

feminist perspectives féministes

\$3.00

No. 1

**Lament for a "Patriarchy Lost"?
Anti-feminism, Anti-abortion,
and R.E.A.L. Women in Canada**

by Karen Dubinsky

**CRIAW
ICREF**

CANADIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN
INSTITUT CANADIEN DE RECHERCHES
SUR LES FEMMES
151 Slater, Suite 408,
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5H3

FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES

is a series of topical, provocative, issue-oriented papers and essays exploring many aspects of women's experience and concerns.

The papers come from a variety of sources including established scholars who wish to write outside their usual disciplinary boundaries, graduate students, and community researchers and activists. All papers must be non-sexist in methodology and language.

Papers are assessed by members of CRIAW's Publications Committee or other qualified referees. Authors of accepted papers must provide camera-ready copy conforming to guidelines which will be supplied upon request. A license to publish is purchased from the author of a negotiated number of copies. Copyright will be retained by the author.

CRIAW believes that this new series will not only contribute to the advancement of knowledge about women, but will also add fresh 'feminist perspectives' to the dialogue and debates on many current issues.

PERSPECTIVES FÉMINISTES

une nouvelle série de publications de l'ICREF, contient des essais ou articles d'actualité sur le vécu des femmes. Ces derniers, non-sexistes, sont rédigés par des étudiants de second cycle, des personnes impliquées en recherche communautaire, et d'autres. Les documents choisis pour publication par notre comité éditorial, devront correspondre aux normes de format édictées par l'ICREF, qui sont disponibles sur demande. L'ICREF offrira une redevance à l'auteure pour la publication d'un certain nombre d'exemplaires. Celle-ci retiendra ses droits d'auteur.

Selon l'ICREF, cette nouvelle série de documents contribuera à la connaissance des sujets d'actualité concernant les femmes, et apportera une 'perspective féministe' aux débats.

LAMENT FOR A "PATRIARCHY LOST"?:-

ANTI-FEMINISM, ANTI-ABORTION AND R.E.A.L. WOMEN IN CANADA

**Karen Dubinsky
March, 1985**

CRIAW/ICREF gratefully acknowledges the financial assistance of the Women's Program, Secretary of State, in the production of this publication.

The ideas expressed in this document are the author's and do not necessarily reflect those of CRIAW or of the Women's Program, Secretary of State.

* * * * *

Cover design: Julia Ames

* * * * *

© Karen Dubinsky

Published by
CRIAW/ICREF, July 1985
408 - 151 Slater Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5H3

ISBN-0-919653-46-4

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The relationship between theory and practice is never very simple. While feminist theory prides itself on remaining relevant to and informed by women's experience, attempts to 'chart' the relationship between feminist theoretical concerns and the ongoing experiences of the women's movement must go beyond a reductionism which attempts to 'fit' one component neatly and unproblematically into the other. This paper will attempt to avoid such pitfalls, while at the same time addressing itself to several substantive issues facing the women's movement today. It is informed by feminist theory and methodology, and it is prompted by experience and involvement in feminist politics.

Specifically, this research was initiated to investigate several concerns I developed as a pro-choice supporter, and, at times, activist. The first was simple curiosity about pro-life organizations and their ideology. I wanted to uncover more about the extent to which they can or cannot be perceived as 'agents' of the pro-family, new right in Canada. This, of course, raised another set of questions. To what extent can Canadian analysts discuss a 'new right' in this country? Where do specifically anti-feminist groups, like Realistic, Equal,

Active for Life (R.E.A.L.) Women, fit in? These are anti-abortion women, to be sure; but they also oppose a host of other feminist 'sacred cows'--equal pay for work of equal value, universal free child care, enforced affirmative action--and they are women. Canadians have been surprisingly silent on this issue. This paper, therefore, must be seen as a very preliminary attempt to discuss not only the relationship between pro-life ideology and the right, but to assess the right in Canada itself.

While I was thinking about this research I began to notice what appeared to be a change in pro-life public appeals. Initially, it seemed to me that they were using the language of feminism and, ironically, the peace movement in recent campaigns. For example, a recent pro-life newspaper advertisement urged readers to "sign here if you believe that killing isn't the answer to human problems". The Interim, Canada's "National Pro-Life Newspaper", advertised a Toronto anti-abortion march recently by proclaiming "abortion isn't a personal issue, it's a political issue."¹

I also began to notice articles about the 'feminist for life' component of the right-to-life movement. There appears to be a growing number of self-defined feminists who are active in pro-life organizations.² All of this led me to question popular

feminist perceptions of the 'opposition'; perhaps, as Kathleen McDonnell in Still Ain't Satisfied recently argued, it's time for a more nuanced, 'second look' at the right-to-life movement in Canada.³

Since this paper was first drafted, McDonnell's own 'second look', Not An Easy Choice has been published.⁴ It is ironic that many of the same themes I approached in this paper have been similarly (but more exhaustively) covered by McDonnell. I agree with a recent review of Not an Easy Choice, that this book has become the starting point for feminist reflections on, or re-evaluations of, the abortion issue.⁵ While I do have questions about some of McDonnell's conclusions (in particular, her 'case for lay abortions', which I question at the level of political strategy), my own work obviously owes much to hers. Rather than approach the entire spectrum of issues raised by the debate on reproductive choice as McDonnell does, however, this paper is basically confined to a study of one 'side'--anti-abortionists.

A second and related theme I wished to pursue arose from difficulties I was having as a pro-choice feminist with the way other feminists labelled anti-abortion groups, and especially anti-abortion women. Generally speaking, feminists have tended to dismiss anti-abortion and anti-feminist women as

insignificant in their own right. The common response has been to see these women as either 'duped' or terrorized by patriarchy. We always point out, for example, that the anti-abortion movement is financed and heavily controlled by the (male-dominated) Catholic Church. We sniff that Margaret Thatcher has become an 'honourary male'. At our most extreme, we celebrate the fact that so called pro-life women are (as are all women, supposedly) 'life affirming' beings, who have been led astray. It's our job as feminists, therefore, somehow to 'win' them away from male dominance.

Andrea Dworkin, a respected feminist polemicist, ultimately relies on the 'women are terrorized' argument in her analysis of right wing women. She concludes that the American new right "is a social and political movement controlled almost totally by men, but built largely on the fear and ignorance of women".⁶

I will argue in this paper that this sort of analysis is a simplistic and dangerous misreading of the origins and motivations of both anti-abortion and anti-feminist women. The evolution of broadly anti-feminist groups like R.E.A.L. Women surely punctures the 'women as dupes' theory. Here is a group of generally well-educated, articulate and politically astute women, with an essential raison d'etre of opposing feminism! We obviously cannot lay a gender hierarchy neatly and evenly over

this group; nor, for that matter, over the anti-abortion movement. That is not only an insult to their intelligence and motivation, but it also denies them any responsibility or agency for their actions and their ideas.

To understand why R.E.A.L. Women exists, we must move beyond the dual 'women are good/women are victims' school of feminism. This approach simply asserts the innate 'goodness' (or correctness) of the biological female and, therefore, can only blame inconsistencies (i.e. anti-feminism) elsewhere, usually on men. Now, without denying the coercive power of male violence, or the fact that men indeed play a significant role in anti-feminist and anti-abortion politics, I think the R.E.A.L. Women phenomenon has shown us it is time to start looking at anti-abortion and anti-feminist women as political actors in their own right. Hence, this paper attempts to explore these two questions. What is the right to life movement, and what are they saying? and How have feminists accounted for the widespread appeal that new right ideology has for women?

The paper has three sections.⁷ I will begin with a brief history of Canadian abortion legislation, and attempt to situate the rise of both pro-choice and anti-abortion organizing in the context of the legislative changes. Second, I will examine pro-life ideology, through a review of the movement's

literature, both popular and 'theoretical'. I also will begin to assess the groups' broader political alliances. I must stress at the outset that the emphasis of this paper is pro-life ideology; empirical data about anti-abortion organizations is quite fragmentary and should be the subject of continued research. Finally, I will discuss several feminist theoretical works which attempt to account for the rise of pro-family/anti-feminist sentiment. Again, I must stress that most of the work which has been done on this issue is American. There is, of course, a certain logic to this; they after all have Ronald Reagan and a far stronger new right presence in national politics. I will attempt, however, to point out the differences, where appropriate, between the Canadian and American situations. One other preface concerns the language that will be used throughout this paper. The abortion debate represents a powerful example of the ideological implications of language and terminology. The war of words between the opposing sides on this issue contains a deep and meaningful political significance. For example, groups which favour easier access to abortion insist that they are 'pro-choice' not 'pro-abortion'; (although this distinction is, as we shall see, a fairly recent one). Pro-choice supporters label their opponents 'anti-choice'. Groups which favour restricted or no access to abortion reject this label and instead refer to themselves and

thus their opponents as 'anti-life', or, sometimes 'pro death'.

Pro-choice groups refer to the object of this struggle as a 'fetus'--for pro-life people it becomes a 'baby'.

The language issue is so highly charged that one pro-life publication actually contains a glossary of 'politically correct' terms to employ. For example:

Abortion clinic? No, 'clinic' sounds like a place of curing and caring. That's a pro abortion word. Rather, use 'abortion chamber', reminding us of gas chamber--for isn't one of every two humans who enter that place exterminated?⁸

It is difficult, if not impossible, to negotiate a neutral path through this minefield. I have tried to refer to each group as they wish to be referred to, however, given that I am not a disinterested observer in this debate, I will no doubt fall back from time to time to the language I am the most comfortable with.

ABORTION IN CANADA - 1969-1984

Abortion in Canada was legalized, under certain conditions, in 1969. Pierre Trudeau's now famous discovery that "the state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation" ushered in a flurry of legislative changes; including the liberation of birth

control, homosexuality and abortion laws. The abortion law finally passed permits abortion if three criteria are met:

1. it is performed in an accredited hospital,
2. it is performed by a licensed physician, and
3. it has been approved by a therapeutic abortion committee, consisting of three doctors. The committee may permit an abortion if the pregnancy is likely to endanger the life or health of the woman.

For our purpose, the significance of this legislation is its historical evolution and context. It was passed at a time when there were very few groups organized on either side of the issue. Much of the pro-choice organizing occurred after the passage of the legislation, beginning with the 'Abortion Caravan' which made its way from Vancouver to Ottawa in the summer of 1970. Right-to-Life organizing also occurred in response to the passage of the legislation. For example, the Toronto Right to Life Association, one of the largest in the country, was organized in 1971.

The earliest proponents of legislative change came from two rather unlikely sources. Debate occurred in the press, particularly Chatelaine magazine and the Globe and Mail. Both questioned the 'harshness' of the Canadian law as early as 1959.⁹ Professional associations also took an interest in the area--specifically the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian

Medical Association. Their discussions of the issue recurred throughout the 1960's and in 1966 both organizations passed policies favouring access to abortion under the conditions later set down in legislation.¹⁰ The way the debate was framed is also quite revealing. Most arguments in favour of liberalized abortion laws had both a 'humanist' and a "pragmatic" edge to them. For example, the Canadian Bar Association debate reveals a great concern with the number of illegal abortions (estimated by the Globe and Mail at between 20 and 120 thousand per year in June of 1966), and the concomittant necessity of dealing with this 'problem'.

Many organizations which took positions on the issue, and made presentations to the House Health and Welfare committee, which discussed the legislation in 1967 and 1968, also made their case in terms of a 'humanist' concern for the poor pregnant woman forced to seek an illegal abortion. The law, it was argued, was unjust, archaic and out of step with the changed sexual climate of the 1960's. What may be obvious is what wasn't discussed. Feminist notions of 'reproductive control' (or even reproductive 'choice') were largely absent during this first round of debate.

It is true that many organizations and individuals who entered these discussions obviously had an interest in fairness,

and in women's rights. For example, the Voice of Women, Planned Parenthood, the National Council of Women, and the Federation of Ontario Women's Institutes all made submissions advocating legislative change to the Health and Welfare Committee. Grace McInnis, NDP MP, was one of the most vocal parliamentary proponents of liberalized legislation. But all of these organizations and individuals framed their discussion in terms of a 'social welfare' concern with women as victims of unwanted pregnancy or illegal abortion. The notion of reproductive control as an element for women's liberation just wasn't there.

Finally, we must briefly examine the opposing side of the debate. The basic thrust of the anti-abortion argument is a familiar one: the fetus is considered a human being and thus deserving of the protection of the state. The campaign against the new legislation was limited, however, to the Canadian Council of Catholic Bishops, and a vocal Progressive Conservative caucus. (Thirty-five percent of P.C. members voted against the new legislation, fifty-five percent were absent for the vote).¹¹ In fact, a leading Roman Catholic anti-abortion spokesperson, Alphonse deValk, suggests that it was the weakness of the opposition that allowed the legislation to pass. It is ironic that most anti-abortion literature takes great pains to separate the Catholic Church from the pro-life movement,

insisting that the movement is far broader than a Catholic 'front', yet deValk's analysis of the 1969 campaign blames, quite explicitly, the Church for its weak and confused opposition.¹²

There are, deValk argued, three reasons for the confusion of the opposition during this debate. First, he cites the influence of the Second Vatican Council, a series of worldwide consultations between Bishops and the Pope which took place between 1962 and 1965. The purpose of the consultation was to redefine the relationship between the Church and lay people, and it stressed the autonomy of the Church from the political arena. Yet, according to deValk, this was interpreted by some North American Catholics as signaling a 'hands off' approach by religious people towards political concerns, and this led to a resistance to 'impose' Catholic views on particular pieces of legislation. This in turn led to what he calls an 'authority crisis' within the Church. "What started as renewal had developed into a crisis",¹³ people simply were not listening to the Church hierarchy as intently. Finally, he cites the debate within the Church over the issue of contraception. In the mid 1960's, it appeared that the Church was going to liberalize its strongly held views against birth control. Hence when the Pope released his famous statement against birth control in 1968,

there was a great deal of internal dissent. The issue exacerbated the turmoil within the Church. All of this explains, in deValk's view, why the church did not take a leadership role in organizing a strong campaign against the new legislation.

DeValk also accuses the 'pro-abortion' forces (particularly the Globe and Mail and the United Church) of framing the debate in very strident anti-Catholic, anti-French terms. This contributed, he argues, to a kind of self-consciousness on the part of anti-abortion Catholics about attempts to 'impose' their views. He does have some interesting evidence to support this claim. For example, a Globe and Mail editorial in 1968 thundered:

It would be regrettable if a coherent and vociferous opposition to reform from Quebec MP's were to unleash old demons of anti-French Canadian prejudice in English Canada. Exasperated English Canadians who strongly wish for a civilized abortion law might be tempted to blame a failure on priest ridden Québecers.¹⁴

The editorial went on to explain that this would be wrong and unjust and, after all, it was Pierre Trudeau himself who introduced the amendments when he was Justice Minister. The editorial, however, does illuminate deValk's contention about the hint of bigotry which prevaded the debate, and it also

corroborates the observation made above; the first abortion debate was not explicitly about women. It was about English/French relations, it was about Catholic/Protestant relations, it was about individual/state relations; but women's liberation was very low on the agenda of the major actors in this debate.

This focus, however, did not last for long. The law that was passed is a perfect example of a state's attempt to mediate between two opposing positions, and ending up pleasing no one. The legislation raised both the expectations of the pro-choice supporters and the ire of the right-to-life forces. The law thus galvanized both sides of the issue and lead to a great upsurge in organizing. Feminist activity was channelled into the Abortion Caravan, referred to earlier,¹⁵ and organizing also revolved around Henry Morgentaler's defence. Right-to-Life supporters formed their own organizations, and christened them with a Parliament Hill demonstration in the summer of 1971.¹⁶ In 1975, in response to the continued public debate and to the first acquittal of Dr. Morgentaler, the government appointed a "Committee on the Operation of the Abortion Law" headed by Dr. Robin Badgley. The Badgley committee made its report in 1977, and confirmed what pro-choice organizers had been claiming throughout the 1970's:

- the law was not applied equally,

- there was a huge geographic disparity within Canada regarding access to abortion, since hospitals were under no compulsion to establish abortion committees,
- the bureaucratic committee procedure caused delays which made abortions unnecessarily complicated and
- the ambiguity of the criteria for granting abortion allowed for a very wide or very narrow interpretation depending on the political forces within each hospital across the country.¹⁷

One can capsulize the intervening years quite quickly; the report was shelved, and the legislation passed in 1969 remains in force today. This brings us to current campaigns to establish abortion clinics, as well as the constitutional challenges issued by both sides. An analysis of the current campaign is beyond the scope of this paper. For the purposes of the analysis of the anti-abortion ideology which follows, however, I want to comment on one aspect of today's struggle.

Specifically, I want to argue that competing notions of feminism have informed organizing around abortion far more in the recent debate than was the case in the late 1960's. Anyone with even a nodding acquaintance with feminist theory must recognize the emphasis placed on reproductive control by most theorists and, accordingly, this notion has become far more central in abortion campaigns. The impact of feminism on the abortion debate in Canada, however, has often been obscured, and there are several reasons which might account for this.

The slogan adopted in the mid 1970's was pro-choice. This is a far cry from the 'free abortion on demand' slogan, which was popular among feminists and leftists in the early 1970's. To some, 'choice' has a liberal ring to it--it has been used by everyone from Amway Corporation to Seven-Eleven Stores. On the surface, therefore, it may sound as if the movement has adopted the discourse of liberal democracy. That is not how the slogan has been employed, however, and one can certainly argue that it represents a more thoroughly feminist position on the issue.

Implicit in the slogan is a recognition that abortion is neither an ultimate 'solution', nor an unproblematic experience for all women. It shows a sensitivity and respect for the fact that morality or religious conviction may in fact prevent some women from making this choice themselves. More important, however, it allows the women's movement to put forward a more complete agenda of issues involved in women's liberation. As recent pro-choice literature stresses, 'choice' becomes an empty slogan to the minimum wage earning woman with three kids and no day care.¹⁸ Thus, the campaign for access to abortion clinics has taken a wider and arguably more feminist perspective in its attempt to link reproductive rights with other aspects of women's oppression--both sexual and economic.¹⁹

A further and, as other commentators have noted, rather

ironic twist to abortion organizing in Canada, which may have obscured feminist issues, is the fact that two of the most public players in the debate are men: Henry Morgentaler and Joe Borowski.²⁰ The 'cult of personality' that follows both men has a number of sources. The media finds them both colourful and quotable figures. Borowski and Morgentaler have added to this 'colour' themselves by engaging in several well publicized debates. They are both difficult to 'pin down' on feminist issues. Morgentaler has only recently approached abortion in feminist terms--he arrives at his convictions from secular humanism. As he explained to his biographer, Eleanor Wright Pelrine, he began to perform abortions in his Montreal clinic out of a desire to help women--the victims of a hypocritical and unjust law.²¹ While Borowski might deserve the label 'anti-feminist', he is also 'anti' almost everything else. The anti-abortion press has published extremely vitriolic columns by Borowski, attacking the New Democratic party, the peace movement, trade unions and the Soviet Union.²² Finally, several feminists have questioned the strategy of the campaign for abortion clinics, arguing that this still does not challenge male control of female health. As Broadside, a Toronto feminist newspaper recently asked, "if Henry Morgentaler were to operate an abortion clinic free of legal harassment, would we say that the goal of women's control over our own reproduction has been

achieved?"²³ While an examination of this debate is beyond the scope of this paper (and, as already noted, there are a myriad of questions raised when one attempts to apply these arguments to concrete political organizing), all of these factors point out the necessity of maintaining a feminist perspective, focused on the right to control reproduction, within the abortion debate.

It is possible, however, that feminists have a rather unlikely ally in the campaign to address this issue in feminist terms; the anti-abortion movement, as the following examination of anti-abortion literature will show. The focus of feminist concerns has certainly not been lost on its exponents.

THE ANTI-ABORTION MOVEMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE

It is useful to read anti-abortion literature to discern not only what the anti-abortion movement thinks about abortion, but also its adherents' views on women and the family more generally. Two kinds of literature will be discussed here. There have been several books published by religious presses, which contain the 'theoretical justification' for the anti-abortion position. Popular literature (pamphlets, newspaper ads) will also be examined to see what kind of image is being projected to the public.

I must first stress that all anti-abortion 'theorists' make their case in absolutist terms. 'There is no middle ground' is a theme and statement which recurs throughout the literature.²⁴ As Alphonse deValk has stated:

...a compromise solution will satisfy no one. Seen in the light of two diametrically opposed views of life, abortion as a moral/political controversy is a first contradiction of what may become a much wider clash between rival points of view.²⁵

DeValk's statement also points to an interesting sub-theme within many anti-abortion arguments, especially those put forward by Catholic theologians. The wider context of conflicting ideologies he refers to is the clash between a collectivist 'old world' and the 'neoliberal', 'utilitarian' world view, represented in this instance by the Liberal party and some pro-choice advocates. These will be examined more fully below, however, it is important to note the significance of this schism, as many of the Catholic criticisms of the so-called private morality of liberal individualism have an uncanny similarity to feminist arguments.

The second point to stress at the outset is the common denominator of all anti-abortion arguments: all of them start with a notion of the sanctity, humanity and defenselessness of the fetus. Scientific 'facts' regarding the humanity of the

fetus are presented as if there were no debate or disagreement within the scientific or medical community. Pro-life advocates thus present themselves as the only true defender of human rights, because their campaign involves the most fundamental right of all, the right to life:

It is a mistake to think of the right to life as nothing more than the sum of all other rights judged to be within the border of individual inviolability. It is prior...The right to life is primary.²⁶

Or, as the Toronto Right to Life Association succinctly put it, "Freedom of choice stops where the rights of others begin".

From this point, the arguments tend to branch out in several different directions. I have discerned what I will call a 'humanist' and a 'moralist' stream or school within pro-life thinking. I stress that this distinction is artificial in that it is of my own creation, also I should note that both views are often present, sometimes within the same body of literature. The distinction is an extremely valuable one, however, as it reflects the two impulses evident in the literature.

The humanist school is represented primarily by the theologians both Catholic and Anglican and, generally speaking, does not get translated into the popularization of the issue by Right-to-Life groups. This school is also the site of the small 'feminist for life' component of pro-life ideology. The

arguments put forward within this framework draw heavily on issues of the humanity and defenselessness of the fetus, and tend to be compassionate and principled.

The moralist school also uses the humanity of the fetus arguments, but tends to be more concerned with how the current 'abortion culture' is contributing to the breakdown of the family and society. These people worry about the 'hedonism and selfishness' the rising abortion figures indicate. These concerns tend to dominate the public profile of the right-to-life movement, and rely far more on harch, graphic and emotional imagery than the reasoned and compassionate arguments of the humanists. As might also be obvious, this school is far more explicitly anti-feminist. I will now examine each view in turn.

HUMANIST ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABORTION

George Grant, a leading Canadian 'red Tory' is a good example of a humanist anti-abortionist. He and other Anglican 'dissenters' have compiled a book of anti-abortion essays in response to the official pro-choice position taken by the Anglican church in 1973,²⁷ (a position which, the dissenters argue, revealed a lack of "solid philosophical and theological foundations"²⁸).

Grant's essay repeats the standard humanist arguments. The issue of human rights is fundamental. Christianity is built on the notion that all humans are 'children of God' and, thus, those who advocate abortion on the basis of rights undermine the very system they are claiming. The next step for Grant, as for most humanist pro-life advocates, is to evoke the spectre of a totalitarian, unChristian society, which is the logical extension of the utilitarian arguments put forward by pro-abortion advocates.

The talk about rights by those who work for abortion on demand has a sinister tone to it, because in it is implied a view of human beings which destroys any reason why any of us should have rights. What will be demanded next: the denial of the rights of the aged, the mentally retarded and the insane, the denial of the rights of the less economically privileged who cannot defend themselves?²⁹

This 'where will it end' scenario is a constant theme in anti-abortion polemics. As another Catholic theologian has expressed it:

The right to life of no one is safe unless that right is accepted to be beyond the vagaries of partisan group beliefs. Should we be willing to acquiesce in the destruction of the rights of others as long as we think we are safely included in the 'in' group, how shall we plead our own case when our masters turn their displeasure upon us?³⁰

Those who argue this position often conjure up the image of Nazi

Germany or American slavery to buttress their argument--which essentially boils down to the familiar Christian maxim: we are our brother's (or, our fetus's) keeper.

In rejecting the so-called 'utilitarian' arguments to permit abortion, the humanists are also rejecting what they perceive as a mechanistic, uncaring and atomized society. Abortion becomes an excuse; for governments it can become "an easy way of avoiding hard social problems"³¹, and pregnant women (who appear very rarely in these discussions) become victims of the abortion culture; subject to pressure from "husbands, boyfriends, parents, peers, social workers, doctors and governments."³²

Pro-choice advocates have attempted to point out the contradictions in this seemingly humane line of analysis. The Canadian Abortion Rights Action League (CARAL) has published a leaflet which addresses this:

The right-to-life-people call themselves 'pro life'. Yet they don't concern themselves with the issues of capital punishment, nuclear proliferation or disarmament. So, who's life are they pro?³³

Humanist anti-abortionists are not unaware of these contradictions. James Cameron, another Catholic theologian remarks:

It strikes me as quaint that President Nixon, in the course of waging war in Indo-China, should express his opposition to

abortion.³⁴

The anti-abortion press has published several letters from such 'dissenters'. A gay male anti-abortionist recently pleaded for an end to the rampant homophobia of the anti-abortion movement, and another reader questioned the overt support for Ronald Reagan expressed by the anti-abortion press. Reagan's Central America policy indicates, the reader argued, that he "appears to be in the business of picking and choosing whose lives he feels are worth saving."³⁵

The Handbook on Abortion, the bible of the American anti-abortion movement, has also addressed this issue explicitly. In a chapter entitled "Correct Social Injustice", the authors insist that the anti-abortion movement must make links with other social movements:

Correcting social injustice is, without question, the most important aspect of the entire abortion problem. Women want abortions because, in the vast majority of situations, they are in social or economic difficulty. To merely oppose abortion and do no more is not only useless, but frankly immoral.³⁶

The humanists are the ones who speak of the 'larger context of conflicting ideologies' the abortion debate represents. DeValk rejects the argument that abortion is a 'private' concern, on two grounds.³⁷ Abortions are performed in public hospitals using public funds, hence it is 'technically' incorrect to view

it as an entirely personal matter. He also insists that the so-called 'private morality' called upon by some pro-choice advocates to defend their position has historically been the subject of public scrutiny, discussion, and religious and state policy. The convergence with feminist theory on this point is unmistakable. While making their case from a rather different perspective, feminists have argued not only that 'the personal is political' but that the presumed separation between public and private spheres is an ideological, political and economic creation. DeValk is hardly a feminist, but he has pointed out an important contradiction in some of the more liberal pro-choice arguments.

Finally, one must also address the self-described 'feminists for life' who make their case through a humanist framework. Most collected essays contain one perfunctory article by a 'feminist for life', and there is a network of 'feminist for life' organizations in the U.S. (There is, to my knowledge, no organizational counterpart in this country.) By all accounts, this so called 'left wing' of the anti-abortion movement is numerically and politically quite small. Judy Rebick, spokesperson for the Toronto abortion clinic claims that she has met one pro-life activist who took what she termed a 'principled, progressive position'.³⁸ Ellen Willis, a U.S.

journalist, also agrees that U.S. feminists for life are a tiny minority, but they serve a crucial function of "making opposition to abortion respectable among liberals, leftists and moderates disinclined to sympathize with a right wing crusade."³⁹

The best statement of the feminist for life position in Canada can be found in the Anglican collection of essays. Marnie deVarent employs a variety of maternal feminism to make her case against abortion:

During the initial stages of their awakening, women's liberation groups established a sense of solidarity by an aggressive opposition to the male image. In the process, they fell into the trap of adopting what is essentially a male bias or attitude toward life. Identifying with a social order created by wombless males insensitive to the female experience, they opted to suppress their own body life to win entry into that order.⁴⁰

An American Feminist For Life leaflet makes the maternal feminist argument even more explicitly:

We, as pro-life feminists, offer a return to the roots of feminism in this country, a feminism which is a loving, nurturing response to any human suffering, be it the suffering of a woman, a man or an unborn child...We proclaim that we are homemakers, that the world is our home and we make it loving, nurturing, gentle and pro life.⁴¹

As Ellen Willis has suggested, "...with feminist opposition like

this, Phyllis Schlafly can rest easy."⁴²

This excursion through humanist pro-life arguments has by now revealed several significant points. It is incorrect to view the pro-life movement solely as a monolithic, reactionary force; as we have seen there are tensions, conflict and competing points of view. One can also discern a very direct attempt to appropriate the language and even some of the ideas of feminism (or at least, one strain of feminism), and this raises a related set of questions about the 'underside' of maternal feminism, particularly as it is employed currently by the feminist peace movement. Arguments which rely on women's biological capacities as evidence of our superior, 'life affirming' qualities can have, as we have seen, some quite conservative applications.

Finally, I would conclude that feminist pro-choice supporters should be looking not at the contradictions or the silences in pro-life ideology, for as we have seen they do offer an analysis of contemporary society which we might find ourselves in at least partial agreement with. The issue I want to address is where they see the source of these problems. It is here that we can find the reactionary, anti-feminist 'kernel' of pro-life thinking which sets it clearly within the terrain of the new right.

MORALIST ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABORTION

The moralist arguments against abortion contain many of the same themes as the humanist arguments. They just take them a few steps further and reveal, sometimes unwittingly, their perception of the real source of the 'abortion culture' they so abhor. Humanists are concerned about the abdication of social responsibility liberalized abortion laws represent. Moralists are worried about the selfishness and hedonism the same phenomena reflect.

This theme pervades both their public campaigns and their theoretical discussions. A billboard campaign run by Right-to-Life groups several years ago is a perfect example of this; it displayed a photograph of a young man and woman, with a caption underneath asking, "Shall we kill for convenience?". A leaflet from the Ottawa based Action Life group also serves as an example; it links increased violence in society, infanticide, teenage suicide, drug and alcohol abuse and the oppression of minorities, all under the general heading of 'disrespect for life'.⁴³

The message seems clear: liberalized abortion laws are evidence of a society spinning out of control, a society which has lost touch with the religious and moral code which is its

foundation. One must look a bit further to determine the source of this societal breakdown, but it becomes clear in an unusually candid essay by a Catholic theologian.

Perhaps the most important feature of our culture today is that it is a contraceptive culture. By this I don't just mean that a great many people use contraceptive methods of various kinds, but that the power of women to prevent conception tends to transform the institution of marriage, making the procreation of children something that is optional, not in the normal case a necessary consequence of the marriage relation. From this there comes the idea that since conception can be prevented at will, there is no need to confine heterosexual acts to those who are married. And from this there comes the idea that whatever gives pleasure is all right, inside or outside marriage, so that perverse acts are all right; they are a private concern of the individual and it doesn't matter if those engaging in sexual activity are of the same sex, or perhaps, as in the case of bestiality, of the same species.⁴⁴

An appropriate reaction to this argument; that birth control leads to bestiality, might be amusement or incredulity. One must admit, however, that to a certain extent our righteous theologian has hit on something. The 'problem' which the moralists identify, is exactly this: female sexuality, unleashed from ties to procreation and the family is a scary, powerful thing; and it is indeed a threat to patriarchal control of the family. This, as feminist theorists of all stripes have pointed out, is a key element to the potential liberation for

women from significant aspects of our oppression.

It is this fear of female sexuality and the much heralded 'decline of the family' which is the cornerstone of the right-to-life movement. A U.S. theorist has also expressed this view:

Like the family, the fetus is considered a symbol. The fetus simultaneously stands for the desire to regain traditional society and for hostility to feminism and freer sexuality which threaten that world. Symbolized as a minute pair of feet and worn on a chain as a necklace, the fetus is a symbol of life, of the patriarchal chain of being and the wonder of life. Symbolized as a bloody mass of tissue in a plastic garbage bag, the fetus is a symbol of the costs of female sexuality let loose...⁴⁵

It is here, at the level of ideology, that the right-to-life movement, in its humanist, feminist and moralist manifestations, converges with the pro-family, anti-feminist new right. As U.S. commentators have pointed out, one key ingredient of the success of the American new right has been its ability to link economic and social or sexual conservatism into a unified whole. Thus, struggles about the family and female sexuality and struggles about the role of state intervention in the economy become the same struggle.⁴⁶ This analysis will be developed in more detail below. There is not, at this point, sufficient empirical evidence available to discuss organizational links between

Canadian pro-life groups and other right wing groups in Canada. By looking at pro-life ideology and internal documents, however, one can discern at least the beginning of that same kind of fusion here.

The best Canadian example of the convergance of economic and sexual conservatism is, of course, R.E.A.L. Women. R.E.A.L. Women arrived on the political landscape early in 1984, claiming a membership of 10,000 at their first press conference.⁴⁷ (Not bad for an organization which had yet to publish its first newsletter). After a year of media blitzing, and submitting briefs to government on issues ranging from equal pay for work of equal value, sex education for minors, and "no fault" divorce (all of which they oppose) they held their first national conference in February, 1985. They now claim a membership of 20,000, but refuse to divulge their membership lists or financial supporters.⁴⁸

It is tempting to dismiss R.E.A.L. Women as simply a 'front' for the anti-abortion movement. There is a certain amount of truth to this; most of the leadership of R.E.A.L. Women are also anti-abortion activists, and the anti-abortion press heralded the group's formation, and continues to give it uncritical support. The campaign to stop abortion is very high on R.E.A.L. Women's list of priorities, and they use a curious feminist

twist in their argument. Their "Statement of Reproductive Choice" notes that:

It is said repeatedly by feminists that society over the years has oppressed women and that feminism is the answer to overturning this oppression. How, then, can the genuine feminist justify, in turn, aborting her unborn son or daughter, the most deadly kind of oppression?⁴⁹

To view R.E.A.L. Women as simply an arm of the anti-abortion movement, however, obscures the scope of the issues this group is attempting to reclaim. They oppose no-fault divorce, universal free child care, enforced affirmative action, equal pay for work of equal value, and prostitution. They argue that the wage gap between men and women is not evidence of sex discrimination, but simply a reflection of the different career paths chosen by the sexes.⁵⁰ They support all policies which uphold the Judeo Christian view of traditional marriage and the family. They also, not surprisingly, support state censorship of all pornography--a position which is not dissimilar to that of some feminists. The basis of opposition to pornography may be different between feminists and the right, however, perhaps the similarity of the solutions advocated might give some pro-censorship feminists pause. They organized precisely to undermine the legitimacy of groups like the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC) which they refer to as "a

handful of radical feminists promoting their own personal extremist views purportedly on behalf of the women of Canada".⁵

By asserting themselves as the majority; as the "real" women of Canada, this group is obviously attempting to broaden the appeal of 'pro-life' ideology. Their scope, however, has expanded to include far more than simply abortion policy. And as feminist commentators have pointed out, there is indeed a vast potential constituency for these groups to mobilize. To understand this more fully, we must turn to the work of American feminists who are trying to come to grips with this phenomenon in their country.

WHAT IS THE NEW RIGHT?

The first point most feminist accounts of the rise of the new right stress is that it is about feminism and sexuality. As Rosalind Petchesky has recently argued, if the embodiment of 'evil' for a previous generation of American conservatives was international communism and domestic trade unions, 'evil' is now at least equally represented by feminism and homosexuality.⁶ What is important about the new right, therefore, is that they have discovered "what feminists for generations have been urging--that issues related to the family, sexuality and reproduction are political at their roots."⁵³

What is 'new' about the new right is that they have succeeded in combining these two conservative impulses: an anti-feminist backlash, which is manifested in opposition to abortion, birth control, homosexuality, and alternatives to the family, and an anti-social-welfare backlash, which is manifested as opposition to the post-war notion of the state as the provider of social welfare and equal opportunity. What brings these two impulses together and gives new right ideology its 'coherence' and wide-spread appeal is its defence of the patriarchal family form; or, as Petchesky has argued, its promotion of a particular notion of privacy.

Historically, the concept of privacy has included not only free enterprise and property rights, but also the rights of the white male property owner to control his wife and his wife's body, his child and his child's body, his slave and his slave's body. It is an ideology which is patriarchal and racist, as well as capitalist.⁵⁴

This is what fuels the new right's sexual, social and economic agenda. Defence of the family involves not only the re-establishment of the family, not the state, as the provider of social welfare, it also involves the re-entry of women back into the family where we become defined as subordinate, reproductive beings.

Zillah Eisenstein has also commented on this essential

precept of new right ideology. For her, the "fundamental thrust of present new right politics is directed at redefining the relationship between the state and the family."⁵⁵ The 'problem with the family' identified by the new right is the loss of the husband's control and authority as wives have been pulled into the labour force. The state is 'blamed' for encouraging this decline of patriarchal authority, and hence the new right opposition to affirmative action, equal pay legislation, state sanction of abortion, birth control and gay rights protection. Thus, again, the politics of economic conservatism and sexual repression become merged into a unified whole; and 'defence of the family' becomes the rallying cry for both impulses.

Thus, in the U.S., the new right has not 'co-opted' single issue anti-abortion or anti-gay groups. Rather the ideological and basic premises which fuel such groups, i.e. the romanticization of the patriarchal, heterosexual family, have merged with the ideology of economic conservatism. In the U.S. this merger has been quite thoroughgoing, it has taken place at both the level of ideology and rhetoric and at the level of organization and activism. This combination of pro-family ideological appeals, financial contributions from the fringes, entrepreneurs, and a huge network of pro-family 'foot soldiers' (many of whom served their political apprenticeship in a decade

of anti-abortion organizing) is what produced the Reagan victories, and is what defeated the ERA.

This combination has yet to surface in any significant way in Canadian politics, but it seems that R.E.A.L. Women is doing its best to promote these sorts of linkages here. And while, to my knowledge, groups like the Fraser Institute, sections of the Conservative Party, or the National Citizens Coalition have yet to fully concern themselves with the sexual agenda of R.E.A.L. Women or the anti-abortion movement, they would certainly find themselves quite comfortable together. What, after all, is "realistic" except accepting economic priorities and arrangements as they currently exist, and 'making do'? Equal pay for work of equal value is rejected on similar grounds by R.E.A.L. Women, because it would involve a huge state bureaucracy to evaluate jobs and, according to Grace Petrasek, R.E.A.L. Women's President "there's only so much money in the kitty".⁵⁶

It remains, however, to account for the success of the American new right, not only in winning state power, but in capturing the hearts and minds of many American women along the way. There have been several explanations put forward to account for this. Perhaps the most popular feminist account has been Andrea Dworkin's Right Wing Women, which, as the

introduction to this paper might suggest, is an analysis which I find insufficient. I will begin by examining her thesis.

Dworkin explains the appeal of right wing, anti-feminism primarily in terms of women's need for physical and emotional safety. The political right makes five promises to women, promises which, she argues, exploit and quiet their fears. The right promises form; women don't understand the world because they didn't create it--the right provides easy answers. They promise shelter by protecting the only place women have had any power or safety; the home. They promise safety, by manipulating fears. They promise rules and they promise love, based on order and stability.⁵⁷ Women are 'easy targets' for new right ideology because women are in a precarious and dangerous position:

From father's house to husband's grave...a woman acquiesces to male authority in order to gain some protection from male violence.⁵⁸

Right wing women thus make a tacit 'deal' with patriarchy; she doesn't resist patriarchal norms and authority in the family "he" protects her from a dangerous, misogynistic world. Anti-abortion women make this 'deal' even more explicitly:

They are not dazzled by the promise of abortion as choice, as sexual self-determination, as women's control of

her body because they know that the promise is crap: as long as men have power over women, women will not be allowed abortion or anything else on those terms.⁵⁹

Pregnancy thus becomes a bargaining tool--further glue to cement the deal the right wing women have made, because "(I)n their view, pregnancy is the only consequence of sex that makes men accountable to women".⁶⁰

So, for Dworkin, right wing women are both terrorized into accepting patriarchy and, in the case of abortion, into adopting patriarchal norms as a kind of 'survival strategy'. While one cannot minimize the extent or influence of male violence in undermining women's capacity to resist or act autonomously, it is difficult to accept Dworkin's thesis that patriarchy is maintained primarily or exclusively by coercion. Patriarchy in this sense is perhaps more usefully understood as a complex set of ideologies which define and make sense of the world, with coercion and threats of coercion as damage-control mechanisms and, according to feminist theorist Mary O'Brien:

Ideology is not simple fraud or a triumph of propaganda: it is a complex social production in which class (...and gender) power is clothed in the seemingly robes of democratic consent in ways which are experienced both directly and intangibly.⁶¹

The hegemony of any dominant ideology rests fundamentally on the appearance of this consent--we accept capitalist relations

of production because they appear as 'commonsense' or natural. We work a full day's work, and receive a fair day's pay. These ideologies are reproduced culturally at every level of society, so that they appear as normal. I think we accept patriarchal relations in similar ways--buttressed and reproduced biologically as well as culturally. One cannot deny that, just as the capitalist state relies on both its coercive and its ideological 'apparatuses', so too does patriarchy, and Dworkin is correct in identifying male violence as part of the mechanism which keeps the structures in place--but it's only part. The 'hegemony' of patriarchal ideology, or in the case of the new right, an extremely devotional romanticization of a 'patriarchy lost', lies in its ideological appeal. It simply 'fits' or makes sense of the world for large numbers of women. It is only when these presumed natural, commonsense ideologies start breaking down that the whole structure begins to shake, and an attempt may be made to re-assert dominant ideology in a particularly virulent manner. This is what we are witnessing with the rise of the new right, and the 'culprit' in this case, is feminism.

Petchesky also argues that in this sense the new right is not only a response to feminism but should be seen as a measure of the success of feminism. But our success is obviously only a

partial one. Feminism, in combination with great changes in the economic and social structure over recent decades, has certainly 'freed' many women from some traditional domestic roles, but such freedom has often proved rather illusory. For many it has meant entry into the low paid, monotonous world of the female job ghetto. It has meant an increasing divorce rate and an increase in female-headed, single-parent families. And, as Dworkin has aptly pointed out, sexual freedom can also be rather chimerical. 'Sexual liberation', as it unfolds in the context of a patriarchal society, can have the effect of 'freeing' women from one of the few sources of security we have had, a stable and responsible male breadwinner. As Petchesky has point out:

...(antifeminism) has attained a mass following and a measure of political power because it is in fact a response to real material conditions and deep lying fears--a response that is utterly reactionary but never the less true.⁶²

We must, therefore, also look within the women's movement and examine our failures as well as our successes. Barbara Eherenreich has argued that what she terms "lifestyle feminism" (also known as 'superwoman phenomenon') has allowed fewer and fewer women to identify themselves with the women's movement.⁶³ 'Lifestyle feminism' is, to an extent, a measure of the success of the women's movement in changing perceptions of female roles.

But it also represents the success of the media in presenting feminism simply as a 'career strategy':

Outside the middle classes, lifestyle feminism can be actively repellant. If feminism is for women who are slender, 'intelligent' and upwardly mobile, and you are over forty, perhaps overweight and locked into a deadend job and/or marriage, then you are more likely to see feminism as a putdown than a sisterly call to arms.⁶⁴

One should not suggest that liberal feminism, with its emphasis on helping women 'succeed' in a male-dominated world, should be in this sense 'blamed' for the rise of the new right. Nonetheless, feminists must recognize that this perception of feminism has a fairly limited appeal.

The material basis of anti-feminism, therefore, is exactly the condition of women's lives which spawned feminism to begin with. And, with an understanding that those conditions have actually changed very little (or, in the case of women's economic power, may actually have declined), we can begin to understand why feminism is losing ground to the right on issues such as sexuality and the desirability of the patriarchal family.

CONCLUSIONS - WHITHER THE NEW RIGHT IN CANADA

Unlike many U.S. commentators, it is difficult for me to conclude this paper on an optimistic note. Most U.S. feminists

end their analyses by pointing to the tensions and contradictions in new right ideology, leaving one with the hopeful impression that they leave it seconds away from self-destruction. To be fair, it is of course true that pro-family ideology is riddled with contradictions. The ideal two-parent, male-breadwinner family the new right wishes to resurrect accounts for a shrinking minority of Canadian families. Sixty percent of all married women worked outside the home in 1980, and forty percent of all marriages ended in divorce in 1982.⁶⁵ As the economic recession intensifies, there is little evidence to suggest that women will be able to afford to live out this vision of domestic bliss. Other writers have pointed to the 'selective anti-statism' of new right ideology; they oppose state regulation of statism' of new right ideology; they oppose state regulation of business at the same time as supporting state regulation of abortion and other aspects of sexuality.⁶⁶ It is also true that capital needs cheap female labour, this in itself is perhaps the most telling contradiction in the free enterprise, pro-family alliance.⁶⁷

Some U.S. feminists have even suggested that time spent in new right activism might be a radicalizing experience for women. For example, Carol Pohli's recent study of women in fundamentalist churches points out some deep fissions in the

church's armour--a significant minority of women in her study responded positively to questions about discrimination against women within the church.⁶⁸ Anita Bryant, now divorced and apparently quite bitter about her experience as sweetheart of the homophobic fundamentalists, is often trotted out as an example that the new right's grasp on women is not as firm or as infinite as they might believe.⁶⁹

The reason it is difficult to be optimistic when writing from a Canadian perspective is that it seems that the new right has yet to reach its zenith in Canada; and there are many signs that it is on the horizon. While the political dynamic within the ruling federal Conservative party tends to push it away from its extreme right wing, that's not something we can always take for granted. And, indeed, as many have suggested, perhaps the new right in Canada has found a permanent home in British Columbia. The full-scale assault on the welfare state launched by the Social Credit government certainly looks a lot like the 'pro-family', anti-state campaigns in the U.S.

Feminists must also pay close attention to R.E.A.L. Women and similar groups. While we can disagree about the numbers R.E.A.L. Women claim to represent, we cannot overlook their potential. Frankly, there may be little to be gained by entering into a dialogue with R.E.A.L. Women, as some feminists

have considered. Their leadership has a particular set of concerns which are manifestly opposed to feminism. Unless we challenge the perceptions of feminism which R.E.A.L. Women is attempting to exploit, however, we run the risk of losing the little ground we have gained. Is there some truth, for example, in R.E.A.L. Women's claim that issues pertaining to women in the home have been under-emphasized or forgotten by the women's movement? Is it true that the majority of feminist activists are white, young (i.e., under 40), urban and university educated? When we speak of women at work, do we really have in mind the full range of women's jobs; from factory to checkout stand to office?

Feminism has always proved itself ready to rise to challenges from those whose power we seek to overthrow; are we ready for a challenge from other women?

One can conclude, however, with a degree of certainty and perhaps optimism, that the ensuing battles in Canada will be about feminism and anti-feminism, about conflicting notions of the family, sexuality, masculinity and femininity, public and private. The current struggle over abortion clinics and abortion legislation is truly the thin edge of this wedge.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Interim, Vol. 1, No. 6, September, 1983.
2. See, for example, John Brehl, "The people Who Oppose Abortions", Toronto Star, 22 August, 1983.
3. Kathleen McDonnell, "Claim No Easy Victories", in Maureen Fitzgerald et al (eds.) Still Ain't Satisfied - Canadian Feminism Today, (1982), p.38.
4. Kathleen McDonnell, Not An Easy Choice, (1984).
5. Eve Zarembo, "Choice is Not Enough", Broadside, Vol. 6, No. 4, February, 1985.
6. Andrea Dworkin, Right Wing Women, (1983).
7. As this paper began as a seminar presentation for graduate Women's Studies and Political Science courses at Carleton University, I would like to thank two professors, Reg Whitaker and Jill Vickers, as well as my fellow students, for their comments. Jill Vickers in particular encouraged me to pursue and refine my ideas on this topic and is largely responsible for seeing to it that a term paper was rescued from obscurity. Discussions with friends and family also clarified my thoughts - thanks to Kelly Dubinsky, John Doherty, Donna Jowett, Rob Kanasy, Rosemary Kness and Carol Whitehead. Thanks also to Vi Augustine for typing and proofreading.
8. Dr. and Mrs. J.C. Wilkie, Handbook on Abortion, (1979), p. 200.
9. See Alphonse deValk, Morality and Law in Canadian Politice - The Abortion Controversy, (1974), for an account of the early abortion debate, (Chapter 1).
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., p. 91.

14. Globe and Mail, 15 March 1968, quoted in deValk, p. 82.
15. Two quite fascinating chronicles of the Abortion Caravan are Krista Maeot's "Abortion Caravan", in Canadian Forum, July/August 1970 and Katherine Keate's "Out From Under, Women Unite", in Saturday Night, July 1970, Vol. 85, No. 7. See also Myrna Kostash's general history of the new left and early women's liberation movement, A Long Way From Home, (1980).
16. Right to Life News, December 1981.
17. Robin Badgley et al, Report of the Committee on the Operation of the Abortion Law, (1977).
18. See recent literature from the Ontario Coalition for Abortion Clinics (OCAC), and the Toronto International Women's Day Committee.
19. For a further discussion of the implications - positives and negatives - of the wholesale adoption of 'choice' by feminists, see McDonnell (1984), Chapter 5, pp. 68-80, and Rosalind Pollack Petchesky "Reproductive Freedom: Beyond 'A Women's Right to Choose'", in Catherine R. Stimpson and Ethel Spector Person, (eds.), Women Sex and Sexuality, (1980), pp. 92-116.
20. McDonnell, (1984), p. 19.
21. Eleanor Wright Pelrine, Morgentaler - The Doctor Who Couldn't Turn Away, (1979), p. 79.
22. Joe Borowski, "The Now Dead Party", Interim, Vol. 2, No. 5, August, 1984.
23. "Morgentaler Decision: Who Controls What?", Broadside, Vol. 6, No. 3, December 1984/January 1985. Similar arguments have been put forward by Susan G. Cole in "Doctor Power: The Real Abortion Issue", This Magazine, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1983; Connie Clement, "The Case for Lay Abortions", Healthsharing, Winter 1983 and by McDonnell, (1984), Chapter 8, pp. 125-139.

24. James M. Cameron, "Introduction" to E.J. Kremer and E.A. Synan (eds.), Death Before Birth - Canada and the Abortion Question, (1974), p. 12.
25. deValk (1974), conclusion.
26. Lloyd Gerson, "Abortion and the Right to Life", in Kremer, p. 93.
27. Eugene Fairweather and Ian Gentles, The Right To Birth - Some Christian Views on Abortion, (1976).
28. Ibid., Preface.
29. George and Shiela Grant, "Abortion and Rights - the Value of Political Freedom", in Fairweather, p. 3.
30. Gerson in Kremer, p. 95.
31. Ian Gentles, "The Unborn Citizen - Do We Need A Law Against Abortion?", in Fairweather, p. 21.
32. Ibid.
33. CARAL leaflet, "You Know Them As The People Who Oppose Abortions", a pro-life group responded to this attack, labelling CARAL's position "pure, doctrinaire, power-elite feminism", (The Uncertified Human, Vol. 7, No. 5, October 1979).
34. Cameron in Kremer, p. 1.
35. The Interim, Vol. 2, No. 3, May 1984.
36. Wilkie (1979), p. 142.
37. deValk, conclusion.
38. Interview with Judy Rebick, OCAC, 29 February, 1984.
39. Elen Willis, "Abortion, Is a Woman A Person", in Ann Snitow et al, The Powers of Desire - The Politics of Sexuality, (1983), p. 472.
40. Marnie deVarent, "Feminism and Abortion", in Fairweather, p. 63.
41. Feminists for Life of America leaflet.

42. Ellen Willis, "Abortion - Which Side Are You On?", in Radical America, Vol. 15, No. 1 and 2, Spring 1981, p. 91.
43. Action Life Ottawa leaflet.
44. Cameron in Kremer, p. 3.
45. Allen Hunter "In the Wings - New Right Ideology and Organization" in Radical America, Vol. 15, No. 1 and 2, Spring 1981, p. 132.
46. Allen Hunter, *ibid.*, and Zillah Eisenstein, "The Sexual Politics of the New Right - Understanding the Crisis of Liberalism", in Keohane et al (eds.), Feminist Theory, A Critique of Ideology, (1981), have both stressed this point.
47. Pat Daly, "Real Women of Canada", Broadside, March 1984.
48. Charlotte Gray, "R.E.A.L. Women - The Traditionalists Take on the Feminists", Chatelaine, March 1985.
49. Real Women of Canada, Position Papers, (n.d.).
50. "Wage Gap Between Men and Women Not Sexual Discrimination", REALITY Update, November, 1984.
51. "Feminists NAC - Who are They?", Reality, Vol. 2, No. 2, Fall, 1984.
52. Rosalind Pollack Petchesky, "Anti Abortion, Anti Feminist and the Rise of the New Right", Feminist Studies, Summer, 1981.
53. *Ibid*, p. 208.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
55. Eisenstein in Keohane, p. 77.
56. Grace Petrasek on As It Happens, CBC Radio, 2 February 1984.
57. Andrea Dworkin, p. 22.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

61. Mary O'Brien and Sheila McIntyre, "Patriarchal Hegemony and Legal Education", n.d., unpublished, p. 7.
62. Petchesky, p. 237.
63. Barbara Ehrenreich, "The Women's Movement - Feminist and Anti Feminist", Radical America, ibid.
64. Ibid., p. 98.
65. Pat and Hugh Armstrong, A Working Majority - What Women Must Do For Pay, (1983) and Advisory Council on the Status of Women, As Things Stand, (1984).
66. Both Eisenstein and Hunter have pointed out this contradiction in new right thought.
67. See Petchesky on this point.
68. Carol Pohli, "A Feminist View of Moral Majority Women", Feminist Studies, Fall 1983, Vol. 9, No. 3.
69. Both Petchesky and Dworkin have commented on Bryant's recent 'fall from grace'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anglican Church of Canada - Task Force on Human Life, Abortion, An Issue for Conscience, 1974.
- Badgley, Robin, et al, Report of the Committee on the Operation of the Abortion Law, Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1977.
- Clement, Connie, "A Case for Lay Abortion", in Healthsharing, Winter, 1983.
- Cole, Susan G., "The Real Abortion Issue", in This Magazine, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1983.
- deValk, Alphonse, Morality and Law in Canadian Politics - The Abortion Controversy, Montreal: Palm Publications, 1974.
- Dworkin, Andrea, Right Wing Women, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1983.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, "The Women's Movement - Feminist and Anti Feminist", in Radical America, Vol. 15, No. 1 and 2, Spring 1981.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, The Hearts of Men - American Dreams and the Flight From Commitment, London: Pluto Press, 1983.
- Eisenstein, Zillah, "The Sexual Politics of the New Right - Understanding the Crisis of Liberalism", in Nanrerl O. Keohane, et al, (eds.), Feminist Theory - A Critique of Ideology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- English, Deirdre, "The War Against Choice - Inside the Anti Abortion Movement", in Mother Jones, February/March, 1981.
- Fairweather, Eugene and Ian Gentles, The Right to Birth - Some Christian Views on Abortion, Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1976.
- Ganz, Richard, Thou Shalt Not Kill: The Christian Case Against Abortion, New York: Arlington House, 1978.

- Hunter, Allen, "In the Wings - New Right Ideology and Organization", in Radical America, Vol. 15, No. 1 and 2, Spring 1981.
- Keate, Katherine, "Out From Under - Women Unite", in Saturday Night, July 1970, Vol. 85, No. 7.
- Kremer, E.J. and E.A. Synan, Death Before Birth - Canada and the Abortion Question, Toronto: Griffin House, 1974.
- Kostash, Myrna, A Long Way From Home, Toronto: Lorimer, 1980.
- Maeots, Krista, "Abortion Caravan", in Canadian Forum, July/August, 1970.
- Mackinnon, Catherine, "The Male Ideology of Privacy: A Feminist Perspective on Abortion", in Radical America, Vol. 17, No. 4, 1983.
- Masters, Roger D., "Explaining Male Chauvanism and Feminism. Cultural Differences in Male and Female Reproductive Strategies", in Women and Politics, Vol 3, No. 2 and 3, Summer/Fall, 1983.
- McDonnell, Kathleen, "Claim No Easy Victories - The Fight for Reproductive Rights", Maureen Fitzgerald, et al, (eds.), Still Ain't Satisfied - Canadian Feminism Today, Toronto: Women's Press, 1982.
- McDonnell, Kathleen, Not An Easy Choice, Toronto: Women's Press, 1984.
- Merton, Andrew, Enemies of Choice - The Right to Life Movement and Its Threat to Abortion, Boston: Beacon Press, 1981.
- O'Brien, Mary and Sheila McIntyre, "Patriarchal Hegemony and Legal Education", (n.d., unpublished).
- Pelrine, Eleanor Wright, Abortion in Canada, Toronto: New Press, 1972.
- Pelrine, Eleanor Wright, Morgentaler - The Doctor Who Couldn't Turn Away, Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Petchesky, Rosalind Pollack, "Anti Abortion, Anti Feminism and the Rise of the New Right", in Feminist Studies, Summer 1981.

- Pohli, Carol, "A Feminist View of Moral Majority Women", in Feminist Studies, Fall 1983, Vol. 9, No. 3.
- Power, Doris, "Statement to the Abortion Caravan", in Women Unite, Toronto: Canadian Women's Educational Press, 1972.
- Randl, Shirley Rogers, The Invisible Woman. Targets of the Religious New Right, New York: Delta Books, 1983.
- Riley, Susan, "The Nation's New Agony Over Abortion", in McLeans, July 15, 1983, Vol. 96, No. 30.
- Rowland, Robyn, Women Who Do and Women Who Don't, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Stacey, Judith, "The New Conservative Feminism", in Feminist Studies, Vol. 9, No. 3, Fall 1983.
- United Church of Canada, Abortion - A Study, (n.d.).
- Waters, Wendell W., Compulsory Parenthood - The Truth About Abortion, Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Willis, Ellen, "Abortion - Which Side Are You On?", in Radical America, Vol. 15, No. 1 and 2, Spring 1981.
- Willis, Ellen, "Abortion - Is A Woman A Person?", Ann Snitow et al, (eds.), in Powers of Desire - The Politics of Sexuality, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS
FROM THE
FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE SERIES

No. 16 - The Canadian Women's Movement, Equality Rights and the Charter, by Lise Gotell, 1990.

This article examines the contradictory consequences of the entrenchment of a sexual equality clause in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms for the Canadian women's movement. At the same time as the Charter provides a symbolic assurance of women's equality, its use as an instrument for ensuring such equality risks legalizing and judicializing the quest for improvements in women's status. Through an exploration of a number of legislative and judicial decisions in recent years, the author suggests the women's movement should exercise caution in its embrace of a charter-based strategy.

No. 17 - Towards Family Policies in Canada With Women in Mind, by Susan A. McDaniel.

That Canadian families are changing is a subject of increasing political and intellectual discussion and debate. On both sides of the 49th parallel, the family has emerged as a central political issue as never before in history. Policy initiatives on such fronts as day care, reproductive control and employment equity, as well as the growing call for policies which might prop up the traditional family, may all have profound implications for women in Canadian families. This paper examines some issues of importance to women on which family policy might build in light of existing research and trends in family change. Particular attention is given to the concerns of women within the concerns of the family.

ORDER FORM

Price per copy: \$3.00. Please add \$1.00 postage and handling for each copy. Postage will be added to bulk orders. 20% discount on orders of 10 or more copies of each title.

Number of Copies	Series No.	Total
_____	_____	\$ _____

Name: _____
Address: _____

CRIAW/ICREF, 408-151 SLATER STREET, OTTAWA, ONTARIO K1P 5H3.
TEL: (613) 563-0681 TDD: (613) 230-1641 FAX: (613) 563-7739

Karen Dubinsky, a Masters student in Women's Studies at Carleton University, brings fresh insights to the examination of 'right-wing women' in Canada, and the ideology behind anti-abortion and anti-feminist groups such as R.E.A.L. Women. A brief history of Canadian abortion legislation and the rise of pro-choice and anti-abortion organizing is followed by an overview of pro-life ideology through a review of the movement's literature. In discussing several feminist theoretical works which attempt to explain the rise of anti-feminist sentiment, Ms. Dubinsky challenges feminists to re-assess the impact and significance of this new phenomenon.

Karen Dubinsky est étudiante de maîtrise à l'université Carleton à Ottawa au département de Women's Studies. Elle porte un regard nouveau sur la question des "femmes de la droite" au Canada et de l'idéologie des groupes anti-avortement et anti-féminisme tel que le R.E.A.L. Women. L'auteure présente un bref historique de l'évolution des lois canadiennes en matière d'avortement et décrit la naissance des mouvements en faveur du choix et des mouvements contre l'avortement. Elle s'attarde ensuite à l'étude de l'idéologie pour la vie dont elle retrace l'évolution à partir des ouvrages publiés à ce sujet. En examinant les travaux théoriques des diverses féministes qui tentent d'expliquer l'apparition des sentiments anti-féministes, Mme Dubinsky invite les féministes à réévaluer les répercussions et le sens de ce phénomène nouveau.



CANADIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN
INSTITUT CANADIEN DE RECHERCHES
SUR LES FEMMES

151 Slater, Suite 408,
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5H3