfish, permissive and pro-choice criterion and base their evaluation of right and wrong on what they want to do while ignoring any negative impact

on other people and society. They also ignore the impact of their pro-choice decisions on desensitizing other people into being more pro-choice in other areas and more accepting of moral relativism.

Hence, people who subscribe to cafeteria morals really have no morals. Like a chameleon, they simply change their colors to blend in with their current decisions.

When you ask the permissive and pro-choice people to come up with a criterion for their version of right and wrong, they cannot do it. In my 19 years of researching social problems, I have never had a liberal actually say that being pro-choice and permissive is good for society. Nor have they ever said that spreading moral relativism by pro-choice actions is good for society.

Instead, what they do is to ignore right and wrong and try to justify their actions using cafeteria morals. To a very real extent, permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism is the absence of right and wrong. However, the avoidance of right and wrong brings us right to the heart and foundation of Christianity, as mentioned in the first question.

Question Three: Should we encourage or discourage public pro-choice actions and decisions that spread moral relativism through our society?

Permissiveness, the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism spreads through our society by a process called desensitization. A good way to explain this is to go back to the old argument years ago as to whether kids should be allowed to watch violence on television. Parents were opposed to this. However, liberals said that kids should be allowed to be pro-choice in their viewing habits. The experts sided with the parents. They said that as the kids are exposed to more violence, they become desensitized to violence. The kids then become more accepting of violence and no longer see violence as evil or wrong.



Those of us from an earlier generation or educated in Catholic schools may remember this under a different name. While the experts call this “desensitization,” the nuns and other teachers in Catholic schools referred to this as “giving bad example.”

Desensitization has harmed our society in several areas. What should be a big concern is that this same process of desensitization also applies to the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism. When people are told that it is acceptable to be permissive and pro-choice, or when they see others being permissive and pro-choice, then they become more permissive and pro-choice themselves. This is how the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism spreads through our society.

Since the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism spreads through society like germs and pollution, there is no option to be pro-choice in one area but not in other areas. You would not tell someone that it is acceptable to spread germs on Monday, Wednesday and Friday but it is unacceptable on other days of the week. You also would not tell someone that it is acceptable to pollute the north side of a river but not the south side of the same river. Likewise, all pro-choice actions and decisions that impact others are wrong because they spread the pro-choice attitude and moral relativism through our society.

What actions and decisions are the worst in spreading moral relativism through our society? Since the mechanism of spreading moral relativism is desensitization and giving bad example, it logically follows that the biggest impact on society comes from the more public actions and decisions.

While private actions and decisions are no less evil, they impact society less because they are not immediately seen. Yes, they can be known through statistics or their effects, but because they are less obvious and public, they have less of an impact on society.

Among the most public actions encouraging pro-choice decisions, and hence a major factor in spreading moral relativism, are those of the feminist movement. The two most obvious are being pro-choice on marriage (and/or religious vocations) and being pro-choice on stay-at-home moms. There are numerous reasons why marriage and religious vocations are better for society. Likewise, the stay-at-home mom provides at least seven advantages to herself, her family and society.

Some people claim that being pro-choice and spreading moral relativism can be condoned when an individual feels that they have a financial need. If we accept

that, then anyone who needs money can commit murder and have an abortion. Another justification put forth by the feminists is that their position in being pro-choice on marriage and stay-at-home moms is a lesser evil than being pro-choice on abortion or murder. What they fail to realize that there is not much difference between one person spreading a million bubonic plague germs and a million people spreading one bubonic plague germ . . . you still have a million germs in society. Actually, the million people may be worse since they spread germs throughout society rather than concentrate them in one place.

Question Four: Should we ignore or broadcast the fact that being unselfish has its own rewards and that people who put others first and work with others come out ahead?

Those of us who have put years of serious research into social problems are fascinated by the fact that the statistics and reports continually show that those who are unselfish, put others first, and work with other people come out ahead in several areas while those who are permissive and pro-choice do not do as well.

One basic definition of society is a group of people working together for common goals. When people are pro-choice instead of pro-society, they are not only not working together but are pulling society in different directions. This is why we have social problems.

Another way of looking at this is to consider a wagon pulled by four horses. If the horses pull together in the same direction, the wagon makes good progress. However, if each horse decides to be pro-choice and pulls in a different direction, the wagon not only makes no progress but could easily be damaged. In similar fashion, our society and each of us individually come out ahead when we work together for the same goals.



The statistics and reports are very obvious in the areas of marriage and parental supervision of children. People who have a good marriage tend to be healthier and live longer. They are also statistically less likely to commit crimes, are less likely to be the victim of crimes, and are statistically less likely to be homeless, on welfare or require government support.

Statistics are very clear that children who spend more time with their parents are more likely to do better in school, and are less likely to get in trouble with the law than children to spend more time with their peers. Children raised in a family with their biological father and mother come out the best. Stay-at-home mothers statistically come out ahead in many areas including having a better marriage, having a healthier family, children doing better in school and less crime in the area.

One of the biggest current concerns is how being pro-choice on marriage and divorce affects children. Some of the latest statistics show that in some areas as much as 75% of juvenile delinquency is attributable to single-mother households where no father is present to help raise the children.

There is some magic in working with others and putting others first. One has to ask whether this is the lesson Jesus Christ was trying to teach us when he admonished us to "Love your neighbor."

Contact Information

E-Mail: Unselfish@poloil.com

Snail Mail:

Unselfish.Org

c/o NBT, Inc.

9698 W. Judson Road

Polo, Illinois 61064