

Proctor's Agnotological Principle Demonstrates Fully How Roe v Wade Came About and Continues to Exist.

The agnotological principle refers to the creation of bald ignorance and docile acceptance of Whatever through the manufacture and propagation of disinformation. It was discovered in sorts and developed by Stanford University History of Science Professor, Robert Proctor. Michael Hiltzik, in his Sowing Doubt About Science (LA Times, Sunday, 3/9/14 at B1) insightfully (but, nevertheless, only “partially”) pinpoints what, perhaps, poses the greatest ever threat to Democracy, if not also to all of Civilization: “commercially manufactured ignorance”. His great example is the disinformation manufactured by the tobacco industry on the demonstrable dangers of smoking. But there is a far greater example that can be given here, and it can be given so in a manner that completes the part of the agnotological equation which Hiltzik conveniently, or at least unwittingly, leaves out: the propagation and dissemination of “manufactured ignorance” by members of the information media, such as Hiltzik’s own Los Angeles Times Newspaper. Here is the far greater example (which I lifted from Philip Lawler’s, The Faithful Departed (2008) at p.63), and which explains in part, how what was once accepted as “one of the worst crimes known to law” became one of America’s most sacred and inviolate constitutionally guaranteed rights - or so says the ideology of radical feminism:

As the leading abortionist Bernard Nathanson would reveal after his dramatic conversion to the pro-life cause and the Catholic Church, strategists for the abortion lobby deliberately cultivated the notion that all public opposition to abortion was guided by the Catholic Church. The belief that a fetus is an unborn child, they argued, was based on a Catholic theological tenet, which non-Catholics could not be expected to accept. This argument *should* have been recognized immediately as a fraud. The humanity of a fetus is not a matter of theological speculation; it can be established by scientific tests. And opposition to abortion was never exclusively a Catholic affair.

This can be shown, if not by scientific testing, then at least by scientific observation. And so says both the medical science and the life sciences communities. See, e.g., Mosby’s Dictionary of Medicine 720 (2009), which defines *fetus* as a “human being” in utero: “The human being in utero after the embryonic [stage] and the beginning of development of the major structural features, from the ninth week after fertilization [at which fetal - beginning stage the fetus is approximately one inch in length]”. And then there is this observation set forth on page 4 of the 1976 edition of Van Nostrand’s Scientific Encyclopedia (the Preface of which reads, in pertinent part, as follows: “The editors ... have attempted to stress the proven, generally accepted description of both new and old ... concepts. In soundly controversial areas, however, where two, well-grounded schools of thought may be arguing while awaiting the results of further investigations and experimentation, both sides of such questions are given.”)

The creation of an embryo and development of a fetus and finally the birth of an infant is a continuous physiological process commencing with conception and ending with the cutting of the umbilical cord. It is not in any way a digital, step-wise process with distinct periods....

Only for convenience in studying and teaching are certain rather fuzzily defined phases or stages of embryo and fetus development identified and given names ...

The embryo and later the fetus is an individual entity, imbued with individualistic qualities [genes] which affects its rate of progress, much as later the progress of the infant to a mature adult will be determined by individualistic qualities. From a purely scientific standpoint, there is no question but that abortion represents the cessation of [a] human life.

Anti-religious bigotry, medical science, the life sciences, Anglo-American legal history on the prosecution of abortion and unborn child-killing (see my 1992 Work in www.parafferty.com) have all now been eliminated as supports for the acceptance of the insidious practice of procured abortion. And there are no “generally accepted” philosophical, moral or ethical principles which would support such a practice. And so, it seems that, indeed, the only support left for this insidious practice is “manufactured ignorance” topped off with, of course, private bias, aka: an anarchical sense of individualism coupled with an utter lack of a sense or insight into the nature, and destiny of the human person in light of the truth of the Incarnation. (See www.parafferty.com, and then click on Rafferty on the Human Person.)