

1. The new know-nothingism: five myths about immigration

DAVID COLE

(*The Nation*, October 17, 1994, reprinted with permission of *The Nation*, excerpt)

[L]et's look at five current myths that distort public debate and government policy relating to immigrants.

- *America is being overrun with immigrants.* In one sense, of course, this is true, but in that sense it has been true since Christopher Columbus arrived. Except for the real Native Americans, we are a nation of immigrants.

It is not true, however, that the first-generation immigrant share of our population is growing. As of 1990, foreign-born people made up only 8 percent of the population, as compared with a figure of about 15 percent from 1870 to 1920. Between 70 and 80 percent of those who immigrate every year are refugees or immediate relatives of U.S. citizens.

Much of the anti-immigrant fervor is directed against the undocumented, but they make up only 13 percent of all immigrants residing in the United States, and only 1 percent of the American population. Contrary to popular belief, most such aliens do not cross the border illegally but enter legally and remain after their student or visitor visa expires. Thus, building a wall at the border, no matter how high, will not solve the problem.

- *Immigrants take jobs from U.S. citizens.* There is virtually no evidence to support this view, probably the most widespread misunderstanding about immigrants. As documented by a 1994 A.C.L.U. Immigrants' Rights Project report, numerous studies have found that immigrants actually *create* more jobs than they fill. The jobs immigrants take are of course easier to see, but immigrants are often highly productive, run their own businesses and employ both immigrants and citizens. One study found that Mexican immigration to Los Angeles County between 1970 and 1980 was responsible for 78,000 new jobs. Governor Mario Cuomo reports that immigrants own more than 40,000 companies in New York, which provide thousands of jobs and \$3.5 billion to the state's economy every year.
- *Immigrants are a drain on society's resources.* This claim fuels many of the recent efforts to cut off government benefits to immigrants. However, most studies have found that immigrants are a net benefit to the economy because, as a 1994 Urban Institute report concludes, "immigrants generate significantly more in taxes paid than they cost in services received." The Council of Economic Advisers similarly found in 1986 that "immigrants have a favorable effect on the overall standard of living."

Anti-immigrant advocates often cite studies purportedly showing the contrary, but these generally focus only on taxes and services at the local or state level. What they fail to explain is that because most taxes go to the federal government, such studies would also show a net loss when applied to U.S. citizens. At most, such figures suggest that some redistribution of federal and state monies may be appropriate; they say nothing unique about the costs of immigrants.

Some subgroups of immigrants plainly impose a net cost in the short run, principally those who have most recently arrived and have not yet “made it.” California, for example, bears substantial costs for its disproportionately large undocumented population, largely because it has on average the poorest and least educated immigrants. But that has been true of every wave of immigrants that has ever reached our shores; it was as true of the Irish in the 1850s, for example, as it is of Salvadorans today. From a long-term perspective, the economic advantages of immigration are undeniable.

Some have suggested that we might save money and diminish incentives to immigrate illegally if we denied undocumented aliens public services. In fact, undocumented immigrants are already ineligible for most social programs, with the exception of education for schoolchildren, which is constitutionally required, and benefits directly related to health and safety, such as emergency medical care and nutritional assistance to poor women, infants and children. To deny such basic care to people in need, apart from being inhumanly callous, would probably cost us more in the long run by exacerbating health problems that we would eventually have to address.

■ *Aliens refuse to assimilate and are depriving us of our cultural and political unity.* This claim has been made about every new group of immigrants to arrive on U.S. shores. Supreme Court Justice Stephen Field wrote in 1884 that the Chinese “have remained among us as a separate people, retaining their original peculiarities of dress, manners, habits, and modes of living, which are as marked as their complexion and language.” Five years later, he upheld the racially based exclusion of Chinese immigrants. Similar claims have been made over different periods of our history about Catholics, Jews, Italians, Eastern Europeans and Latin Americans.

In most instances, such claims are simply not true; “American culture” has been created, defined and revised by persons who for the most part are descended from immigrants once seen as anti-assimilationist. Descendants of the Irish Catholics, for example, a group once decried as separatist and alien, have become Presidents, senators and representatives (and all of these in one family, in the case of the Kennedys). Our society exerts tremendous pressure to conform, and cultural separatism rarely survives a generation. But more important, even if this claim were true, is this a legitimate rationale for limiting immigration in a society built on the values of pluralism and tolerance?

- *Noncitizen immigrants are not entitled to constitutional rights.* Our government has long declined to treat immigrants as full human beings, and nowhere is that more clear than in the realm of constitutional rights. Although the Constitution literally extends the fundamental protections in the Bill of Rights to all people, limiting to citizens only the right to vote and run for federal office, the federal government acts as if this were not the case.

In 1893 the executive branch successfully defended a statute that required Chinese laborers to establish their prior residence here by the testimony of “at least one credible white witness.” The Supreme Court ruled that this law was constitutional because it was reasonable for Congress to presume that nonwhite witnesses could not be trusted.

The federal government is not much more enlightened today. In a pending case I’m handling in the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, the Clinton Administration has argued that permanent resident aliens lawfully living here should be extended no more First Amendment rights than aliens applying for first-time admission from abroad—that is, none. Under this view, students at a public university who are citizens may express themselves freely, but students who are not citizens can be deported for saying exactly what their classmates are constitutionally entitled to say.

Growing up, I was always taught that we will be judged by how we treat others. If we are collectively judged by how we have treated immigrants—those who appear today to be “other” but will in a generation be “us”—we are not in very good shape.

2. Rap and hip-hop’s negative impact on society

JOSHUA SMITH

(*Issues*, October 2007, at: <http://socyberty.com/issues/rap-and-hip-hops-negative-impact-on-society>; excerpt)

Secular rap as a whole has a negative impact on society, particularly on our youth, through its explicit content. It sends a powerful message of hate and violence that is devouring the minds of our youth, playing a major role in such problems as rape, racism, teen pregnancy, suicide, homicide and even gang violence.

Throughout the years rap, particularly secular rap, has had a huge impact on our society. Not only are millions of CDs produced every year but popular rap songs receive heavy rotation on multiple hip hop radio stations. It seems that society—or rather, today’s youth—is engulfed in the hip hop culture.

According to Patrice B. Jones, the author of an article written in 2005 on secular rap, the affects [sic] of secular rap on society and our youth could be

detrimental. He states that African Americans are “portrayed unfairly and unattractively” by secular rap. Secular rap is simply harmful and is polluting society.

Secular rap music portrays African Americans in a negative light through its lyrics. Many secular rap lyrics consist of horrid tales of violence, such as black on black violence, alcohol abuse, and drug related crimes. Secular rap basically adds on to an already existing stereotype that all black males are violent and dangerous.

This in turn makes life even harder for young African Americans because now they are looked upon as being a “potential threat” to a person’s life, or should I say, a person’s well-being. This only increases the amount of racism against African Americans and rightfully so because people believe what they hear and may begin to develop a fear of those spoken of in rap lyrics.

Though there is obvious damage being done, these rap artist [sic] refuse to put themselves in the shoes of a young black male who is trying to succeed in a “White Man’s World.” The way some of the rap songs portray African Americans puts them in an even deeper hole because they have to prove that they are different from the roughhousing gang bangers depicted in secular rap.

As secular rap has progressed and evolved, it has begun to lean more and more towards sexually explicit lyrics which in turn has damaged the image of women. Unlike the “old days” or the so called “early stages” of secular rap, today’s rap music portrays women in a negative light through sexually inappropriate remarks.

Popular rap artist [sic] such as E-40, 50 Cent, Ludacris, and Young Buck are well-known for their sexual lyrics. The popular song “Money Maker” by Ludacris not only destroys the image of women, but it also encourages them to prostitute themselves: “Shake, shake, shake your money maker / Like you were shakin’ it for some paper.”

Critics of my position really seem to not see the whole picture; they do not fully understand how women are being dehumanized by these lyrics and in turn are now being looked upon as sexual objects by our youth. In my opinion this not only puts women in a losing situation (same as African Americans who have to prove they are different from the stereotype) but it also puts many women in danger of sexual crimes, such as rape.

What a person listens to can have a dramatic impact on the emotions and actions of that person. Being a male, I fully understand the influence that sexually related lyrics have on a person. It causes their minds to wander and to think inappropriate things about women. Soon they began to view women not as humans who have feeling, but as sex objects which they must have.

Along with its controversial lyrics on sex and races, secular rap also promotes gang violence and at times even glorifies it. Many of today’s popular rap artists, such as Snoop Dogg (Crip), The Game (Blood) and Lil Scrappy (Blood), promote their life of crime through their music. A good example of the promotion of gang violence would be a song released in 2002 by Tupac Shakur (2Pac) entitled

"Ghetto Star." Though I myself am a fan of 2Pac because of some of the good things he stood for, he was also very gang related.

The first verse of the song basically demonstrates how violent secular rap is nowadays: "I hit the weed / And hope to god I can fly high / Witness my enemies / Die when I ride by / They shouldn't have tried me / Send they bodies to their parents up north / With they faces they wrists and they nuts cut off."

Secular rap is not only sending a message of violence to our youth and society as a whole, but it is also glorifying these acts of violence ("Ghetto Star"). This, in turn, leads directly to an immense problem our world is facing today. People die daily in the streets of New York, Compton, Long Beach, Houston and just about every other urban city across the United States.

According to areaconnect.com, in LA and NY alone a little more than 1000 people were murdered in 2005. The crime rates continue to rise almost every year, and you have to wonder if secular rap is influencing this in any way.

One of the most disturbing aspects of secular rap is its violent words directed towards cops and other authority figures. Rappers today continuously attack police officers verbally, even using profanity to describe them. Back in the early days of rap, N.W.A made the phrase "F*** the police" famous and it just has continued to grow even more violent.

According to raplyricssearch.com, in a song by Kool G, he describes a train robbery in which he shoots and kills four cops; and in a song made by Makaveli (aka, 2Pac) entitled "Open Fire," he goes into great detail about an event (made up) in which he escapes from the cops, leaving multiple officers dead. These words of hate directed towards cops are poisonous to society because of the affects [sic] they have on the youth. Today's generation is strongly influenced by the hip-hop culture, made evident through the millions of CDs produced every year, so the views of these rappers can easily influence their listeners to see things in the same light. This is one of the reasons why the youth today are so out of control.

They lack respect for any real authority figure and most secular rap simply reinforces this thinking. Without question the impact of secular rap has led to many slain cops. According to axt.com, the controversial song "Cop Killer" by Ice-T has been "implicated in at least two shootings." One of the deadliest ones happened in 1992.

According to axt.com, "While on patrol in July 1992, two Las Vegas police officers were ambushed and shot by four juvenile delinquents who boasted that Ice-T's 'Cop Killer' gave them a sense of duty and purpose, to get even with 'a f---king pig.' The juveniles continued to sing its lyrics when apprehended."

Secular rap's promotion of cop killings is a very disturbing problem that should in no way be overlooked. Secular hasn't always been so bad, but throughout time it seems to have strayed from the path. Back in the 1980s, hip hop/rap was born. Artists such as Run DMC, LL Cool J, Sugarhill Gang, and GangStarr all were very popular. They were, as many would call, the pioneers of rap.

Unlike today's music, vulgar language was rarely used; instead, they spoke about more social issues and changes that could be made to make society better. Even rappers of the early 1990s, such as 2Pac, were making positive impacts on society through their lyrics. 2Pac touched many people's lives through songs such as "Keep Ya Head Up," "Trapped," and "Hold on be Strong," encouraging the black community (as well as everyone else) to continue to fight and to be strong even when tragedy occurs.

Hip hop didn't always used to be negative and vulgar, no; it started off as a good thing, a positive thing. As a result, crimes were somewhat down and society seemed to be growing. Then came rappers such as N.W.A and Ice-T, who promoted the use of violence when confronted by policemen and gang violence. Also with this came many other rappers such as Biggie and Nas. Violence grew as the 2Pac vs. Biggie feud emerged, which led to both of them being murdered. To show how negative an effect these two feuding rappers had on society during this time period, you need not look any further than their deaths.

After 2Pac of Deathrow records (ties with the Bloods) was apparently killed by a Crip, the following week gang violence between the Bloods and the Crips in Compton, California was intense. Several people were slain in retaliation, which ultimately led to the death of Biggie. Their feud had a negative impact on society, proving that we are indeed affected by what we listen to.

Today, the music has gotten even worse and this seems to be one of the reasons society, in general, is failing. What if the positive tactics of the early days of rap were used in today's music? Would it change things? There is no doubt that it would send a more positive message to the youth, which in turn would change the way we as a society think . . .

3. In defense of negative campaigning

WILLIAM G. MAYER

(Reprinted by permission from *Political Science Quarterly*, 111 (Fall 1996): 437–455, excerpt)

When televised presidential debates were first held in 1960, many commentators deplored them for their shallow, insubstantial nature. But when scholars write about those debates today, they almost invariably comment about how much better the Kennedy–Nixon encounters seem than any of the more recent presidential debates. Students to whom I have shown excerpts from these debates usually have the same reaction. Compared to the Great Confrontations of [today], the 1960 debates seem more civil, more intelligent, more substantive. Especially noticeable is what is missing from the 1960 debates: the antsiness, the evasions, the meaningless memorized one-liners designed only to be featured on the postdebate newscasts, the boos and applause from the studio audience.

...

This nascent reform movement has a number of specific targets and criticism, but one of the most widely mentioned is negative campaigning. Whenever commentators compile a catalogue of the most heinous sins in current American politics, negative campaigning and attack advertising usually wind up near the top of the list . . .

...

To many observers, the problem is sufficiently serious to require laws and regulations that would discourage or penalize negative campaigning . . . One frequently made proposal . . . would require any candidate who uses radio or television commercials to attack another candidate to deliver the attack in person. Another suggestion is to allow television and radio stations to charge higher rates for negative commercials than for positive ones. Some critics have even argued that the United States should follow the example of Venezuela and bar candidates entirely from referring to their opponents by name or by picture in their ads.

...

There is little doubt that contemporary American election campaigns do fall short of the standards commended in our civics books. But in the laudable desire to improve our campaigns, surprisingly little attention has been paid to the easy, almost reflexive assumption that negative campaigning is bad campaigning: negative speeches and advertising are always morally wrong and damaging to our political system. In part, perhaps, the problem is one of semantics. Negative campaigning certainly sounds bad: it's so, well, you know, negative. But if we move beyond the label, what really is so bad about negative campaigning?

The purpose of this article, as its title indicates, is to challenge the accepted wisdom about negative campaigning. Negative campaigning, in my view, is a necessary and legitimate part of any election; and our politics—and the growing movement to reform our election campaigns—will be a good deal better off when we finally start to acknowledge it.

The value of negative campaigning

What exactly is negative campaigning? Most people who use the term seem to have in mind a definition such as the following: Negative campaigning is campaigning that attacks or is critical of an opposing candidate. Where positive campaigning dwells on the candidate's own strengths and merits, and talks about the beneficial politics he would adopt if elected, negative campaigning focuses on the weaknesses and faults of the opposition: the mistakes they have made, the flaws in their character or performance, the bad policies they would pursue. And the more one focuses on the reality and consequences of such practices, the more clear I think it becomes that negative campaigning is not the plain and unmitigated evil that it is frequently portrayed to be. To the contrary, negative campaigning

provides voters with a lot of valuable information that they definitely need to have when deciding how to cast their ballots.

To begin with, any serious substantive discussion of what a candidate intends to do after the election can only be conducted by talking about the flaws and shortcomings of current policies. If a candidate is arguing for a major change in government policy, his first responsibility is to show that current policies are in some way deficient. If the economy is already growing rapidly with low rates of inflation, if the “environmental crisis” has been greatly exaggerated, if present policies have largely eliminated the possibility that nuclear arms will actually be used, then everything the candidates are proposing in these areas is useless, even dangerous. The need for such proposals becomes clear only when a candidate puts them in the context of present problems—only, that is to say, when a candidate “goes negative.” . . .

But the information and analysis embodied in negative campaigning are also valuable on their own terms, for they tell us something extremely relevant about the choices we are about to make. We need to find out about the candidates’ strengths, it is true, but we also need to learn about their weaknesses: the abilities and virtues they don’t have; the mistakes they have made; the problems they haven’t dealt with; the issues they would prefer not to talk about; the bad or unrealistic policies they have proposed. If one candidate performed poorly in his last major public office, if another has no clear or viable plan for dealing with the economy, if a third is dishonest, the voters really do need to be informed about such matters. I need hardly add that no candidate is likely to provide a full and frank discussion of his own shortcomings. Such issues will only get a proper hearing if an opponent is allowed to talk about them by engaging in negative campaigning.

Finally, negative campaigning is valuable if for no other reason than its capacity to keep the candidates a bit more honest than they would be otherwise. One doesn’t have to have a lot of respect for the truth and intelligence of current campaign practices in order to conclude that things would be a lot worse without negative campaigning. If candidates always knew that their opponents would never say anything critical about them, campaigns would quickly turn into a procession of lies, exaggerations, and unrealistic promises. Candidates could misstate their previous records, present glowing accounts of their abilities, make promises they knew they couldn’t keep—all with the smug assurance that no one would challenge their assertions. Every campaign speech could begin with the words, “I think I can say without fear of contradiction . . .”

. . .

I have frequently encountered [this] surprising reaction: . . . “Nobody criticizes *all* negative campaigning. When people criticize negative campaigning they’re not worried about attacks that are true and deal with significant issues. What they’re upset about is that so much of this attack advertising is misleading or nasty or about made-up issues that have no real relevance to governing. *That’s* what the furor’s all about.”

To this argument, I would make two responses. First, I would urge anyone who thinks I am overstating the case to read through a substantial part of the writing that has built up recently around the question of negative campaigning. What you will find is that the vast majority of this work . . . does, indeed, indict all campaign activities that are aimed at criticizing one's opponents, regardless of the particular issues they deal with, without even investigating whether the attacks are true or not . . . [M]ost writing on the topic criticizes *all* negative campaigning, without any attempt to draw distinctions about its truth, relevance, or civility . . .

...
To defend negative campaigning, of course, is not to deny that positive campaigning is also important . . .

4. Television and violent crime

BRANDON S. CENTERWALL

(*The Public Interest*, no. 111, Spring 1993, pp. 56–71, excerpt.
Reprinted with permission of National Affairs, at:
www.nationalaffairs.com)

From 1945 to 1974, the white homicide rate in the United States increased 93 percent. In Canada, the homicide rate increased 92 percent. In South Africa, where television was banned, the white homicide rate declined by 7 percent.

Could there be some explanation other than television for the fact that violence increased dramatically in the U.S. and Canada while dropping in South Africa? I examined an array of alternative explanations. None is satisfactory:

- Economic growth. Between 1946 and 1974, all three countries experienced substantial economic growth. Per capita income increased by 75 percent in the United States, 124 percent in Canada, and 86 percent in South Africa. Thus differences in economic growth cannot account for the different homicide trends in the three countries.
- Civil unrest. One might suspect that anti-war or civil-rights activity was responsible for the doubling of the homicide rate in the United States during this period. But the experience of Canada shows that this was not the case, since Canadians suffered a doubling of the homicide rate without similar civil unrest.

Other possible explanations include changes in age distribution, urbanization, alcohol consumption, capital punishment, and the availability of firearms. As discussed in *Public Communication and Behavior* (1989), none provides a viable explanation for the observed homicide trends.

In the United States and Canada, there was a lag of ten to fifteen years between the introduction of television and a doubling of the homicide rate. In South Africa, there was a similar lag. Since television exerts its behavior-modifying effects primarily on children, while homicide is primarily an adult activity, this lag represents the time needed for the “television generation” to come of age.

The relationship between television and the homicide rate holds *within* the United States as well. Different regions of the U.S., for example, acquired television at different times. As we would expect, while all regions saw increases in their homicide rates, the regions that acquired television first were also the first to see higher homicide rates.

Similarly, urban areas acquired television before rural areas. As we would expect, urban areas saw increased homicide rates several years before the occurrence of a parallel increase in rural areas.

The introduction of television also helps explain the different rates of homicide growth for whites and minorities. White households in the U.S. began acquiring television sets in large numbers approximately five years before minority households. Significantly, the white homicide rate began increasing in 1958, four years before a parallel increase in the minority homicide rate.

Of course, there are many factors other than television that influence the amount of violent crime. Every violent act is the result of a variety of forces coming together—poverty, crime, alcohol and drug abuse, stress—of which childhood TV exposure is just one. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that if, hypothetically, television technology had never been developed, there would today be 10,000 fewer homicides each year in the United States, 70,000 fewer rapes, and 700,000 fewer injurious assaults. Violent crime would be half what it is.

5. A crime by any other name

JEFFREY H. REIMAN AND PAUL LEIGHTON

(Jeffrey H. Reiman and Paul Leighton, *The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison*, © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc.
Reproduced by permission of Pearson Education, Inc.)

If it takes you an hour to read this chapter, by the time you reach the last page, two of your fellow citizens will have been murdered. *During that same time, at least 4 Americans will die as a result of unhealthy or unsafe conditions in the workplace!* Although these work-related deaths could have been prevented, they are not called murders. Why not? Doesn't a crime by any other name still cause misery and suffering? What's in a name?

The fact is that the label “crime” is not used in American to name all or the worst of the actions that cause misery and suffering to Americans. It is primarily reserved for the dangerous actions of the poor.

In the March 14, 1976 edition of the *Washington Star*, a front-page article appeared with the headline: "Mine Is Closed 26 Deaths Late." The article read in part:

Why, the relatives [of the 26 dead miners] ask, did the mine ventilation fail and allow pockets of methane gas to build up in a shaft 2,300 feet below the surface? . . .

[I]nvestigators of the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee . . . found that there have been 1,250 safety violations at the 13-year-old mine since 1970. Fifty-seven of those violations were serious enough for federal inspectors to order the mine closed and 21 of those were in cases where federal inspectors felt there was imminent danger to the lives of the miners working there.

(*The Washington Star*, March 14, 1976, pp. A1, A9)

Next to the continuation of this story was another, headlined: "Mass Murder Claims Six in Pennsylvania" (Ibid. p. A9). It described the shooting death of a husband and wife, their three children, and a friend in a Philadelphia suburb. This was murder, maybe even mass murder. My only question is, why wasn't the death of the miners also murder?

Why do 26 dead miners amount to a "disaster" and 6 dead suburbanites a "mass murder"? Murder suggests a murderer, while "disaster" suggests the work of impersonal forces. But if over 1000 safety violations had been found in the mine—three the day before the first explosion—was no one responsible for failing to eliminate the hazards? Was no one responsible for preventing the hazards? And if someone could have prevented the hazards and did not, does that person not bear responsibility of the deaths of 26 men? Is he less evil because he did not want them to die although he chose to leave them in jeopardy? Is he not a murderer, perhaps even a mass murderer? . . .

It is important to identify this model of the Typical Crime because it functions like a set of blinders. It keeps us from calling a mine disaster a mass murder even if 26 men are killed, even if someone is responsible for the unsafe conditions in which they worked and died. In fact, I argue that this particular piece of mental furniture so blocks our view that it keeps us from using the criminal justice system to protect ourselves from the greatest threats to our persons and possessions.

What keeps a mine disaster from being a mass murder in our eyes is the fact that it is not one-on-one harm. What is important here is not the numbers but the *intent to harm someone*. An attack by a gang on one or more persons or an attack by one individual on several fits the model of one-on-one harm. That is, for each person harmed there is at least one individual who wanted to harm that person. Once he selects his victim, the rapist, the mugger, the murderer, all want this person they have selected to suffer. A mine executive, on the other hand, does not want his employees to be harmed. He would truly prefer that there be no accident, no injured or dead miners. What he does want is something legitimate.

It is what he has been hired to get: maximum profits at minimum costs. If he cuts corners to save a buck, he is just doing his job. If 26 men die because he cut corners on safety, we may think him crude or callous but not a killer. He is, at most, responsible for an *indirect harm*, not a one-on-one harm. For this, he may even be criminally indictable for violating safety regulations—but not for murder. The 26 men are dead as an unwanted consequence of his (perhaps overzealous or undercautious) pursuit of a legitimate goal. And so, unlike the Typical Criminal, he has not committed the Typical Crime. Or so we generally believe. As a result, 26 men are dead who might be alive if cutting corners of the kind that leads to loss of life, whether suffering is specifically intended or not, were treated as murder.

6. Does society have the right to force pregnant drug addicts to abort their fetuses?

GEORGE SCHEDLER

(Social Theory & Practice, 17.3 (Fall 1991), excerpt. Reprinted with permission of Social Theory & Practice and the author)

My argument in brief is that, first, society has a duty to insure that infants are born free of avoidable defects, and, second, that those defects caused by chemical abuse of the pregnant mother are easily avoidable. Third, it follows that society can prevent pregnant addicts from giving birth. The paper is divided into three parts containing the argument for each of these propositions in turn.

1. Society has a duty to insure that infants are born free of avoidable defects

There are three arguments for this proposition: one, based on the rights of the fetus as a future infant; another, based on the rights of future persons; and a third, based on the economic and human costs of drug abuse during pregnancy. The first two arguments are rights-based, while the third is utilitarian. Although the first and second arguments have in common an appeal to our duties to future persons, they differ insofar as the first focuses on our duties to presently existing creatures that will become persons, while the second focuses on the precautions we must generally take to avoid unnecessary suffering for future persons.

- A. The Right of the Fetus as a Future Infant. This argument is based on the general principle that all creatures—even those who are not persons now—