



Abortion's limit

by Dorothy Timko

Last year I took a course in developmental psychology and the one area that I found fascinating was that of pre-natal development. Within 16 - 20 days of conception the internal organs have started to form. At 6 - 7 weeks the standard human form is visible. By eight weeks "the baby" is an individual with distinct sleeping habits, fingernails have started to grow and the digestive system is working.

Birth then is not the commencement of life but one of the stages through which humans must pass in their development; the physical development of which is completed by 25 - 27 years.

I think the implications of these facts should be obvious. Potentially human life is there at conception. "The conceptus contains all the genetic material which will constitute his person to the end of his days from the very moment of formation, when the sperm unites with the ovum." (Paul V. Adams, M.D., 1971)

When one considers that some abortions are performed at 19 - 20 weeks, I do not believe that we can honestly say that the fetus is not a human being by this time. Many pro-abortionists are using the term "fetus"

rather glibly, believing that its status attaches the status "non-human" to the life in the womb.

Fetus is merely a term for one stage in human development. Just because we call an individual an adolescent does not mean he is no longer human. Clearly then, from just a biological point of view we are dealing with human life in the process of becoming.

The question of when the human being receives his soul is highly irrelevant to the discussion of abortion when used out of context. In viewing the teachings of the Catholic Church it is important to distinguish between theological opinion and doctrinal teaching.

Prior to modern scientific knowledge and understanding of pre-natal life some theologians have speculated that the fetus was not ensouled until several weeks after conception. However the doctrinal teaching of the Church has always been that "an intentional attack on unborn human life at any point after conception is grave and sinful and criminal" (Joseph J. Farrar, S.J., *Our Family*, Nov. 1971).

With new scientific knowledge it appears most probable that "the new human person with a human spirit"

Yes Virginia...

...There is some

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION OF PSYCHOLOGY TODAY MAGAZINE Copyright © 1976 Ziff-Davis Publishing Company

by Mary G. Marcus

The man on the TV screen throws his hands in the air, a silly grin on his face, watching as the family washing machine overflows. As he's standing in soapy water up to his ankles, his wife bounds in, takes charge, and tells him that with Brand A, he needs only a quarter cup of detergent to get the family wash sparkling white. More likely than not, the sheepish, bumbling husband is named Harvey.

In 1965, to protest such advertisements, New Yorker Harvey Edwards organized a group of 150 Harveys and besieged the ad agencies. The Harveys won their fight, and three sponsors retired their offending commercials. To counter the media's portrayal of men named Harvey as weak and bumbling, the group set up an award for the best positive portrayal of a Harvey. The first winner: Columbia Pictures' Harvey Middleman, Fireman.

Harveys and other people with unusual names often do suffer. Psychologists and educators have found that while names cannot guarantee fame or insure neurosis, they can help or hinder the development of a good self-image, friendships, and even affect success in school and on the job.

As Humpty-Dumpty told Alice in *Through the Looking Glass*, certain names imply that their owners have specific characteristics. Alice asked, "Must a name mean something?" Humpty-Dumpty replied, "Of course it must ... My name means the shape I am ... With a name like yours, you might be any shape, almost."

Trustworthy John. Whenever researchers ask people to describe the owners of specific names, they find wide agreement. In 1963, a British psychologist asked a group of citizens to rank names as to their age, trustworthiness, attractiveness, sociability, kindness, and lack of aggression. He found that Johns are seen to be trustworthy and kind; Robins are young; Tonys, sociable, Agnesses, old; Agneses and Matildas, unattractive; and Anns, nonaggressive.

In the United States, psychologists Barbara Buchanan and James Bruning got college students at Penn State and Ohio Universities to rate 1,060 names. The students reported how much they liked or disliked them, whether the names were

active or passive, and how masculine or feminine they seemed. The students had no difficulty agreeing that they especially liked active Michael, James, and Wendy, and that Michael and James were extremely masculine while Wendy was quite feminine. They disliked passive Alfreda, Percival and Isadore, and felt that Percival's and Isadore's masculinity was in doubt. So was Alfreda's femininity. Feeling about most names was less intense.

In another study, psychologist E.D. Lawson asked a group of students to rank men's names. Ten of the 20 names (David, Gary, James, John, Joseph, Michael, Paul, Richard, Robert, and Thomas) were the most common on campus. The other 10 (Andrew, Bernard, Dale, Edmond, Gerd, Ivan, Lawrence, Raymond, Stanley, and Matthew) were selected at random from the total enrollment. Both men and women held stereotypes about the 20 names, they saw common names as better, stronger, and more active than unusual ones.

Even children share stereotypes about names. In one experiment, kindergartners, third- and sixth-graders judged a list of 10 uncommon names. The children matched the names with such descriptions as: "Who runs?" "Who sits?" Apparently stereotypes are learned, because while third- and sixth-graders confirmed the adults' stereotypes, kindergarten children did not. Five of the names (Sargent, Baxter, Otto, Shepard, and Bruno) were those rated by adults as active; the other five (Aldwin, Winthrop, Alfred, Milton, and Wendell) were rated as passive. Either the older children had already met people whose names fit the stereotypes, or they had picked up the stereotypes from parents, teachers, friends, or the media.

Psychologists have also found that names affect the way in which people think of themselves. New Zealanders who like their names are likely to have high self-esteem, and Americans who dislike their names do not feel as good about themselves as people who like theirs.

Strange names and psychosis. Uncommon names seem more of a handicap for men than for women. In the 1940s, B.M. Savage and F.L. Wells found that students with unusual names were more likely than their classmates to flunk out of Harvard. They were also more likely to be neurotic. Chicago researchers A. Arthur Hartman, Robert Nicolay, and Jesse Hurley looked for evidence of psychosis in a group of men who had been referred for psychiatric evaluation. Half the men were burdened with strange names (Oder, Lethal, Vere, and so on), and the other half had common names. The researchers found



© 1974 RECORD ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

more psychosis among men with odd names.

Women with unusual names appear to be more disturbed than those with common names. At least one study found that those with unusual names are not more neurotic. The difference between the two groups is in their differing attitudes toward their names. Researchers have found that men with unusual names and women with common names also prefer their own names and prefer unusual names over others.

People don't live in a vacuum. The impact of a name on his or her self-concept and health is largely by how others react to it. Psychologists John S. Berber and Herbert H. Harter found that members of four groups of 75 names each of 75 names below