

the HUMAN LIFE REVIEW



SPRING 2008

Featured in this issue:

William Murchison on No “Change” for the Unborn
Laura Echevarria on Obama & Clinton on Abortion
Stephen Vincent details Spitzer’s Bad RHAPP
Brian Clowes on The Abortion Lobby’s Deep Pockets
Kathryn Jean Lopez on Confronting a Changed Culture
Catherine Rinko-Gay on A Baby Named Evan
Donald DeMarco on My Telomeres Are Getting Shorter
Edward Short on Motherhood in Georgian England

Also in this issue:

Paul Kengor • Michelle Malkin • Ian Marcus Corbin • Kristin Hansen
Maggie Gallagher • Fr. Thomas Berg • Yuval Levin • Steven Pinker
Christopher Tollefsen • Wesley J. Smith • Nat Hentoff

Published by:

The Human Life Foundation, Inc.

New York, New York

Vol. XXXIV, No. 2

\$7.00 a copy

ABOUT THIS ISSUE . . .

. . . it was a long primary season, but even after the white smoke went up from the networks most voters still had little idea of just how extreme the Democratic Party's presumptive nominee's position on abortion is. We are indebted to contributor Laura Echevarria for doing the yeoman's work of transcribing speeches that both Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton gave at a Planned Parenthood event last year. While she quotes extensively from each in her article here (page 14), the full texts are available on her website (www.lauraechevarria.com) and well worth reading.

The Internet, where Echevarria found videos of the speeches posted on Planned Parenthood's site, is an invaluable conduit for abortion-related information. In "Confronting a Changed Culture" (page 36), Kathryn Jean Lopez, who heads up National Review Online—perhaps the preeminent online news and opinion site—reports on Abortion Changes You, a new outreach program created by Michaelene Fredenburg, a woman who wants to help others who have suffered, as she did, from having had an abortion. Ms. Fredenburg's book, *Changed: Making Sense of Your Own or a Loved One's Abortion Experience*, and related promotional materials such as advertisements and posters, can be ordered through her website at www.abortionchangesyou.com, or by calling 1-(877)-325-HEAL.

Brian Clowes, who is director of research for Human Life International in Virginia, used the Internet to access publicly available IRS filings from scores of pro-life and pro-abortion organizations to see how their finances compared—or didn't. His article, "The Abortion Lobby's Deep Pockets" (page 27), painstakingly shows how pro-lifers are outspent by outfits like Planned Parenthood, which receive tax dollars in one hand and dole out dollars to pro-abortion politicians with the other.

Former New York Governor Eliot Spitzer, who resigned early this year after news of his fondness for prostitutes hit the papers, used to be a feminist dreamboat. In "Spitzer's Bad RHAPP" (page 22), contributor Stephen Vincent examines a radical bill the governor left behind in the New York State legislature—a gift to the girl groups that would enshrine abortion as a state civil right.

While baby-boomer politicians like Obama (and Spitzer before his fall) do abortocrats' bidding, growing numbers of young people identify themselves as pro-life. Catherine Rinko-Gay, a new contributor we welcome to the *Review*, is a student who recently spent some time in Africa. Her poignant remembrance—which came in over our e-mail transom—of a baby named Evan begins on page 39.

Eighteenth-century baby-love is a theme of Edward Short's latest article for us (page 44). We are delighted that Mr. Short continues to bring his literary perspective to bear on the abortion issue, as his keen look at the work of Georgian women poets undercuts the carping of contemporary feminist scholarship.

Speaking of delight, we continue to be moved to it by the work of Nick Downes, a cartoonist whose humor exudes hope even as it touches on horror—what we like to think we do here.

ANNE CONLON
MANAGING EDITOR



the HUMAN LIFE REVIEW

Spring 2008
Vol. XXXIV, No. 2

Editor

Maria McFadden

Senior Editors

Ellen Wilson Fielding
Faith Abbott McFadden
Mary Meehan
William Murchison

Managing Editor

Anne Conlon

Consulting Editor, Europe

Mary Kenny, London

Contributors

Lynette Burrows
James Hitchcock
Rita L. Marker
William McGurn
George McKenna
David Quinn
Wesley J. Smith

Business Manager

Rose Flynn DeMaio

Production Manager

Christina McFadden

Publishing Consultant

Edward A. Capano

Founding Editor

J.P. McFadden

Introduction 2
Maria McFadden

No "Change" for the Unborn 7
William Murchison

Obama & Clinton Talk about Abortion 14
Laura Echevarria

Spitzer's Bad RHAPP 22
Stephen Vincent

The Abortion Lobby's Deep Pockets 27
Brian Clowes

Confronting a Changed Culture 36
Kathryn Jean Lopez

Evan 39
Catherine Rinko-Gay

My Telomeres Are Getting Shorter 41
Donald DeMarco

Motherhood in Georgian England 44
Edward Short

Appendices 55

Paul Kengor
Michelle Malkin
Ian Marcus Corbin
Kristin Hansen
Maggie Gallagher
Fr. Thomas Berg
Yuval Levin
Steven Pinker
Christopher Tollefsen
Wesley J. Smith
Nat Hentoff

Published by THE HUMAN LIFE FOUNDATION, INC.
Editorial Office, 353 Lexington Avenue, Suite
802, New York, N.Y. 10016. Phone: (212) 685-
5210. The editors will consider all manuscripts
submitted, but assume no responsibility for un-
solicited material. Editorial and subscription
inquiries, and requests for reprint permission
should be sent directly to our editorial office.
Subscription price: \$25 per year; Canada and
other foreign countries: \$30 (U.S. currency).
ISSN 0097-9783.

©2008 by THE HUMAN LIFE FOUNDATION, INC.
New York, N.Y. Printed in the U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

“As we know all too well,” recalls William Murchison in our lead article (“No ‘Change’ for the Unborn”), “the feminist agitations of the 1960s, which led directly to *Roe v. Wade* on Jan. 22, 1973, made abortion a political issue for the first time in U.S. history.” And, he goes on, “A political issue it remains, first and foremost” because we have been forced to count on our elected representatives to defend, or undermine it.

As I write we are entering, thank God, the final months of this extraordinary campaign for the presidency. About the plight of the unborn, Murchison observes, “there is no dispute as to the broad contours of the matter. McCain is pro-life. Obama is pro-choice.” There are those who question the *depth* of Senator McCain’s commitment to the pro-life cause, but no one has come forward with similar doubts about Senator Obama: His views are firmly fixed and startlingly clear. And so, Murchison writes, “With proper respect to McCain, whose party base includes many a dissenter from pro-life orthodoxy, Obama’s declarations on abortion enjoy a superior claim to study.”

What does the “candidate of change” say? Well, among other things, that he is “absolutely convinced that culture wars are so ’90’s,” and he’s “tired of arguing about the same ol’ stuff.” Which sounds like he’s for some kind of compromise; the problem is, he’s not. Senator Obama’s voting record is extreme: While serving as an Illinois state senator he even opposed that state’s version of the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act—so it seems *his* idea of stopping the arguing would translate into a policy of no mercy for the lives of not only the unborn, but those who survive the abortion procedure as well. Murchison, in his deft prose, exposes Obama’s shallow passing off of “what we commonly call culture,” and makes the case with eloquence that it is precisely what happens in the culture that makes the lasting difference. This election will someday be “so” over, and the pro-life cultural “warriors,” who have made tremendous inroads against the culture of death, are just getting started—they are not going to, as “Obama imagines” go “back to their tents to sulk.”

Murchison was able to access Obama’s Planned Parenthood speech thanks to

the efforts of our next author, Laura Echevarria. The former Director of Media Relations for National Right to Life, Echevarria knew that both Democratic presidential candidates had been invited to speak before the Planned Parenthood Action Fund in July of 2007. The speeches garnered little public attention; neither candidate's website mentioned his or her appearance at the event, and transcripts could not be found. So Echevarria spent many hours transcribing the speeches from a video on Planned Parenthood's website, and then posted her transcriptions on the Internet. Why? Because, as she explains, while both Clinton and Obama have made "much milder statements" about abortion on the campaign trail, "it was likely" that in these speeches the candidates would be most open about their positions. And they were: They promise pro-abortion advocates, Echevarria writes, a "laundry list of pro-abortion legislative items."

Of course, as Echevarria notes, Hillary is no longer a presidential contender, but her record is important all the same; as for Obama, "He is dynamic: and because of this people often don't listen to *what* he is saying, only to *how* he is saying it." All style, no substance? Well, not when it comes to abortion: "The first thing I'd do as president," he told the Planned Parenthood crowd, "is sign the Freedom of Choice Act"—federal legislation which would, says National Right to Life, "nullify virtually all federal and state limitations on abortion." Obama also assured them that his health plan would cover "reproductive services," and that he would nominate Supreme Court justices who would take a "broad" view of the Constitution and show "empathy" for a "young teenage mom." He describes his vision of the Court as being the "refuge of the powerless," of those who may be "locked out" from participating "fully in the democratic process." That's why he opposed Justices Alito and Roberts. But . . . who could be more powerless than unborn children?

Abstortion extremism is a big story here in New York as well—and Stephen Vincent gives us an excellent rundown. Governor Eliot Spitzer resigned in disgrace last March, after admitting to heavy involvement in a prostitution ring. As spectacular as his fall was to witness, it was not all that shocking. As Vincent writes, "pro-lifers knew that Eliot Spitzer had already crossed the line of decency," and had repeatedly shown a "callous disregard for human life." In 2002, as attorney general, Spitzer had set up a Reproductive Rights Unit, and then launched an intimidation campaign against crisis pregnancy centers across New York State. That campaign failed. But last year, "heavily beholden to the pro-abortion forces that bankrolled his runs for state attorney general and governor," Spitzer introduced one of the most extreme abortion bills ever—the Reproductive Health and Privacy Protection Act (RHAPP), which would, among other things, permit non-doctors to perform abortions, and allow 12-year-old girls to get abortions without parental consent. In a nutshell, RHAPP would enshrine abortion as a "civil right," and Spitzer, says Vincent, "promised to push it in the 2008 legislative session." But "fate" intervened: Ironically, on the day his scandal broke, Spitzer was to have met with Cardinal Edward Egan and other New York bishops who rightly feared that passage of the

bill would force Catholic hospitals to provide “reproductive services.” New York’s new governor, David Paterson, had other priorities in the days after he took over from Spitzer—like dealing with press revelations of his own (and his wife’s!) extramarital indiscretions—so, thankfully, RHAPP has been put on hold. Though Paterson is no friend of the unborn, Vincent hopes that the radical nature of this bill will make it “impolitic” for him to push it with Spitzer’s zeal.

One of the lies told by the pro-abortion forces is that they are hounded by well-financed “anti-choice” groups, as if *we* have the monetary advantage. Nothing could be further from the truth—we really are David to their Goliath—but, as our next author writes, this lie “has been allowed to stand, primarily because there are so many different pro-life and pro-abortion groups in the U.S. that it is very difficult to pin down the truth of this matter without a detailed examination of the financial records.” Brian Clowes, who is research director at Human Life International, has thoroughly researched this subject for us: He has examined over 15,524 IRS forms (all available to the public on the Internet) of groups on both sides of the abortion debate. In “The Abortion Lobby’s Deep Pockets,” he shares the results of his analysis, comparing the financial status of the culture of death to that of the culture of life. You may be surprised at what a huge disparity there is; it is a testament to the truth of our cause, and the dedication of our activists, that we have been able to achieve what we have at such an enormous disadvantage.

There is, of course, a *devastating* cost of abortion, first of all in the deaths of millions of unborn children. But those who abort—or acquiesce in an abortion—also pay a big price. In our next article, National Review Online editor Kathryn Jean Lopez reports on a new outreach program called Abortion Changes You, which seeks to address the pervasive suffering experienced by those whose child, grandchild, or sibling has been aborted. The program includes a website, a book (*Changed: Making Sense of Your Own or a Loved One’s Abortion Experience*) and an advertising campaign designed to wake up the culture to this basic, uncontested fact: Abortion changes everyone it touches. The concept was created by Michaelene Fredenburg, a woman whose own life was irrevocably altered by her abortion. Fredenburg’s program, Lopez writes, is designed to reach out to a “wounded culture: a culture that pretends to embrace ‘choice,’ but has little interest in providing honest preparation and support for those choices and their consequences.” If you would be interested in ordering her book, see “About this Issue” on the inside cover of this *Review*, or visit her website at www.abortionchangesyou.com for details.

Catherine Rinko-Gay, a college student who recently spent a semester studying in Ghana, sent us the story of how *she* was changed by her love for a six-month-old baby boy there who was born with, and died from, HIV. In her poignant account, she describes how she came to see that the value of human life is intrinsic—not based on potential, but on the mere fact of being.

As Rinko-Gay learned an important lesson from baby Evan, so our long-time contributor Donald DeMarco shares an important lesson he has learned—from his

telomeres. Do you know what telomeres are? (I didn't.) You'll learn what they are and why thinking about them reinforces, for DeMarco, his conviction that "if we want to feel rejuvenated, we should involve ourselves with children."

Women, as mothers, have traditionally been intensely involved with children, but some feminist historians now claim that motherhood was a role often not enjoyed, but rather forced on and resented by women, who were victims of a patriarchal culture. Mothers as "noble victims" is a theme in Amanda Vickery's *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England*, a well-reviewed book which our next author, Edward Short, uses as jumping-off point to consider motherhood in that era. While Vickery's book "abounds in scholarly evidence," writes Short, "rather than let the evidence speak for itself she often misrepresents it to support prejudices that would have been unfathomable to her subjects." Motherhood in the 18th and early 19th centuries was, to be sure, fraught with peril and heartache—many mothers died in childbirth and many children died early of illness—but is there any evidence that mothers actually resented their positions?

In a refreshing literary excursion, Short looks to the work of some women poets from the Georgian period to get at the authentic mindset of women re motherhood in that era. Short's poets are not, I suspect, widely known to our readers—but they are a joy to discover, and they reveal much: The joys and the sorrows of motherhood, yes, but overall, the fierce love and devotion of the mothers.

* * * * *

We have a host of appendices in this issue—twelve—and only room here for a quick rundown. *Appendix A* is Paul Kengor's report on Senator Bob Casey (D-Pa). Son of the late great champion of the unborn, Governor Robert Casey of Pennsylvania, and erstwhile "pro-lifer" himself, Casey, Jr. apparently has no qualms about supporting Obama for president, even though, writes Kengor, the Illinois senator "is so extreme on abortion that he has managed to achieve what I once thought impossible: He is to the left of Hillary Clinton." The four appendices that follow are disturbing accounts of what abortion has wrought: Michelle Malkin on the tragic suicide in England of a woman tortured with regret because she aborted her twins; Ian Marcus Corbin on a horrific abortion "art" project at Yale University; Kristin Hansen on NARAL'S attempt (blessedly, as with Gov. Spitzer's, it went nowhere) to intimidate pregnancy centers, and Maggie Gallagher on the recent racism scandal at Planned Parenthood.

Appendix F is a fascinating account by Father Thomas Berg on how, despite the exciting news about the promise of non-controversial stem-cell research, scientists continue to push the embryonic variety. In *Appendix G*, Yuval Levin responds to a recent *New Republic* essay by Steven Pinker titled "The Stupidity of Dignity," in which Pinker rants against Leon Kass and the President's Council on Bioethics—we have reprinted Pinker's essay in *Appendix H*, so you can read it for yourself. *Appendix I* is a report by Christopher Tollefsen on Britain's disturbing new

INTRODUCTION

embryology bill and in *Appendix J*, Wesley J. Smith describes new trends at the other end of life's spectrum, especially an effort to make a *rarely* needed method of palliative care into a "choice."

We wrap up this issue with a trio from Nat Hentoff, our 2005 Great Defender of Life. Earlier this year, the *Village Voice* ran a special section: "Nat Hentoff's Greatest Hits" (January, 2008) featuring excerpts from Hentoff's "first 50 years" at the *Voice*. Journalist Allen Barra wrote in an accompanying editorial that Nat has "never lost his ability to agitate us and make us rethink our positions." This is abundantly evident in the essay reprinted in *Appendix K*, "How can the left be against life?," which originally appeared in 1985. In a recent column, one of two reprinted in *Appendix L*, Hentoff criticized Obama for a statement the senator made last winter about the Terri Schiavo case, highlighting what it reveals about Obama's (lack of) awareness of disability advocates. Finally, in "Infanticide candidate for president," Nat says that he was "once strongly inclined" to support Obama: "I admire much of Obama's record . . . But on abortion, he is an extremist." Hentoff quotes the now famous comment made by Obama during a town-hall meeting in March: "I've got two daughters . . . and I am going to teach them about values and morals. But if they make a mistake, I don't want them punished with a baby." Writes Hentoff: "Among my children and grandchildren are two daughters and three granddaughters; and when I hear anyone, including a presidential candidate, equate having a baby as a punishment, I realize with particular force the impact that millions of legal abortions in this country have had on respect for human life."

We couldn't say it any better.

MARIA MCFADDEN
EDITOR

No “Change” for the Unborn

William Murchison

It might be called a judgment upon us Americans that the latest election cycle summons us to renewed contemplation, if that’s the right word for it, of the plight of the unborn. Well, many of the unborn. You know the ones I mean: those subject to the considered decision—or, possibly worse, the whim—of a woman not to complete the process of life renewal.

To the consideration of these solemn matters we invite—politicians? Holders of, and candidates for, public office? We do and we must. It’s how we, so to speak, live our lives today. You don’t have to call that a judgment upon us. But if you wanted to, I might encourage it.

The intrusion of politics and polls and publicity into our deliberations on human life is exquisitely modern. In the olden time, whatever its defects as to indoor plumbing and temperature control, voters rarely extended themselves to wonder which candidates were “pro-life” and which “pro-choice.” There was no need. Virtually everyone was pro-life, at any rate in theory. Abortions took place, yes, of course, and always had. But lawmakers had taken care to make them as hard to get as possible, with sanctions prepared for any doctors who performed what was known as an “illegal operation.”

As we know all too well, the feminist agitations of the 1960s, which led directly to *Roe v. Wade* on Jan. 22, 1973, made abortion a political issue for the first time in U.S. history. A political issue it remains, first and foremost. Not so much a theological issue any more, linked to understanding of God’s purpose for human life; not so much a cultural issue, of the sort we understand as related to snugly laid-out viewpoints on family relationships and obligations. Abortion we call a political issue. That is because the politicians have wrested it from the grip of theologians, philosophers, and moral teachers, and have made it their own. To defend it, to undermine it, we count on our elected representatives. This is a great irony to which I will come back shortly. First, we need to notice the *political* shape of the abortion issue in the year of grace 2008 as Barack Obama and John McCain seek the presidency of the United States.

* * * * *

There’s no dispute as to the broad contours of the matter. McCain is pro-life. Obama is pro-choice. Let their critics vouch for them. Of McCain, the

William Murchison writes from Dallas for Creators Syndicate and is a senior editor of the *Human Life Review*. His new book, *Chameleon Churches: Episcopalians and the Crisis of Mainline Christianity*, will be published this year by Encounter Books.

National Abortion Rights Action League says in a fundraising letter, “John McCain . . . is anti-choice—period . . . The fact is, during a quarter century in Congress, Sen. McCain has shown nothing but contempt [for abortion] . . . Funding for . . . abstinence-only programs—he’s for it. Clarence Thomas, John Roberts, and Sam Alito for the Supreme Court—he’s for them.”

Of Obama, Michael Gerson, the former Bush speechwriter and Washington *Post* columnist, says, his “record on abortion is extreme. He opposed the ban on partial-birth abortions . . . strongly criticized the Supreme Court decision upholding the partial-birth ban. In the Illinois State Senate, he opposed a bill similar to the Born-Alive Infant Protection Act, which prevents the killing of infants mistakenly left alive by abortion. And now Obama has oddly claimed he would not want his daughter to be ‘punished with a baby’ because of a crisis pregnancy—hardly a welcoming attitude toward new life.”

In McCain’s case, longtime support of life causes had not, as of late spring, fully mobilized or brought to their feet the evangelical voters he needs for success. No less a pro-lifer than Gary Bauer remonstrated with evangelicals on National Review Online for the failure of some of them fully to appreciate McCain’s commitment to the cause. In Obama’s case, no such reproaches have arisen, or seem likely to. NARAL has its candidate, and he isn’t even the “she” he clearly was supposed to have been.

With proper respect to McCain, whose party base includes many a dissenter from pro-life orthodoxy, Obama’s declarations on abortion enjoy a superior claim to study. That’s because, in listening to him, one gains some notion of:

1) What the candidate of “change you can believe in” thinks the American people want to hear about abortion.

2) What mainstream Democrats, in a Democratic year, apparently, see as the position that squares best with the current requirements of electoral politics.

3) Why electoral politics is so poor and feeble a thing for the management of a question no more political than What’s for dinner?

The first thing we notice about Obama is that when he approaches the topic of abortion, he steps with more precision, and perhaps more delicacy, than might be expected of a media-designated messiah. NARAL might tromp into the room, yelling about oppression and none-of-your-business-bub. Obama’s audience is larger. He knows the ambivalence many Americans feel on the subject: on one hand, support for A Woman’s Choice, on the other hand growing nervousness as to the frequency and usualness with which that choice gets exercised.

A May 2008 Gallup Poll found most residents of the East and West Coasts

generally supportive of abortion, “while residents of the South are mostly pro-life and those in the Midwest are evenly split.” Obama, needless to say, isn’t trolling for votes only along Cape Cod and San Francisco Bay. The South has to be propitiated. For that matter, the sensibilities of religious Southern blacks have to be assuaged. America is divided. How to speak across those divisions?

The Obama strategy—as with seemingly all other issues—is linguistic as well as substantive. The word becomes flesh and dwells for a while, nodding to variant viewpoints.

What “the candidate of change” believes the American people believe, or anyway don’t object to hearing, about abortion is that each side in the controversy has a viewpoint. Which isn’t saying that, in Obama’s mind, all such viewpoints are equal. It’s saying two, or even more, viewpoints exist. As the candidate acknowledged in July 2007, speaking to Planned Parenthood, “There will always be people, many of good will, who do not share my view on the issue of choice.” More: He allowed he was “absolutely convinced that culture wars are so ’90s.” Time to “turn the pages . . . We’re tired of arguing about the same ol’ stuff.”

One starts to see where this thing is going. We’re “always” going to face disagreements over abortion. The issue is here to stay, like it or not. If it’s here to stay, we can choose one of two courses: fight on and on and on, or seek some kind of peaceful middle position—bearing in mind that among the prospective beneficiaries of any possible truce are “people of good will.” The cockles of the heart begin to warm, and here and there a tear forms. It’s the American way of getting things done: conciliation and common cause. We’re going to turn the page. We’re going to move on. We’ll yet put the ’90s behind us, with all the feuding, fighting, and fussing that wore us out and sapped national unity. What Obama gives every appearance of believing is that Americans want a sensible way of living together again as a people. On abortion as on terrorism and climate change and what not. The pollsters point him in this direction. So does pure political necessity: the goal of get all the people you can on your side and you’ll end up president of the United States.

Well, then, how? How to move beyond the desire for “being together” to the fashioning of a program meant to achieve that desire? If it’s impossible, as the sages say, to be “just a little pregnant,” it’s likewise impossible to split the difference between choice and no choice. Somebody loses. How to make loss partly palatable?

Here’s how. As Obama said in New Hampton, Iowa, in the run-up to the

caucus victory that sent his candidacy into orbit, “A lot of people have arrived at the view that I’ve arrived at, which is that there is a moral implication to these issues, but that the women involved are in the best position to make that determination”—meaning the determination to abort a pregnancy. “And I don’t think they make it lightly . . .

“[I]f we reduce unwanted pregnancies, then it’s much less likely that people resort to abortion . . . [P]art of my job as a parent is to communicate [to my daughters] that sex isn’t casual, and that it’s something that they should really think about and not think is just a game.” This aim we achieve with “family planning and education for our young people and so forth.”

At Messiah College, in April 2008, Obama unburdened himself further: He would “take a comprehensive approach, where we focus on abstinence, where we are teaching the sacredness of sexuality to our children”—an instructional emphasis that includes the virtues of contraception. “I think we should make sure that abortion is an option for people out there. . . . We’re not going to completely resolve [the debate]. At some point there may just be an irreconcilable difference.”

Well, yes. Might as well be frank about that: but only after mention of a moral dimension to the matter, approachable through abstinence education and the distribution of condoms.

Let’s see, then: In exchange for that undertaking, Americans leaning pro-life or laboring for the overthrow of *Roe v. Wade* would surrender—what? Ninety-five percent of that which still-vast numbers see as government’s rock-bottom obligation to respect and protect unborn life? Ninety-eight percent? Whatever.

A pledge to acknowledge abortion’s moral dimension, and to “understand” better those who don’t go along with the casual extermination of unborn life, would on this showing trump all other political measures that might provide the unborn some larger measure of protection.

Take the federal courts, which landed the country in this particular mess in the first place. Any chance Obama would appoint to the bench, and especially the Supreme Court, a Clarence Thomas-like judge who sees federal judges as other than social arbiters and lawgivers? By accident he might: certainly not by intention. “We need,” Obama has said, “somebody [on the High Court] who’s got the empathy to recognize what it’s like to be a young teen-aged mom.” On he went—this was the same July 2007 speech quoted above—to deplore the Supreme Court’s 5-4 decision that month (*Gonzales v. Carhart*) upholding the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. “For the first time,” said Obama, “the Court’s endorsed an abortion restriction without an exception for women’s health. The decision presumed that the health of

women is best protected by the Court—not by doctors and not by the woman herself. That presumption is wrong.” (As for the unborn baby’s health, well) Further, “[W]ith one more vacancy on the Court, we could be looking at a majority hostile to a woman’s fundamental right to choose for the first time since *Roe v. Wade*, and that is what is at stake in this election.”

So there you have it—on the authority of Barack Obama himself: If you want *Roe v. Wade* to stand, you better hustle yourself and your friends to the polls this November and vote for “change we can believe in.” Not as to abortion policy, alas. That’s not on. The candidate of change is digging in his heels against whatever measure might provide greater protection to unborn life—with the exceptions, you understand, of abstinence education and condoms: that which elsewhere is called “a mess of pottage.”

The irony here is considerable. Friends of unborn life, as they contemplate the political process in 2008, may be forgiven if they see themselves fighting at best a holding-off action. With large Democratic gains expected in the House and the Senate, no one expects Congress to do much more for the pro-life cause than, well, pay for more and better condoms to be handed out in public schools. Nor could one expect an Obama attorney general to appeal to the Supreme Court—as did the much-maligned Alberto Gonzales in the *Carhart* case—a lower-court decision adverse to tightened restrictions on abortion. Nor, much more to the point, could one expect an Obama White House to countenance any appointment to the High Court for a jurist to the right of Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

Such a state of affairs argues, many will conclude, for hard work to put McCain rather than Obama in the White House. A melancholy thought rises nevertheless to the surface. The election of George W. Bush was supposed to effect, among other things, the removal of political obstacles to the restoration of general respect for unborn life. Circumstances intervened: not least a war whose conduct grew steadily more prejudicial to the wellbeing and achievements of the Bush administration. You never know, in other words. A superlatively pro-life president, Ronald Reagan, made progress, but only of a limited kind, on the pro-life front. Relatively few deceive themselves that Congress, short of the second coming, will send to the states a constitutional amendment overturning *Roe v. Wade*. McCain allows that he sees no purpose to the investment of time and energy in such a project.

Why, indeed, is electoral politics so poor and feeble a means for the management of the abortion question? And if such is the case, what’s the answer? Let me take here a crack at the ball.

We certainly like to think, in the 21st century, that politics—which

organizes and marshals the united power of the community—is central to life. If we don't, really, we certainly give a good show of acting as though we did, with our constant political chatter and public anxieties about electoral outcomes. Good government is a cause not to be despised, as we all know. And yet government's ability to shape *minds*—through legislation, court rulings, and the like—is almost certainly overrated. Every election cycle brings to the fore new proposals and new proposers. Certain things get done. The right things? In the political context, what matters more than right or wrong, viewed in abstract terms, is feasibility. A thing that *can* get done becomes “right” on that slender ground and, possibly, no other.

What we commonly call the culture may seem a sort of formless, shapeless blob, lacking clear leaders and modes of seeking and forming consensus. And yet it helps to remember that culture, as the more-or-less viewpoint of the more-or-less majority, shapes law prior to the law's so much as acknowledging itself to have been shaped. Before action comes thought: What do we believe? What kind of action do we want? To what ends and purposes? The political leader sees himself (or herself, if you will) as the shaper of grand events. The true shapers of grand events lack meaningful connection to politics. They start by thinking. Then they write or speak. They inspire or persuade others to write and speak. Or maybe they don't at all. Maybe their ideas wither. That, too, is “the culture”: a place where, as Americans have noted with special poignance at least since the 1960s, certain ideas take over by virtue of being the ideas for which people are ready.

In the context of abortion, we rightly blame the U. S. Supreme Court for ramming *Roe v. Wade* down the throats of a public not ready to receive the idea of abortion as a constitutional right. A corollary detail is that “the culture,” awakened as it may have felt to new “realities” about the rights of women, put insufficient pressure on Congress to reverse the decision by constitutional amendment. The Court decided; the culture ended up affirming, even if against the instinct of many, possibly most of its members.

Here is what I am saying: It is one thing, and a necessary one, to strive in a political context for the restriction and, ultimately, the reversal of the constitutional “right” to end a pregnancy by deliberate extermination of the fetus. It is another thing, and likely a more important one, to strive for the restoration of something like that condition I mentioned at the outset, in which Americans saw “illegal operations” as beyond the civilized pale. The law of the time was instrumental insofar as it punished breaches of the consensus. The consensus itself, which preceded the law, was what counted more. It underwrote the law—until in the '70s and '80s a new, only half-glimpsed

consensus acquiesced in a power grab by the nation's highest court.

Obama regards the culture wars as “so '90s”—just the “same ol’ stuff.” He could be in for a surprise if elected—provided the friends of life were to show themselves more intellectually and morally agile than their ossified foes. To tell the truth, a lot of outstanding apologia and explanation, coupled with works of mercy to Obama’s “young teen-aged moms,” has gone forward for decades now: much of it inspired by churches and priests and pastors; much of it the result of spontaneous initiative on the part of people old-fashioned enough to think life matters in all its varied forms. Shelters and counseling for pregnant mothers, the promotion of adoption strategies, even the celebration in popular movies like *Juno* of the joy of life encountered unexpectedly—such are the tools of the culture “warriors” whom Obama imagines have gone back to their tents to sulk.

The new campaign season reminds us who is presently in the saddle, at least among Democrats—those, namely, who think shrill claims to individual rights override and beat down infinitely older, and more merciful, entitlements. Those who think this way speak primarily the language of politics and political engagement, from caucus level all the way to the top. The oddity could be that, for all anyone knows for sure, their influence is fading as they shriek. That they seem to sit securely in the saddle suggests little more than that the force of cultural reform has not yet gathered the power to unhorse them.

These things take time. Elections come, elections go, and politicians distract the voters with this or that appeal. The culture's strength is in massiveness and patience. An election can turn on the late and the last-minute—a scandal, an illness, a crisis internal or external. The culture, by contrast, moves gravely forward—or backward, as the case might be. It depends on what goes in, or fails to. A culture broadly devoted to life, and respectful of the God who gave the gift of life in the first place, would appear on precedent to enjoy greater prospects for longevity and success than . . . what? The newest congressional caucus? The newest president, his new-new dreams starting so soon to disappear into the fleecy clouds above the Capitol dome?

Obama & Clinton Talk about Abortion

Laura Echevarria

In July 2007, the major Democratic presidential candidates were invited to speak before the political arm of Planned Parenthood—the Planned Parenthood Action Fund. The speeches received little attention: Videos of them were posted on a Planned Parenthood website, and a few news articles reported on the appearance of the candidates—but the campaign websites of the two leading candidates at the time, Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, failed both to note the candidates’ appearances at the event and to post the text of the speeches. (I couldn’t find a transcript at any other websites either.)

But it was highly likely that it was in these speeches that the candidates were the most open they would be, during the campaign, about their positions on abortion. Using the video provided at Planned Parenthood’s website, www.imoneinamillion.com, I spent hours transcribing what each candidate had to say.

On the campaign trail, both Obama and Clinton made much milder statements on the abortion issue—therefore appearing more “moderate.” Yet an examination of these two speeches shows that both candidates express full support for abortion-on-demand, both opposed the Supreme Court ruling upholding a ban on partial-birth abortions, and both planned to nominate justices who would uphold *Roe v. Wade*.

The candidates clearly intended to burnish their abortion-on-demand credentials by speaking before the Planned Parenthood activists. They touted their records and presented a laundry list of pro-abortion legislative items that would be part of their agenda if elected president.

Hillary Clinton

Hillary Clinton has dropped out of the presidential race but her speech is still important—she could be the vice-presidential pick or, more likely, hold a position in an Obama administration. Also, her speech clearly illustrates the Democratic Party’s unwavering commitment to abortion-on-demand.

Clinton begins with praise. She thanks the nation’s largest abortion provider for its “commitment to our constitutional rights,” and especially its work on “reproductive rights”:

Laura Echevarria was the director of media relations and a spokesperson for the National Right to Life Committee from 1997 to 2004. Now a writer living in Virginia, she is working on a book about abortion and the Democratic Party. Ms. Echevarria is also an opinion columnist for LifeNews.com, while hosting her own blog at www.lauraechevarria.com.

How do I thank [Planned Parenthood president] Cecile Richards for being the president of this great organization and committing herself to not only continuing and protecting the work that Planned Parenthood has done for so many years, but bringing these issues into the political debate. *No one is better suited to do that than Cecile*, and I'm so grateful to her for her leadership and her friendship. [Italics, throughout these transcripts, have been added by the author of this article.]

Clinton is here drawing a line connecting Richards's activism in the Democratic Party to her work on abortion. For the Democratic leadership, the right to abortion is a core value. Richards's mother was the late Ann Richards, the Democratic leader and former governor of Texas who lost her 1994 reelection bid to George W. Bush. Following her mother's defeat, Richards founded the Texas Freedom Network, which worked to counteract the influence of conservative Christians in local politics. She moved to Washington, D.C., and worked for the AFL-CIO, the Turner Foundation, and Planned Parenthood. She then served as the deputy chief of staff for then-minority whip Nancy Pelosi. After a year and a half, Richards then went on to head the liberal America Votes coalition. Finally, she was drafted by Planned Parenthood as the organization's new president after the retirement of Gloria Feldt.

Senator Clinton then ties herself even more closely to Planned Parenthood, which is based in New York, by thanking the New York activists in attendance:

And I have to make a special thank you to all my friends from New York who have been stalwart on behalf of women's rights and women's reproductive rights for so many years, really leading the way in the movement for a woman's right to choose—being the very first state to really put that on the map and thank you so much.

Clinton goes on to paint a picture of the abortion activists as brave soldiers fighting for a noble cause:

Now, I don't need to tell you what you already know—that *Planned Parenthood is on the front lines*. That you are the ones who are running the clinics, who are conducting the educational programs. You're often the ones who are the sole advocates for women and families in the areas that you come from and, sometimes, *at great personal risk*, you're the ones who push through the crowds and the demonstrators to get to work in the morning.

Almost as an afterthought, she reminds everyone that Planned Parenthood provides services other than abortion:

And I am extremely grateful to you for that, because, for too many women, you are the only place to turn. And that sometimes gets lost in all of the political rhetoric—that this is not just about family planning, as critically important as that is—this is about prenatal care, this is about cancer screening, this is about many other critical health-care services. And that's what you do and that's why we have to support you

Laura Echevarria

and thank you—thank you for your courage, thank you for your dedication, and thank you for your commitment to our constitutional rights and your willingness to engage in the political process to defend them. I am so, so grateful to you.

Nonetheless, the thrust of her statement—and what the audience wants to hear—is about her support of abortion and the “right to choose.” She didn’t speak before the group in support of a right to Pap smears or breast-cancer screening. A few more minutes into her speech, and she is using the polemical language of the pro-abortion movement to criticize the current Bush administration for its pro-life stance:

Now we’ve certainly heard a lot of talk about freedom from President Bush in the last six and a half years, ironically from someone who seems so intent on undermining it here at home. A president who set out on Day One, determined to dismantle reproductive freedoms here in the United States and around the world. He reinstated the “Global Gag Rule,” he appointed a birth-control opponent to serve as the family-planning chief at the Department of Health and Human Services. He nominated not one but, unfortunately, two anti-choice judges to the Supreme Court. His Justice Department issued a 141-page protocol for the treatment of rape survivors that did not contain a single reference to emergency contraception as a potential option. And his own former Surgeon General just testified before a Congressional committee about how the administration censored his speeches and barred him from talking about contraceptives and forbade him from talking about his concerns about abstinence-only sex education.

So for six and a half years, the president has played politics with women’s health. He’s chipped away at reproductive rights and he’s worked to turn Washington, D.C., into an evidence-free zone where facts are subordinate to ideology and opinion. [Applause.] And, of course, we know who’s paying the price for these policies—women around the world suffering because they no longer have access to reproductive care; women right here at home who want to plan their families and who want to prevent unintended pregnancies but no longer have access to contraception. Children sitting in classrooms receiving false, misleading, incomplete information that will not protect them from pregnancy and STDs. This is not just an affront to women’s rights—it is an affront to human rights, to our most fundamental values as a nation.

Clinton uses, throughout, the language of the pro-abortion movement—“reproductive freedoms,” “Global Gag Rule,” “anti-choice”—to ingratiate herself further with her audience. By linking abortion to women’s rights and, by extension, human rights, Clinton also aligns herself with women’s rights groups and closes in on the traditional Democratic concept of women as victims. And then, she clearly announces her own goals and ideology on the issue of abortion:

And I want you to know that when I’m president, I will devote my very first days in office to reversing these ideological, anti-science, anti-prevention policies that this administration has put into place [applause], starting with the “Global Gag Rule” and going from there, and I will not rest until we once again protect women’s health, honor families’ privacy, and restore our fundamental constitutional freedoms.

Strong language—but Clinton wants to appear as a strong candidate on the issue of most concern to this audience; she needs these left-leaning Democratic women. Probably the biggest voting concern for the pro-abortion activists is what criteria a president will use to nominate U.S. Supreme Court justices. On this, Clinton reassures them:

Now, finally, when I am president, we will stand up for choice and nominate judges to our courts who protect and preserve our constitutional rights. [Applause.] For six and a half years, President Bush has appointed one ideological, anti-choice judge after another— . . . Judges Pryor and Owen to the circuit courts . . . Justices Roberts and Alito to the Supreme Court.

Now when I voted against both Justice Roberts and Justice Alito [applause], I made statements that expressed my fear that they would use their seats on the Court to undermine *Roe*. I hoped that I was wrong; I'm sorry to see that I was right. With Justices Roberts and Alito, the Court handed down *Gonzales v. Carhart*. And with that one decision, five justices dismissed four decades of precedent protecting women's health—basically denying medical decision making and undermining the right to choose.

So let me be clear: When I am president, I will appoint judges to our courts who understand the role of precedent. That it actually does mean something. And also the importance of *Roe v. Wade*—that it truly is the touchstone of reproductive freedom and the embodiment of our most fundamental rights, that no one—no judge, no governor, no senator, no president—has the right to take away.

Clinton's pro-abortion credentials are unassailable.

Barack Obama

Barack Obama's language is more subtle than Clinton's; his speaking style is more polished, and is more enthusiastically received. It is reminiscent of an old-fashioned Southern preacher—the repetition, the alliteration. This style works for him: He is dynamic, and because of this people often don't listen to *what* he is saying, only to *how* he is saying it. In public speaking, there is something called the 60-30-10 Rule: Sixty percent of your message isn't coming from what you say, but from how you look. Another 30 percent comes from how you say it—Are you smiling? What about your gestures? Your voice? Only ten percent of your message is actually based on *what* you say. (Several years ago, a colleague of mine did an interview for national television, and afterward spoke with her mother—who had seen the interview and was familiar with the issues being discussed. Having not yet seen the interview herself, my friend was anxious to know whether her message had come across properly. Her mother, however, couldn't recall what was said during the interview—but was able to tell her daughter that she *looked* nice.)

Barack Obama is a standing demonstration of the 60-30-10 rule. But what's unusual about his Planned Parenthood speech is that it is one of the few

times that Obama *does* get into specifics. He criticizes the Supreme Court's decision in *Gonzales v. Carhart*:

And there's a lot at stake in this election, especially for our daughters. To appreciate that, all you have to do is review the recent decisions handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States. For the first time, in *Gonzales v. Carhart*, the Supreme Court held—upheld a federal ban on abortions with criminal penalties for doctors. For the first time, the Court's endorsed an abortion restriction without an exception for women's health. The decision presumed that the health of women is best protected by the Court—not by doctors and not by the woman herself. *That presumption is wrong.*

Some people argue that the federal ban on abortion was just an isolated effort aimed at one medical procedure—that it's not part of a concerted effort to roll back the hard-won rights of American women. *That presumption is also wrong.*

This repetition not only conveys his view but also constructs mental markers or aids—mnemonics—for his audience.

Whereas Hillary Clinton praised her audience for their hard work, Barack Obama comes across as a motivational speaker. He not only reminds the audience what they are fighting for, he identifies himself with them. He makes their cause *his* cause and—as any good speaker knows how to do—inserts a little humor:

Within hours of the decision, an Alabama lawmaker introduced a measure to ban all abortions. With one more vacancy on the Court, we could be looking at a majority hostile to a woman's fundamental right to choose for the first time since *Roe v. Wade*, and that is what is at stake in this election. The only thing more disturbing than the decision was the rationale of the majority. Without any hard evidence, Justice Kennedy proclaimed, "It is self-evident that a woman would regret her choice." He cited medical uncertainty about the need to protect the health of pregnant women—even though the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists found no such uncertainty. Justice Kennedy knows many things; my understanding is he does not know how to be a doctor. [Laughter and Applause]

He dismissed as mere preferences the reasoned judgments of the nation's doctors. We've seen time after time these last few years when the president says otherwise, when the science is inconvenient, when the facts don't match up with the ideology, they are cast aside. Well, it's time for us to change that. It is time for a different attitude in the White House. It is time for a different attitude in the Supreme Court. It is time to turn the page and write a new chapter in American history. [Applause]

Again, Barack Obama employs repetition to wind up his audience—"it's time"—time for change, time for a different attitude, time to turn the page. As human beings, we respond to patterns, they help to give us order; and Obama uses this. He wants his audience to remember that he is with them, that he will, if elected president, make the change from pro-life policies to pro-abortion policies.

We know that five men don't know better than women and their doctors what's best for a woman's health. We know that it's about whether or not women have equal rights under the law. We know that a woman's right to make a decision about how many children she wants to have and when—without government interference—is one of the most fundamental freedoms we have in this country. We also know that there was another voice that came from the bench—a voice clear in reasoning and passionate in dissent. The voice rejected what she called, quote, “ancient notions of women's place in the family and under the Constitution, ideas that have long been discredited.” Unquote. One commentator called the decision in *Gonzales* “an attack on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's entire life's work.” And it was. But we heard Justice Ginsburg and we know what she was saying. She was saying, “We've been there before and we are not going back. [Applause] We refuse to go back.” [Applause]

Again, the repetition: “We know.” He also calls upon one of the heroes of the pro-abortion movement, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, to bolster his arguments. Obama, like Clinton, equates abortion with women's rights and constitutional freedoms. In this speech, there can be little doubt: Barack Obama is saying what he thinks. He clearly supports abortion-on-demand. Even though the language he uses is less polemical than that of Hillary Clinton, he understands what pro-abortion groups and their supporters want to hear.

And, just like Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama will nominate justices who would uphold *Roe v. Wade*. In response to a question about nominating judges, Obama replied:

Well, the first thing I'd do as president is, is sign the Freedom of Choice Act. [Applause] That's the first thing that I'd do. . . . but your question about the federal courts is absolutely on target. I taught constitutional law for ten years and I have to say after reading this latest decision and the series of decisions that the Supreme Court has been putting forward that I find it baffling. . . . That's why I think it's important for us obviously to get not only a Democratic White House as well as a stronger Congress to protect these rights. But I also think it's important to understand that there's nothing wrong in voting against nominees who don't appear to share a *broader vision of what the Constitution is about*.

Here, Obama uses the phrase “broader vision” to let his audience know that the Constitution is—in his liberal view—a “living” document that should be interpreted based on trends of the day. He explains:

I think the Constitution can be interpreted in so many ways. And one way is a cramped and narrow way in which the Constitution and the courts essentially become the rubber stamps of the powerful in society. And then there's another vision of the court [sic] that says that the courts are the refuge of the powerless. Because oftentimes they can lose in the democratic back and forth. They may be locked out and prevented from fully participating in the democratic process. That's one of the reasons I opposed Alito, you know, as well as Justice Roberts. When Roberts came up and

everybody was saying, “You know, he’s very smart and he seems a very decent man and he loves his wife. [Laughter] You know, he’s good to his dog. [Laughter] He’s so well qualified.”

I said, well look, that’s absolutely true and in . . . the overwhelming number of Supreme Court decisions, that’s enough. Good intellect, you read the statute, you look at the case law and most of the time, the law’s pretty clear. Ninety-five percent of the time, Justice Ginsberg, Justice Thomas, Justice Scalia, they’re all gonna agree on the outcome.

But it’s those five percent of the cases that really count. And in those five percent of the cases, what you’ve got to look at is—what is in the justice’s heart. *What’s their broader vision of what America should be.* Justice Roberts said he saw himself just as an umpire but the issues that come before the Court are not sport, they’re life and death. *And we need somebody who’s got the heart—the empathy—to recognize what it’s like to be a young teenage mom.* The empathy to understand what it’s like to be poor or African-American or gay or disabled or old—and that’s the criteria by which I’ll be selecting my judges. All right?

When Obama says he wants to appoint someone who can “empathize” with those he considers victims of the judicial and legislative systems, he wants justices who will legislate from the bench based on their “broader vision of what America should be.”

Obama talked about women’s rights more generally, but with the subtext that these issues were all related at the core to abortion-on-demand. One issue that stands out for Obama is health care and his proposals for reform:

Well, look, in my mind reproductive care is essential care, basic care so it is at the center, the heart of the plan that I propose. . . . Essentially, what we are doing is to say that we’re going to set up a public plan that all persons and all women can access if they don’t have health insurance. It’ll be a plan that will provide all essential services, *including reproductive services*, as well as mental-health services and disease-management services. [Scattered applause]

Because part of our interest is to make sure that we put more and more money into preventative care. And so many of women’s diseases are preventable if they’re getting access to regular care. So we subsidize women who don’t have health insurance or can’t afford health insurance at affordable low group rates. We also subsidize those who prefer to stay in the private insurance market *except that insurers are going to have to abide by the same rules in terms of providing comprehensive care, including reproductive care* and mental-health, mental-care services and they won’t be able to keep people out as a consequence of pre-existing conditions. So that’s going to be absolutely vital.

Obama’s proposals would require “reproductive” health-care coverage both in any government plan and in any plans provided by private health insurers. As all abortion supporters (and pro-lifers) know, “reproductive” health care covers abortion-on-demand and Barack Obama, having worked closely with Planned Parenthood in the past, is well aware of the meaning of this language.

Conclusion

Now that Barack Obama has become the presumptive nominee of the Democratic Party, it is imperative that voters understand his position on abortion. His public discussions on the subject are couched in euphemistic terms, but if elected, he will walk in lock step with pro-abortion groups. His first days in office will likely resemble those of Bill Clinton, who immediately set out to dismantle pro-life executive orders established under President Reagan and continued under President George H. W. Bush. Policies continued or established under our current president, George W. Bush, would be nullified or reversed. Pro-abortion extremists would have easy access to the Oval Office—and they would find there a very receptive audience, one ready and eager to nominate friends of their movement to the U.S. Supreme Court.

*Transcripts can be found through a link at www.lauraechevarria.com. Video of the speeches can still be found at the Planned Parenthood website, www.imoneinamillion.com.



“We’ll have to tranquilize her and move her deeper into the wilderness.”

Spitzer's Bad RHAPP

Stephen Vincent

“**K**risten” was not the worst of it. Before the governor of New York was implicated in a high-priced prostitution ring, pro-lifers knew that Eliot Spitzer had already crossed the line of decency. By proposing and pushing a dangerous bill that would make abortion akin to a civil right in the Empire State—and remove important protections for women as well as full-term babies—Spitzer showed a callous disregard for human life.

Heavily beholden to the pro-abortion forces that bankrolled his runs for state attorney general and governor, Spitzer introduced the Reproductive Health and Privacy Protection Act (RHAPP) last year and promised to push it in the 2008 legislative session.

Until, that is, the “Kristen” matter led to his rapid resignation last March. A few days after he was identified as “Client 9” in a federal complaint against a prostitution ring called the Emperor’s Club, a desperate Spitzer called a press conference in his Manhattan office and all but confirmed the rumors about his sexual hijinks. Yet in perfect lawyerly form, with his wife at his side, he did not admit guilt or tender his resignation, instead calling the unnamed matter “personal.” With a true abortion mindset, which cloaks the killing of babies behind a shroud of undefined privacy, Spitzer sought to extend the realm of privacy to acts that apparently violated federal statutes, such as conspiring to bring “Kristen” across state lines, from New York to the nation’s capital, to engage in prostitution.

Holed up in his Fifth Avenue apartment with his wife and closest advisers, Spitzer let the “people’s business” hang for days as he tried to parse out and peddle his political future. At long last, he decided to resign and prepared to make another announcement at his Big Apple office. With a live helicopter camera adding a low level of farce to the banal drama—following his vehicle O.J.-style through the jammed city streets—Spitzer sought to perform damage control on his future. In another brief, carefully crafted statement (with his wife again at his side), Spitzer made few disclosures and no admissions, and quickly exited the public stage to prepare his defense against possible federal charges.

As attorney general, he had aggressively prosecuted the same type of prostitution rings he was caught patronizing. But some sympathetic commentators wrote the episode off to the perils of being a high-achieving,

Stephen Vincent writes from Wallingford, Connecticut.

hard-driving Alpha Male who got caught doing what most powerful men manage to accomplish more discreetly. Some Democrats smelled a set-up by (who else?) the Bush administration. Yet pro-lifers saw the case for what it was—a bad man caught in his own web of arrogance, lies, and deception.

RHAPP Around?

Spitzer's out of power, but the RHAPP bill is still under consideration in Albany. According to both the New York State Catholic Conference (NYSCC), which produced a 7-minute YouTube analysis of the bill, and New Yorkers for Parental Rights, which maintains a website on the bill (www.abortionbill.org), RHAPP would enshrine abortion as a public good. It would force Catholic hospitals and other conscientious objectors to either perform abortions or get out of the health-care business.

In a strongly worded statement, the state's Catholic bishops warned of a showdown. "We do not relish a public fight with the Governor or the state legislature on this issue," wrote Cardinal Edward Egan. "However, we would be failing in our responsibility as bishops if we did not oppose it strongly. This proposal threatens the life-affirming work we do day in and day out in our hospitals and charitable agencies, in our schools, in our maternity centers and health-care clinics, in our adoption and foster-care programs. Compliance with such a law would violate every principle that we hold sacred. So oppose it we will—from our pulpits, in the media, through our advocacy network, in the legislature, and in collaboration with others who value and defend life."

NYSCC spokeswoman Kathleen Gallagher, in the YouTube video, called the bill "a misguided, immoral, and radical proposal" that "demands societal approval of abortion." The motive behind the bill is to keep abortion legal in New York if *Roe v. Wade* is overturned by the Supreme Court, Gallagher noted. Yet RHAPP goes beyond the 1970 pre-*Roe* state law that at least had set a 24-week limit to abortions, except in cases to save the life of the mother.

According to the Parental Rights website, the bill, known as S-5829 in the State Senate, would:

- allow 12-year-old girls, who can't receive Tylenol at school without a note from their parents, to get an abortion without parental consent;
- allow late-term abortion without restrictions up to the ninth month;
- permit non-doctors, such as nurses or social workers, to perform abortions;
- force public-school sex-education programs to encourage abortion;
- shield abortion providers from prosecution in cases of malpractice;
- modify the NYS Penal Code so that situations of coerced or forced

abortion, abortions performed by unauthorized clinics, or other back-alley scenarios cannot be prosecuted;

—prevent medical examiners from investigating deaths caused by criminal abortion; and

—prevent unauthorized abortion providers from being tried for manslaughter for abortions which lead to a woman's death.

The website also quotes Dr. Alveda King, niece of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and founder of the group King for America. *"We require parental notification and permission for minors for everything from ear piercing to dental work, and in most legal proceedings," King said, "yet abortion, a dangerous and devastating procedure, too often remains in a category apart, protected from parents who will often have to pay for the damages and consequences their children suffer through abortion."*

Spitzer vs. Pregnancy Centers

As pro-lifers could have told pundits who were shaking their heads in disbelief over Spitzer's high-handed sexploits, his flouting of federal statutes was in keeping with his penchant for bending the law for his own purposes and breaking promises that helped get him elected.

When he was the state's attorney general, he launched an all-out attack on New York's pro-life (crisis) pregnancy centers. The motive was easy to see. The pro-life centers were growing in number and size, often setting up across the street from Planned Parenthood clinics and siphoning off business. Many were also offering onsite sonograms to pregnant women who were considering abortion. Even a *New York Times* article at the time, seeking to condemn the clinics, had a telltale quote from a Long Island clinic director, who said, "The bottom line is no woman is going to want to get an abortion after she sees a sonogram." Big Abortion was threatened, and Spitzer came rapidly to its defense. He had already, shortly after becoming attorney general, set up a Reproductive Rights Unit headed by Jennifer Brown, a past president of the National Organization for Women-New York and a former fellow for the ACLU's reproductive-freedom project.

Spitzer's actions appeared to follow a handbook published by NARAL titled "Exposing Fake Clinics: A Step-by-Step Guide" on how to infiltrate and intimidate pro-life centers. (One highlighted tactic was "persuade state attorney general to bring litigation against targeted CPCs.") In early 2002, Spitzer issued blanket subpoenas to an array of 24 centers, from Buffalo to midtown Manhattan, charging deceptive advertising and practicing medicine without a license. Some of the pregnancy-center directors, such as Christopher Slattery, who runs a number of pro-life facilities in New York City, had been

down this road before with a previous attorney general. They had agreed to post a sign stating that they are not a medical center and do not perform abortions.

Yet Spitzer's assault was unannounced and unexpected. Nothing had changed in the way the centers were operating—except that they were becoming more successful. They were also becoming more professional and confident, and, when the subpoenas arrived, they banded together to fight and win. In the end, not even New York's pro-abortion media gave Spitzer much cover, and he was looking very bad to the more-conservative upstate voters whom Spitzer would need in his planned run for governor.

Bishop Henry Mansell of Buffalo, who had been an assistant under pro-life hero Cardinal John O'Connor, reacted early with a statement defending the pregnancy centers. When the attorney general of South Carolina fired a volley, blasting Spitzer for using his office for a political purpose, it was the beginning of the end for his crusade. Spitzer withdrew to fight another day.

As the Winter/Spring 2002 issue of this journal reported in "Anatomy of a Pro-Life Victory":

A handful of crisis-pregnancy centers staffed largely by volunteers stood up to blanket subpoenas from New York's pro-abortion attorney general, yelling "Stop!" To everyone's surprise, Attorney General Eliot Spitzer not only stopped, he withdrew the subpoenas accusing the centers of false advertising and practicing medicine without a license, and took a big public-relations hit in an election year. "For women seeking alternatives to abortion, CPCs can provide valuable services," he conceded in a February 28 statement announcing the withdrawal of the subpoenas.

Despite the temporary setback, the abortion lobby stuck by their man and paved a money-strewn path for Spitzer's gubernatorial campaign. Reaching out to the state's Catholic bishops, who were informing voters of his radical pro-abortion stance, Spitzer promised to push tax credits for parents who send their children to private or parochial schools. Only the truly gullible were surprised when Spitzer, following the lead of the teachers' union, eventually reneged on the promise.

Life in the Balance

With the fallen Spitzer now out of the picture, pro-lifers have an opportunity to gain steam against RHAPP. They must recall the heady days when they pulled together to face down Spitzer's subpoenas and draw energy from the rightness of their cause.

On March 17, the day David Paterson was sworn in as governor, Kathryn Jean Lopez, editor of National Review Online, fired the first volley in the renewed battle. "It's a new day in the Empire State with the inauguration of

STEPHEN VINCENT

a new governor today,” Lopez wrote. “As David Paterson takes the oath of office in Albany . . . pro-life activists hold their breath, having the audacity to hope that the new state executive will consider toning down the previous governor’s planned gift to the abortion industry.”

Lopez informed pro-lifers that their battle would be tough, even though Paterson was brought up Catholic by a father who was honored by the Church in New York. Like another Catholic who sat in the governor’s mansion, Mario Cuomo, Governor Paterson was outspoken in his pro-abortion views.

Lopez reported that Paterson, just a week before he took office, filled in for Governor Spitzer at an abortion fundraiser. “Don’t let anyone slander your ranks by trying to suggest that the fight for reproductive rights for women is some sort of special service,” Paterson told advocates. “All it is, is the embodiment and the embrace of what our state and federal Constitution intended for all citizens but has been subjugated and in many ways changed so as not suit half of the population.”

Though not as eloquent as Cuomo or as ruthless as Spitzer, Paterson is a long-time political insider who came up through the ranks and knows how to get things done in Albany. Still, it is possible that RHAPP is vulnerable because it is so radical, and New Yorkers may turn against it, as the nation has against partial-birth abortion. The new governor may find it impolitic and unnecessary to push the bill in a state that is already known as the abortion capital—and a win for pro-lifers in New York may help give us national momentum.



“In a late-breaking development, our own meteorologist Frank Winters, while on location in the small town of Beaverbrook, has been arrested.”

The Abortion Lobby's Deep Pockets

Brian Clowes

January 2008 marked the 35th anniversary of the legalization of abortion in the United States. *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* have cost nearly 50 million lives and have grossly deformed the practice of both law and medicine in this country. Pro-abortionists have made their greatest gains—not only in the U.S., but all over the world—by claiming victim status, in three ways: First, they claim that thousands of women used to die annually due to complications caused by illegal abortions—a lie long ago exposed by reformed abortionist Dr. Bernard Nathanson.¹ Second, they say that violent pro-lifers are brutalizing them—but if you take a few minutes to visit the website www.abortionviolence.com you'll see what a hoax that is. Third and finally, they complain that they are being oppressed by rich, lavishly funded anti-choice groups.

Unfortunately, this third falsehood has been allowed to stand, primarily because there are so many different pro-life and pro-abortion groups in the U.S. that it is very difficult to pin down the truth of this matter without a detailed examination of the financial records. The purpose of this article is to clarify and define the amount of income generated by groups on both sides of the abortion debate—and to lay this claim to rest once and for all.

Methodology

The author of this article downloaded and examined 15,524 IRS Forms 990 in order to determine just how much income is generated annually by nonprofit groups that support the Culture of Life and the Culture of Death.² The last year that these Forms 990 are generally available for this kind of research was 2006, so that is the base year we will use in this analysis.

The most logical way to examine this question is to look at three different matchups: first, single-issue pro-life vs. single-issue pro-abortion and “family planning” groups; second, pro-family vs. anti-family groups; third and finally, the international population-control movement vs. those opposing it.

Single-Issue Pro-Life vs. Pro-Abortion Groups

Non-profit pro-life groups raised about \$551 million in 2006. About eighty-four percent of this, or \$461 million, was generated by the approximately 3,000 crisis pregnancy centers (CPCs) in the U.S. Most of these CPCs work

Brian Clowes, Ph.D., is director of research at Human Life International.

under the umbrella organizations Birthright, Heartbeat International, and Care Net. Their average income was about \$154,650 in 2006.³

Number one on the pro-abortion moneymaking list, of course, is the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA), which made more than twice as much money in 2006 as every pro-life group in the country *combined*—\$1.12 billion.⁴ 204 of PPFA's affiliates generated significant income in 2006, including 30 that had incomes of \$10 million or more.⁵

Planned Parenthood is apparently embarking on a program to crowd out its competitors, because its share of surgical abortions committed in the U.S. has risen from 1.6 percent (12,000 abortions) in 1973 to a staggering 22 percent (275,000 abortions) in 2006. In fact, Planned Parenthood has committed 4.7 million surgical abortions in the U.S. since *Roe v. Wade*.⁶

Nine Planned Parenthood affiliates have a greater income than the leading pro-life fundraiser, the National Right to Life Committee (NRLC), and 35 have a greater income than the second-ranked pro-life moneymaker, Priests for Life.

The great advantage these groups have over pro-life organizations is that *they have tangible and popular products to sell*. Most people have been conditioned to think that contraception is essential for their “modern” lifestyles, and that abortion must remain available in those regrettable cases when birth control fails. Meanwhile, it is very difficult for pro-life and pro-family organizations to sell values and virtue to a world that is fixated on self-gratification. Even when we *do* manage to get our point of view across, there is little monetary profit in doing so.

The pro-abortionists and “family planners” have a triple-tiered, interlocking moneymaking system that would make the most corrupt used-car salesman drool with envy. To begin with, sex educators sell our children on the idea that sexual activity is permissible and even *inevitable*—just as long as they practice “safe(r) sex” and use condoms or some other form of birth control. Then the “family planners” sell birth-control devices to support the sexual activities recommended by the sex educators. Finally, when these birth-control methods fail (as they do more than 2 million times per year in the U.S.), the “family planners” stand ready to provide abortion, treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, and more contraception, which in turn leads to even more abortion business.

The amount of money generated by the “family planning” consortium in the U.S. exceeds \$9 billion per year.

About 16.8 million schoolchildren in the U.S. receive comprehensive sex education at an average cost of \$38.80 per child per year, for a total of \$650 million.

Nearly 22 million women use abortifacient or contraceptive methods of

birth control each year, generating a 2006 income of \$4.97 billion.

The abortionists performed 1,198,000 surgical abortions and 70,000 medical abortions in 2006, for an income of \$881 million.

And the “family planners” performed 700,000 tubal ligations and 500,000 vasectomies in 2006, for a total income of about \$2.59 billion.⁷

Thus, the “family planners” generated a total direct income of \$9.1 billion in 2006 in the U.S. alone.

If we add the \$107 million received by other pro-abortion advocacy organizations (those that did not provide the above services), we arrive at a total 2006 income of about \$9.2 billion.⁸

If we compare this to the \$551 million raised by pro-life organizations in the same year, we can see that the single-purpose pro-abortion groups outraised the single-purpose pro-life organizations by a ratio of 17 to one in 2006.

Pro-Family vs. Anti-Family

Many well-funded interests are advancing an anti-family agenda—“gay rights,” gambling, drinking, drugs, pornography, no-fault divorce, and so on. For the purposes of this study, anti-family organizations are defined as those that promote any activity or product that tends to damage or warp the natural relationship between men and women or undermines and debilitates what we call the “traditional nuclear family.”

Gay-activist groups raised \$376 million in 2006.

Pro-euthanasia organizations raised \$6 million.

Groups attempting to undermine and subvert the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church regarding sexual morality raised \$77 million.

This makes for a total of \$459 million for anti-family advocacy groups.

But once again we have to take into account the products and services that the groups sell to the public. These fall into two primary categories: The pornography industry sells a minimum of \$13.3 billion in filthy books, movies, and other products.⁹ And prostitution generates about \$8 billion in income annually.¹⁰

We should not lose hope, because there are powerful and well-organized interests standing up for the rights of the family. Non-profit pro-family organizations raised a total of about \$6 billion in 2006.¹¹ But we can see from the above that anti-family groups and activities raised about \$34.2 billion versus \$6 billion for pro-family groups, for a ratio of about 6 to 1.

Population Control Organizations

Nowhere is the struggle between life and death more unequal than it is on the international frontier. Population Action International (PAI) estimates

that funding for population assistance in 2006 was about \$7.784 billion.¹² Population-control groups use this money to generate massive propaganda campaigns, set up sterilization camps and quotas, dump billions of condoms and birth-control devices on Asian, Latin American, and African countries, and lobby for legalized abortion worldwide.

There are only four U.S.-based organizations that oppose international population funding, with a combined income of \$6.8 million: Human Life International (\$3.8 million), Life International (\$1.2 million), Population Research Institute (\$0.9 million), and Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (C-FAM) (\$0.9 million).

The nations that contribute most to suppressing the population in the poor nations of the Southern Hemisphere are largely white, rich, and below replacement population. For instance, 86 percent of the funding for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) comes from nations that all have birthrates that are well below replacement.¹³

The ratio of the resources spent by the population-control organizations to those available to the groups opposing them is 1,145 to one.

Summary

A summary of the above three categories shows that, in 2006, the Culture of Death outfunded the Culture of Life by a ratio of about \$5.9 to \$1:

Comparison of 2006 Incomes	(in \$ millions)	
	<u>Culture of Death</u>	<u>Culture of Life</u>
(1) Single-issue pro-life/pro-abortion	9,200	551
(2) Pro-family/anti-family	21,759	6,000
(3) Population Control	7,784	7
Totals	38,743	6,558

More than a Money Gap

Stark inequalities exist in areas other than funding. To begin with, there are thousands of community planning groups, health-care systems, family-health councils, hospitals, clinics, community-action agencies and health centers in the U.S., and only a very tiny fraction (less than one percent) do *not* perform or refer for abortions and sterilizations or distribute contraception. Hundreds of billions of dollars pass through these health-care systems every

year, and their impact on public policy and private practice cannot be overestimated.

Second, the Culture of Death took control of the nation's media outlets early on and still has a lopsided advantage in its ability to broadcast its message. As Susanne Millsaps of NARAL Pro-Choice America says, "The media has been our best friend in this fight. They claim objectivity, but I know they're all pro-choice."¹⁴

Additionally, there are more than 300 "women's studies" programs in our colleges and universities, which crank out thousands of brainwashed ideologues every year—while the Culture of Life has exactly *one* pro-life program of studies, at the Franciscan University of Steubenville.

Groups Promoting or Cooperating with the Culture of Death

The greatest advantage the Culture of Death has over the Culture of Life is in the thousands of groups that appear to be neutral, but in reality are not. In many ways, the prime movers in the battles over family and the sanctity of human life remain in the shadows and manipulate public opinion and policy through indirect, rather than direct, means. For the purposes of this study, we define groups promoting or cooperating with the Culture of Death as those organizations whose primary mission is not directly related to sanctity of life or family issues, but which nonetheless support the destruction, inhibition, or perversion of human fertility through the distribution, promotion, or support of the following practices and products: population control, surgical or medical abortion, abortifacients and contraceptives, surgical and chemical sterilization, destructive embryonic-stem-cell research (ESCR), fetal-tissue experimentation and transplantation, illicit means of artificial reproduction, and other practices that undermine the foundation stone of society, the family, here defined as marriage between one man and one woman.

The amount of money flowing through these cooperating organizations is simply colossal. The nonprofits that support the Culture of Death generated nearly \$100 billion of income in 2006. These organizations possess tens of millions of members in the U.S., and they influence public opinion and policy in many ways:

1. Supporting Abortion. More than one hundred professional, civic, and religious organizations submitted an *amicus* brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in support of unrestricted legal abortion in the case of *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*.¹⁵ Many of these groups are also members of the Pro-Choice Public Education Project (PEP), which publishes outrageously silly pro-abortion propaganda for college campuses.¹⁶ The American Bar, Diabetes,

Heart, Lung, Medical, Psychiatric, and Psychological Associations are all pro-abortion, directly affecting the abortion opinions of millions of lawyers, doctors, psychiatrists, and psychologists.

2. Opposing Abstinence-Only Education. About 25 groups signed on with the National Coalition Against Censorship, which aggressively opposes abstinence-only education.¹⁷

3. Supporting Fetal Organ Harvesting and Experimentation. Twenty major professional and medical associations have gone on record as supporting fetal organ harvesting and fetal experimentation.¹⁸

4. Supporting Embryo-Destroying Stem-Cell Research. Many medical and professional organizations have gone on record before Congress as supporting the federal funding of embryonic-stem-cell experimentation and its expansion, in spite of more effective and ethical alternatives based on adult stem cells.¹⁹

5. Supporting Euthanasia. Many groups cooperate with or promote the Culture of Death in specific ways to targeted audiences. For example, the American Association of Retired People (AARP) publishes soothing articles promoting physician-assisted suicide to its 39 million members, and recommends the Netherlands as the best place to grow old, while completely ignoring its runaway euthanasia program.²⁰

Many of these organizations escape attention because of their neutral-sounding names, such as “Advocates for Youth,” “National Partnership for Women and Families,” and “Political Research Associates.” Most people have never heard of many of these organizations, but they are pernicious in many ways. Although they all do good work, they also subtly warp the morality of the tens of millions of people they influence through the promotion of anti-life practices. They do far more damage than single-issue pro-abortion groups because they do not wear the harsh and abrasive public personas of NOW, NARAL, or Planned Parenthood, and because they have a vastly greater constituency. They also contribute hundreds of millions of dollars to anti-life politicians annually through their political action committees.

The anti-life strategists have also infiltrated—and subverted the original values of—the biggest girls’ and young women’s organizations in the U.S.: the Girl Scouts of America and the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA). These are logical high-priority targets, along with the Boy Scouts of America, which fortunately is standing firm in the face of continuous assaults by homosexual activists and other anti-family forces.

Meanwhile, there are no large public nonprofit organizations that openly promote the Culture of Life. It seems that even those groups that should naturally support life—such as the National Red Cross—have either been

infiltrated and corrupted by anti-lifers, or are simply too intimidated to promote the cause of life. The pro-abortionists have done a wonderful job of establishing networks of sympathetic contact points at all of these associations, and virtually none of their rank-and-file members realize that their groups are signing on to the endless statements, press releases, manifestos, and declarations supporting anti-life practices. The momentum has become so great that, if a mainline medical, legal, or other professional group does *not* sign an anti-life document, it is perceived as anti-woman or unscientific.

Conclusions

With such crushing advantages, why has the Culture of Death not simply pulverized the Culture of Life? The answers: democracy, demography, and God.

To begin with, the Culture of Death is virulently anti-democratic. It flourishes in environments where absolute government power is concentrated in the hands of a very few, as in Communist regimes. Human beings are basically good and recognize evil when they see it, and this is why the Culture of Death has advanced its causes through the court system rather than by public referenda or votes in state legislatures.

Then there is the question of demographics. The more a people, country, or nation embraces life-destroying activities like abortion, contraception, sterilization, euthanasia, and homosexual acts, the sooner it will die out and give way to people who love life and children. We can observe the tragic case of Europe, which is losing a net two million people a year despite pro-life Muslims flocking in from the South.

But these secular influences, of course, do not provide the complete answer. God has His own purposes—and He sustains our efforts to prevent a total victory by the anti-life forces. We must neither be complacent nor give in to despair. St. Paul spoke not only to the Corinthians of centuries ago, but directly to us, when he said: “Therefore, my beloved brethren, be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that in the Lord your labor is not in vain” (I Cor. 15:58).

For a detailed spreadsheet containing financial information on income from more than a thousand organizations on both sides of the battle between the Culture of Life and the Culture of Death, including over a thousand footnotes, e-mail the author at bclowes@hli.org.

NOTES

1. Bernard Nathanson, M.D., *Aborting America* [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979], p. 193.
2. IRS Forms 990 are posted on the Guidestar Web site at <http://www.guidestar.org>. The most current three years of these forms are available without paid subscription.

BRIAN CLOWES

3. CPCs aside, the ten leading pro-life fundraisers in 2006 were as follows: (1) The National Right to Life Committee and its affiliates (\$29.6 million); (2) Priests for Life (\$8.2 million); (3) American Life League (\$7.4 million); (4) Care Net (\$4.8 million); (5) The *Vitae* Caring Foundation (\$4.7 million); (6) The National Pro-Life Alliance (\$3.8 million); (7) VoteYesForLife.com (\$2.8 million); (8) The Susan B. Anthony National List (\$2.1 million); (9) The Couple to Couple League International (\$2.0 million); and (10) The Center for Bio-Ethical Reform (\$1.9 million).
4. The top ten single-issue pro-abortion moneymakers in 2006 were: (1) The Planned Parenthood Federation of America (\$1,117 million); (2) California Family Health Council (\$29.2 million); (3) NARAL Pro-Choice America (\$25.3 million); (4) Philadelphia Family Planning Council (\$17.9 million); (5) The Center for Reproductive Rights (\$14.5 million); National Organization for Women (\$13.4 million); (6) The [Alan] Guttmacher Institute (\$12.7 million); (7) The Center for Reproductive Rights (\$10.8 million); (8) Yakima Feminist Women's Health Center (\$9.5 million); (9) Interface Children Family Services (\$7.0 million); and (10) The Family Planning Association of Maine (\$5.6 million).
5. The top ten money earners for PPFA in 2006 were: (1) PPFA National Headquarters (New York City) (\$77.3 million); (2) Planned Parenthood Mar Monte (California) (\$64.5 million); (3) Planned Parenthood San Diego and Riverside Counties (\$38.2 million); (4) Planned Parenthood Western Washington State (\$37.8 million); (5) Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains (Denver) (\$35.1 million); (6) Planned Parenthood Houston and Southeast Texas (\$34.5 million); (7) Planned Parenthood New York City (\$3.25 million); (8) Planned Parenthood Los Angeles (\$31.6 million); (9) Planned Parenthood Minnesota North Dakota South Dakota (\$29.9 million); and (10) the Planned Parenthood League of Massachusetts (\$24.9 million).
6. Brian Clowes, *The Facts of Life* compact disc edition. Chapter 19, "United States Abortion Statistics" [Front Royal, Va.: Human Life International], 2007 Edition.
7. The calculations supporting these numbers are detailed and take up a lot of space. For a spreadsheet containing these calculations, plus financial information on income from more than a thousand organizations on both sides of the battle between the Culture of Life and the Culture of Death, including over a thousand footnotes, e-mail the author at bclowes@hli.org.
8. This number does not include the income generated by pro-abortion organizations that actually teach sex education, distribute contraceptives, or perform abortions or sterilizations, because this would double-count such income under the "family planning" calculations. This figure also does not count money received by pro-abortion foundations, because this money is eventually passed on to "frontline" pro-abortion groups.
9. The income of the pornography industry in the U.S. is larger than the revenues of the top eight technology companies combined: Microsoft, Google, Amazon, eBay, Yahoo!, Apple, Netflix, and EarthLink. The income of the porn industry was \$12.62 billion in 2005 and \$13.33 billion in 2006 (Jerry Repolato, "Internet Pornography Statistics"). Top Ten Reviews website at <http://internet-filter-review.toptenreviews.com/internet-pornography-statistics.html>, downloaded on September 20, 2007.
10. The study of "sexonomics" is notoriously imprecise, because prostitution is illegal. However, based on the average income of part-time and full-time prostitutes and an estimate of the number of prostitutes in the U.S., we arrive at an average estimate of about \$8 billion annually. One source of information is Juliann G. Sebastian and Angeline Bushy, *Special Populations in the Community: Advances in Reducing Health Disparities* [Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 1999], page 78.
11. The leading pro-family fundraisers in 2006 were (1) The Knights of Columbus (\$3,706 million); (2) The Boy Scouts of America (\$1,134.8 million); (3) The Christian Broadcasting Network (\$243.1 million); (4) The Trinity Broadcasting Network (\$227.0 million); (5) Focus on the Family (\$160.6 million); (6) The Heritage Foundation (\$70.5 million); (7) Bethany Christian Services (\$62.9 million); (8) The Eternal Word Television Network (\$41.0 million); (9) Coral Ridge Ministries (\$39.9 million); (10) The Alliance Defense Fund (\$27.3 million); (11) Young America's Foundation (\$19.0 million); (12) Judicial Watch (\$18.7 million); (13) Promise Keepers (\$17.9 million); and (14) The American Family Association (\$17.0 million).
12. "Are Nations Meeting Commitments to Fund Reproductive Health?," dated December 1, 2004. Downloaded from the website of Population Action International at http://www.populationaction.org/Publications/Fact_Sheets/FS9/Summary.shtml on November 15, 2007.

THE HUMAN LIFE REVIEW

13. The countries' donations to UNFPA in 2006 were (1) the Netherlands (\$75.2 million); (2) Sweden (\$55.2 million); (3) Norway (\$40.8 million); (4) the United Kingdom (\$37.7 million); (5) Japan (\$33.3 million); (6) Denmark (\$31.0 million); (7) Germany (\$19.5 million); (8) Finland (\$17.2 million); (9) Canada (\$12.7 million); and (10) Switzerland (\$10.0 million) [Table entitled "Top 20 Donors to UNFPA in 2006," *UNFPA Annual Report 2006*, p. 28]
14. Susanne Millsaps, executive director of the Utah Chapter of NARAL (now NARAL Pro-Choice America), quoted in the *Washington Times*, March 13, 1991.
15. Organizations signing on to the pro-abortion *Webster* brief included the American Academy of Pediatrics, American Association of University Women, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Federation of State and County Municipal Employees, American Veterans Committee, Asian-American Legal Defense and Education Fund, Association of Latino Attorneys, American Indian Health Care Association, American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association, and American Public Health Association—and these are just the organizations whose names begin with "A."
16. Members of PEP include the Advocacy Institute, American Federation of Teachers, American Jewish Congress, Center for Women's Policy Studies, Coalition of Labor Union Women, National Asian Women's Health Organization, National Black Women's Health Project, Political Research Associates, Women's Environment and Development Organization, and Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA).
17. Member groups of the National Coalition Against Censorship include the American Medical Student Association, the American Academy of HIV Medicine, American College Health Association, American Medical Women's Association, American Social Health Association, Foundation for AIDS Research, Center for Law and Social Policy, Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Association of Working Women, National Council of Jewish Women, National Education Association, National Partnership for Women and Families, Sierra Club, and Society for Adolescent Medicine.
18. The organizations supporting fetal organ harvesting and experimentation include the Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Cancer Society, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Physicians, American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, American Lung Association, American Medical Association, American Medical Women's Association, and Association of American Medical Colleges—once again, that's just the organizations whose names begin with "A."
19. Groups supporting ESCR include the Academy of Clinical Laboratory Physicians and Scientists, Alliance for Aging Research, American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology, American Academy of Ophthalmology, American Association of Anatomists, American Association for Dental Research, American Association of Dental Schools, American Association of Immunologists, American Association of Neurological Surgeons, American Autoimmune Related Diseases Association, American Burn Association, American College of Clinical Pharmacology, American College of Neuropsychopharmacology, and American Gastroenterological Association. There are over a thousand major medical and dental professional associations in the United States, and this list includes only those groups whose names begin with "A."
20. See, for two examples, AARP's *Modern Maturity* magazine: "The Last Taboo," September 2000, and Mike Edwards. "As Good as It Gets," *AARP: The Magazine*, November and December 2004. (AARP stopped publishing *Modern Maturity* in 2003, before the debut of *The Magazine*).

Confronting a Changed Culture

Kathryn Jean Lopez

“It looked like the life had been sucked out of her.”

So says “Brad,” in *Changed: Making Sense of Your Own or a Loved One’s Abortion Experience* by Michaelene Fredenburg. It’s not everywhere one can express such a brutally honest and graphic sentiment. Fredenburg seeks to provide the opportunity, to people who need it.

Changed is a handbook for a wounded culture—a culture that pretends to embrace “choice,” but has little interest in providing honest preparation and support for those choices and their consequences. The book relays stories, offers loving advice, and extends an invitation. Part of that invitation is the website Fredenburg has set up, abortionchangesyou.com, filled with stories, resources, and interactive opportunities for healing.

On the website, Fredenburg writes: “When I became pregnant at 18, I had an abortion. I was completely unprepared for the emotional fallout. I thought the abortion would erase the pregnancy. I thought I could move on with my life. I was wrong.”

And therein lies the heart of her message and ministry. When you are in any way involved in or touched by an abortion, that abortion changes you. And there are a whole lot of changed people out there, who have to deal with the changes, but who have nowhere safe to do it. *Changed* and abortionchangesyou.com are meant to be a safety net, and a starting point.

As Fredenburg puts it: “I experienced periods of intense anger followed by periods of profound sadness. When my feelings became too difficult to deal with, I reached out for help from a trained counselor.”

She continues, “With counseling and the help of supportive friends, I was able to enter into a healthy grieving process.” Her goal: To end the cultural silence, person by person, abortion by abortion.

Those who run post-abortion healing ministries will tell you that it is hard to get women to attend retreats, to stand up and let themselves be helped. Fredenburg has provided an opportunity for those who have been hurt by abortion to get to the work of healing in private, on their own time, until they feel ready enough to take their story to a priest, a spouse, a friend, a psychiatrist—in short, another person who is available and trustworthy.

Fredenburg presents her *Changed/changesyou* ministry as politics-and judgment-free. And she’s trying to reach *anyone* who has been affected by

Kathryn Jean Lopez (klopez@nationalreview.com) is the editor of National Review Online (www.nationalreview.com) and a nationally syndicated columnist.

abortion. Most obviously, she means women who underwent the life-changing (and-ending) experience. She also means the father of the child who was aborted—a father who wasn't in on the "choice"; a father who may have thought he wanted the abortion; or a father who may have had no idea what other option he could encourage. She also wants to reach the parents of those who've aborted, and children who are born, and know about a sibling they never had the chance to grow up with. As Fredenburg relates, from her own experience: "In addition to grieving the loss of my child, I slowly became aware of how my choice to abort had impacted my family. I was surprised and saddened that my parents, my sister, and even my living children struggled to deal with the loss of a family member through abortion."

Fredenburg, obviously, has been through a healing journey. But some of the stories she relates—names are changed to protect families—are full of vivid and still-raw emotion, often years after the abortion. "Susan" got engaged to "Randy" in college. When they were seniors, she became pregnant. They were so in love that their predicament just made them want to get married earlier. Their parents, however, had different ideas, and offered "persuasive arguments," Susan says, that a baby would ruin their plans. Susan remembers, "Both sets of parents immediately urged us to have an abortion. They said that having a baby now would ruin Randy's chance to accept the full-ride scholarship he'd been offered to medical school."

"Hurt and confused," she writes, "we went to my doctor for the abortion."

Subsequently, the couple got married, Randy went to medical school, and they had more children. Susan writes: "We love our children, and Randy is successful in his field. But there is always a void in our home and in our marriage.

"I feel horrible," she continues, "when someone comes to our house and admires its size, its furnishings, the pool, and the tennis courts."

Chillingly she ends:

I want to shout at them that the cost was too high! But instead of saying anything, I look away with tears in my eyes, and think about how our big house and Randy's successful career were bought at the expense of our first child. It's a thought I can't bear to share with Randy.

"Mindy" highlights the life-gripping contradictions of a Western world embracing the unnatural—a mother "choosing" to end the life within her, pretending it's not life. She's never had an abortion, never been pregnant, but is "at the age when a lot of my friends are getting pregnant." There are miscarriages. There are abortions. "I'm supposed to mourn with my girlfriends who miscarry and cheer on my girlfriends who choose to abort," she writes. "What bothers me the most is that many times the ones who miscarry and

the ones who abort are at the same point in their pregnancies.”

It should bother us all. *Changed* and abortionchangesyou.com seek to do something about it—to reach out and embrace the victims of a culture of “choice” and confront that culture with the pain and lessons of its victims.

Fredenborg offers an accessible and safe embrace with her book and website—a healing ministry, really. *Changed* is a book you want to get into the hands of anyone and everyone who needs it. And with support, Fredenborg hopes to do just that. A series of gripping images announcing abortionchangesyou.com could serve as oases for the suffering, in the rear tables at church, on mass transit, in magazines, as postcards in bars. Among other things, with the necessary financial support, Fredenborg hopes to be able to get the word out about the site through substantial ad buys, provide a fully loaded Spanish version of the website, and develop church and college resource kits as practical aids for those on the frontlines of our abortion-weary culture.

A mother reflects, “I thought I was helping her.”

A father announces, “My wife gets depressed around the anniversary of our daughter’s abortion.”

A boyfriend regrets, “I often wonder if there was something I could have done to help her.”

A woman remembers, “My child would have been 10 this year.”

A twenty-something gal recalls, “I thought life would be the way it was before.”

It, of course, isn’t. Through her book and website, Fredenborg embraces her fellow wounded and issues a wake-up call to a culture of that hides behind emanations and penumbras. Fredenborg writes: “Your losses are real. Your grief is real. Your pain is real.”

Evan

Catherine Rinko-Gay

It can be so tempting to think of life in purely practical terms. When I look at a baby, it's fascinating to wonder about his or her potential. Will that inquisitive glint in her eye develop into the keen gaze of a brilliant scientist? Will his endearing smile one day win the hearts of millions as he campaigns for President? Will those fiercely kicking legs one day race across the finish line of an Olympic marathon? Then when one such baby dies, it's easy to think of what the world lost in the same terms: The world lost a scientist, a politician, an athlete.

But working at an orphanage in Ghana showed me that there's so much more to a life. Evan wasn't a scientist, a politician, or an athlete. He was a little six-month-old baby who had very little potential. Though the workers acknowledged that it was unfair that he had no chance to live, the facts were the facts: He was another statistic dying of HIV.

When I met Evan, I was drawn to his funny-looking face. His skull was flattened on the sides, lacking baby fat to round it out. His hair was falling out, but what was left sprang up stubbornly in little tufts on the top of his head. Yet it wasn't these abnormalities that drew me, but his eyes. Despite the fact that he was severely malnourished and sick with malaria, his disproportionately huge eyes stared at me with surprising awareness. The moment they landed on me, I fell in love.

Evan became my project. No one else would take care of him because they knew he would die anyway. The malaria gave him an upset stomach, causing him to throw up everything he ate. Because he had HIV anyway, people had resigned themselves to the fact that he was fated to starve to death. However, I couldn't accept that he would die abandoned and forgotten. If he was going to die, I resolved, he would die knowing he was loved.

I discovered that if he was fed very slowly, a 50-minute process, he wouldn't throw up. To me, this was a miracle. Over the next three weeks, Evan improved dramatically. He got to the point where he was eating faster and beginning to have more energy. He loved to beat his tiny fists in the air. We developed a game where he would shoot his fist up and wait for me to kiss it. Then he would pull it away and look at me with almost a smile. Then he would shoot up the fist again. This game could go on for quite a while.

Catherine Rinko-Gay, a student at New York University, spent the Spring 2008 semester studying in Ghana where she volunteered at a local orphanage.

CATHERINE RINKO-GAY

People at the orphanage shook their heads at my stupidity. They thought I was foolish to be wasting my time with a lost cause. I became determined to prove his life was worth something. I decided to see if I could find a sponsor to pay for his medical care. With money for the right drugs, I knew he could stay alive for decades. I wrote to organizations in the U.S. I researched NGOs in Ghana.

Then one day Evan died. I was told he woke up unable to breathe. He was taken to the hospital, but the hospital wouldn't admit him. The little fighter died around noon.

As I grieved, people encouraged me to give his life a purpose. They told me to let it motivate me to work for money for other HIV babies. They told me to honor him by naming some project after him. And they meant well.

But they missed something.

Evan's value never lay in his potential, and it didn't lie in what he could inspire me to do. He was valuable for who he was. His value lay in those beady black eyes that looked at you with such curiosity. His value lay in those tiny fists that vigorously beat the air. It didn't matter what he might do with his life later, he was valuable in that moment.

I don't walk down the line of cribs at Osu Children's Home and miss a potential star, and I don't smile at his empty crib, thinking of how much he has motivated me. I miss a baby named Evan. And no matter how many other babies I help, I will always think of him. I loved him.

And I'm grateful to him for teaching me the true value of a life.



“Consider yourselves conquered. We really have to move on.”

My Telomeres Are Getting Shorter

Donald DeMarco

A writer is always looking for ways in which he can express old ideas with new words. He knows that his language must be kept fresh to protect his readers from semantic boredom, if not semantic aphasia.

In the senior circles where I spend a great deal of my social time, I hear the expression “We’re getting older” a little too often. Actually, I am weary of it. The truth is, we start getting “older” the moment our one-cell zygote replicates itself into two nearly identical cells. They are *nearly* identical, I must emphasize, because, in an immeasurably small way, our telomeres got shorter and thereby began the irreversible process of aging that causes us to get older.

What are *telomeres*? They are the protective tips on the chromosomes of all mammals. They keep the ends of various chromosomes from accidentally becoming attached to one another. Chromosomes are the slender strands that carry genes—which are our units of inheritance, the factors that determine our physical features. Over time, as our cells continue to divide, our telomeres become progressively shorter. This takes place without the genes themselves being affected. The shorter our telomeres get, the more we are at risk for all those health problems that are associated with aging: cancer, arthritis, and a variety of other degenerative diseases.

Scientists tell us that when the sheep named Dolly was cloned, she began her life with telomeres that were the same age as the ewe that donated them. In other words, poor Dolly was truly old before her time. She developed obesity at a very young age and also suffered from early-onset arthritis. On Valentine’s Day, 2002, old Dolly was euthanized.

There is rich irony in what happened to Dolly. Cloning was supposed to be a way of starting all over again. It promised to be the scientific discovery of the fountain of youth. But the ewe that provided her DNA, genes, chromosomes, and telomeres also transmitted her age. Cloning, therefore, is not like sexual reproduction that allows new life to begin at the beginning.

Aging, dying, getting older, is not something we can shake, though we do rage against the approaching night. We resort to bogus anti-aging chemicals, cosmetic surgery, cryogenics, the vain hopes of transhumanism, and other

Donald DeMarco is professor emeritus at St. Jerome’s University and adjunct professor at Holy Apostles College & Seminary.

desperate measures. But death remains unshakable. Human existence is a mosaic of life and death, factors that are as tightly interwoven as telomeres are bound to their respective chromosomes.

There is a question that pundits love to ask: “How do you unscramble an egg?” The key, of course, is to prevent the egg from being scrambled in the first place. This is close to what C. S. Lewis had in mind when he advised us, in his science-fiction novel *That Hideous Strength*, not to have dreams but to have babies. If we want to unscramble our life or achieve a sense of immortality, we must honor nature and go back to the source. Reorganization and rebirth are mysterious processes that belong to the maternal.

There is rejuvenation in the strict sense, but only by having children. It may be humbling to look at an infant and realize that he has much longer and more serviceable telomeres than we aging onlookers have. (The cells of an infant divide at a prodigious rate, in comparison with those of senior citizens—in whom cellular activity slows to a crawl.) But it also should cause us to admire the life energy that a child displays, of the kind that we older folk have been steadily losing. We cannot do much about maintaining the length of our telomeres. If we want to feel rejuvenated, we should involve ourselves with children. Their spirit and energy are infectious. “The soul is healed,” writes Dostoevsky, “by being with children.”

A culture that approves abortion, and, as it now appears, is inching toward selective infanticide, is a culture that is getting old without receiving the full benefits that children provide. Growing old is a mandate indelibly inscribed in our chromosomes, without any real form of rejuvenation. In this context, life is seen as a continual and irreversible experience of loss—in which growing old means that a person becomes less and less. This is why the ideas of euthanasia and assisted suicide for the elderly are taking hold, in much the same way as abortion has at the other end of life.

Biochemists inform us, incidentally, that 85 to 90 percent of *cancer* cells are able to divide indefinitely without their telomeres being shortened. For this reason, they can speak of cancer cells in terms of *immortality*. But this immortality is of no benefit to the human organism; in fact, the presence of these cells in the human body can be lethal. They are immortal, but not life-sustaining.

The irony here is that a little bit of death—in the form of shrinking telomeres (that preclude cancer)—is needed to sustain life. In a similar way, vaccination, which is the injection of a small dose of a disease, prevents the disease from overcoming the organism. So too, the difficulties that life sends our way, the

THE HUMAN LIFE REVIEW

“thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to,” as Hamlet says, can also serve to strengthen our life.

We can strengthen our life—and become genuinely rejuvenated—by identifying with and working for the youngest members of the human family, including those who are threatened by abortion. In mysterious and indirect ways, we do become beneficiaries of our efforts to promote and defend life.



“Let me through, please—I’m an aromatherapist!”

Reaping the Rich Inheritance of Love:
Motherhood in Georgian England

Edward Short

In his *Life of Johnson*, Boswell recalls Johnson arguing with a “pertinacious gentleman,” who, after talking “in a very puzzling manner,” turned to the old sage and said, “I don’t understand you, Sir,” whereupon Johnson threw up his hands and replied “Sir, I have found you an argument . . . I am not obliged to find you an understanding.”¹

Anyone who has ever endeavored to convince a hardened pro-abortionist of the inviolability of unborn life will know the exasperation Johnson felt. The reasoning necessary to recognize that destroying unborn life is indefensible is not abstruse. Grasping the golden rule is sufficient: We must not do unto others what we would not have others do unto us. When Ronald Reagan said, “I’ve noticed that everybody that is for abortion has already been born,” he was refuting the case for abortion with the same appeal to common sense that Johnson used to refute Bishop Berkeley’s theory of the non-existence of matter, when, kicking a large stone, he declared: “I refute it thus.” Yet to many pro-abortionists common sense makes no appeal. For them, the child in the womb, like that stone, is simply unreal.

This refusal to accept the testimony of common sense is characteristic of certain feminist history. In her highly acclaimed book, *The Gentleman’s Daughter: Women’s Lives in Georgian England* (1998), Amanda Vickery depicts her upper-class female subjects not as individuals but as noble victims. Thus, the women in her pages are described as resigned to “the symbolic authority of fathers and husbands, the self-sacrifices of motherhood and the burdensome responsibility for domestic servants, house-keeping and family consumption. The fact that these elements were so abiding perhaps accounts for the extent of acquiescence—rebellious against roles that appeared both prehistoric and preordained would profit nothing.”² In other words, if common sense suggests that her subjects became mothers and managed households out of love and a concomitant sense of duty, well, common sense is mistaken. They assumed such roles because they had no choice but to assume them.

Implicit in Vickery’s analysis is the contention that if 18th-century women had had their way they would have rebelled against these “prehistoric and preordained” roles. Like their feminist successors, they would have revolted

Edward Short is completing work on a book about Cardinal Newman and his contemporaries which will be published by Continuum in June, 2010.

against the authority of fathers and husbands, refused the self-sacrifices of motherhood and let others manage the servants and the household accounts. Vickery's book abounds in scholarly evidence. She has pored over county record offices and immersed herself in journals and miscellanies. But rather than let the evidence speak for itself she often misrepresents it to support prejudices that would have been unfathomable to her subjects.

One can see this in the way she treats the subject of childbirth. For Vickery and other feminist historians, the question of how past women viewed childbirth must necessarily present embarrassing challenges to feminist orthodoxy, particularly as this relates to abortion. Of course, there were no pro-abortion women in the 18th century or in any other century prior to the late 20th century: They were all categorically (the feminist historian might say "benightedly") pro-life. Yet what is remarkable is how this never seems to disconcert feminist historians. It certainly never deters Vickery from saddling her philoprogenitive subjects with attitudes hostile to the very idea of childbirth.

If the evidence shows that women assumed the responsibilities of motherhood bravely and, on the whole, uncomplainingly, despite the considerable perils of childbirth in an era without the benefit of obstetrics, Vickery must always insist that this is a sign of "acquiescence," never of choice, never of preference, and certainly never of self-sacrificial love. If one objects that motherhood was an inalienable part of female identity in the 18th as in any other century, Vickery has her answer ready:

Linked to the celebration of marriage was the growing sentimentalisation of motherhood. Of course, the veneration of the mother is at least as old as the Madonna. Elizabeth I would hardly have represented herself as the Mother of her People if the role did not evoke positive associations, and the Puritans did much to promote the honour of breastfeeding in the elite. However, what distinguishes the eighteenth-century discourse of motherhood from its predecessors is the overlaying of secular hosannahs on the ancient religious solemnizations. Breastfeeding became an ultra-fashionable practice eulogized in the most gushing manner in the novels of Samuel Richardson. But for all the sugariness of the proliferating representations of motherhood, the experience for most was not one of undiluted sweetness. Being a mother, against a background of disease and debility, remained a bloody, risky, uncontrollable and often gut-wrenching experience, such that a painting of a cherub chasing a butterfly, or a description of a blushing nursing mother, spoke only intermittently and even then superficially to the powerful feelings evoked. The Bible, and in particular the book of Job, still had more to say than most. The self-representation commonest among genteel mothers was not that of a sighing, contented Madonna, it was rather that of a self-made pillar of fortitude and resignation, built to withstand the random blows of fate.³

The object here seems clearly to diminish motherhood, to argue that a nasty reality—"a bloody, risky, uncontrollable and often gut-wrenching

experience”—has been somehow falsified and glossed over by sentimentality and bad art. She begins with a show of fair-mindedness: “Of course, the veneration of the mother is at least as old as the Madonna”—a concession that does scant justice to the immense creative influence that Our Lady had on the formation and character of Western civilization, a fact that even Henry Adams could appreciate.⁴ From the ruins of Wenlock Abbey in Shropshire in 1891, Adams wrote: “Progress has much to answer for in depriving weary and broken men and women of their natural end and happiness; but even now I can fancy myself contented in a cloister, and happy in the daily round of duties, if only I still knew a God to pray to, or better yet, a Goddess; for as I grow older I see that all the human interest and power that religion ever had, was in the mother and child . . .”⁵ For Vickery, Elizabeth I (of all people) exemplifies why mothers are venerable—surely a bizarre association.

Charging Samuel Richardson with sentimentalizing motherhood is a similarly odd claim. When it came to making room in novels for the everyday aspects of motherhood and marriage Richardson was a pioneer. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu might have thought that he “should confine his pen to the amours of housemaids, and the conversation of the steward’s table,” and Sir Horace Walpole might have considered *Clarissa* and Sir Charles Grandison “pictures of high life as conceived by a bookseller . . . romances . . . spiritualized by a Methodist teacher,” but these were the objections of snobbery.⁶ (Richardson, after all, was only a joiner’s son.) Nonetheless, many more readers, including Samuel Johnson and Sir Walter Scott, have agreed with Macaulay that “no writings, Shakespeare excepted, show more profound knowledge of the human heart.”⁷ Something of this knowledge can be gleaned from a passage in *Sir Charles Grandison* where one of the characters remarks, “A feeling heart is a blessing that no one, who has it, would be without; and it is a moral security of innocence, since the heart that is able to partake of the distress of another, cannot willfully give it.”⁸ Again, we encounter the golden rule. Only the hard-hearted would regard this as sentimental.

But what annoys Vickery about Richardson is not that he was sentimental but that he acknowledged many more positive aspects about traditional marriage and motherhood than feminists are prepared to concede. His character *Clarissa Harlowe*, for example, first rebels against the arranged political marriage with Roger Solmes that her father wishes her to make because she recognizes that personal freedom is indispensable to the proper equality of marriage. In this sense, *Clarissa* might seem feminist enough. But, in feminist eyes, she throws away whatever credibility she has when she freely elopes with the monstrous *Lovelace*. Worse, after she rebels against

Lovelace, she commits the ultimate feminist sin by submitting to a new master. Apropos this submission, the English critic Patrick Parrinder is perceptive:

In opposition to Lovelace's tyranny, Clarissa ceases to appear as the rebellious slave she had been at home and becomes, instead, both a queen and a saint. Lovelace compares her to Mary Queen of Scots at the mercy of Elizabeth I (iv. 31). . . . She renounces her father, too. When at the end she states that she is 'setting out with all diligence for my father's house,' (iv. 157), the father she means to return to is God himself. Not only has she refused to allow Mr. Harlowe to delegate his patriarchal authority to James [her brother], but she is no longer willing to recognize delegation from a heavenly to an earthly father. Clarissa's final 'coming of age,' which is marked by her decision to devote herself to God alone, is the means of her victory over Lovelace . . .⁹

Submission to God requires submission to a natural order: This is why Richardson must repulse feminist critics. One can see Vickery's distrust of this natural order in her handling of motherhood. In a chapter about childbirth and maternity, aptly entitled "Fortitude and Resignation," Vickery goes to great lengths to show how oppressive and indeed nightmarish Georgian motherhood was. What she calls the "sentimental prestige of parenthood" and "the celebration of the pet-like appeal of the progeny" carry no weight with her.¹⁰ The aspect of motherhood that interests her is "the sheer blood and guts of bearing and raising children."

She presents motherhood as inherently nasty. She also shows it to be unsafe, unpredictable, and unhealthy. "When a woman conceived she was launched on a roaring wave of fate. No one could predict how easily she would bear pregnancy, how safely she would deliver, how robust would be her infant, or how long and healthy the life of the child."¹¹ Lest her readers somehow miss the point, Vickery is careful to drive it home with a suitably macabre example. "In June 1739 Anne Gossip laboured in agony for forty-nine and half hours, and with a stoicism barely imaginable suffered her dead baby to be torn within her and removed in pieces."¹² And of course it was a male midwife who attended.

If this does not dissuade her readers from cherishing any positive feelings toward motherhood, Vickery reminds them that even if her subjects and their newborns survived childbirth, their troubles had only begun. Begetting children, she insists, then, as now, kept women from doing anything else. "For fertile women, motherhood could absorb almost all reserves of physical and emotional energy for at least a decade, and was an anxious backdrop for a lifetime."¹³ Breastfeeding presented additional problems. "Bessy Ramsden nursed her four children—Billy, Betsy, Tommy and Dick—herself. 'As I am a nurse,' she reported in 1768, 'I take great care of myself and drink porter like any fishwoman.' But breastfeeding was not without its difficulties and side-effects. Dame Bessy suffered headaches, loss of concentration and dimin-ishing sight."¹⁴ (The readiness here to link breastfeeding with adverse

side-effects should be compared to contemporary feminists' refusal to concede the link between abortion and breast cancer, not to mention post-abortion trauma.)

Notwithstanding these negative consequences, Bessy's ordeal had a silver lining. Breastfeeding, she was convinced, prevented her from being "in an increasing way," which prompts Vickery to comment: "Either she drew on the widespread belief in the contraceptive power of prolonged lactation, or she acknowledged the conservative prohibition against intercourse while breastfeeding. Either way, she registered a desire to delay weaning and control her own fertility."¹⁵ Bessy, in other words, was (dimly) aware of reproductive rights—the great grail of all feminist history.

Still, this did not change the fact that, "once embarked upon a maternal course, married women had only limited time and creative energy to invest in anything beyond household and kin."¹⁶ Hence, "As new mothers, genteel women became less mobile and their time for company was radically reduced."¹⁷ Then, too, children in the 18th century were always coming down with life-threatening illnesses. The whooping cough and smallpox were particularly lethal. "Maternal preoccupation with sick children and the sinister stirrings of infection in the locality were . . . standard themes of women's letters and diaries."¹⁸ Indeed, for Vickery, "a mother's role was interchangeable with that of a sick-nurse."¹⁹ In 1776, one smallpox epidemic alone killed 70 children. "To be a parent," Vickery recognizes clearly enough, "was to be keenly exposed to the vagaries of fate"—though it was mothers, not fathers, who were held most responsible for keeping children healthy.²⁰ So the patriarchal defendant remains in the dock.

What is interesting about Vickery's book, however, is that, despite her readiness to pander to feminist prejudices, she is clear-sighted enough to recognize that "motherhood was not a discrete event, or the work of a day, it was the quintessential labour of love which knew no clock and spent itself in endless small services. . . . In its boundless details, mothering swamped genteel matrons even as it defined them."²¹ What she does not recognize is the *voluntary* nature of this "labour of love." Women willingly made sacrifices for their children, out of love, not because of social conditioning. In praising *The Gentleman's Daughter*, the historian Roy Porter called it "the most important thing in English feminist history in the last ten years." This may be true: Most feminist history is tendentious special pleading. But Vickery's book is valuable despite its feminism, not because of it.

For a less filtered view of how Georgian women regarded motherhood and childbirth we can turn to the poetry they wrote. In a poem called "A

Mother to Her Waking Infant," Joanna Baillie (1762-1851), wrote about the mother and child relationship with unsentimental authority.

Now in thy dazzling half-oped eye,
Thy curled nose and lip awry,
Thy up-hoist arms and noddling head,
And little chin with chrystal spread,
Poor helpless thing! what do I see,
That I should sing of thee?

From thy poor tongue no accents come,
Which can but rub thy toothless gum;
Small understanding boasts thy face,
Thy shapeless limbs nor step nor grace;
A few short words thy feats may tell,
And yet I love thee well. . . .

Each passing clown bestows his blessing,
Thy mouth is worn with old wives' kissing;
E'en lighter looks the gloomy eye
Of surly sense, when thou art by;
And yet I think whoe'er they be,
They love thee not like me. . . .²²

Vickery speaks sneeringly of the "pet-like appeal of the progeny," as though maternal love were somehow analogous to the fondness one might feel for a pet. Yet Baillie proves, if we need proving, that mothers (and fathers) dote on their children out of sacred wonder, not sentimentality or fatuous emotionalism. This realism in Baillie was what appealed to Byron, not the Byron who wasted so much time chasing other men's wives but the Byron who loved his own daughter so much that he insisted on her being brought up Catholic by convent nuns. "What with incense, pictures, statues, altars, shrines, relics, and the real presence, confession, [and] absolution," he told one correspondent, "there is something sensible to grasp at."²³ It was the realism of Joanna Baillie that led him to put her on a par with Walter Scott and George Crabbe, Thomas Moore and Thomas Campbell.²⁴

There are other female poets besides Baillie whose work refutes Vickery's dismal view of Georgian motherhood. In "To a Little Invisible Being Who Is Expected Soon to Become Visible" (surely a problematic title for any pro-choice editor), Anna Laetitia Barbauld (1743-1825) addresses the unborn with

matter-of-fact solicitude:

Germ of new life, whose powers expanding slow
 For many a moon their full perfection wait—
 Haste, precious pledge of happy love, to go
 Auspicious borne through life's mysterious gate.²⁵

In his excellent anthology of 18th-century verse by female poets, Roger Lonsdale notes that Barbauld was the daughter of a Dissenting schoolmaster who gave his brilliant eldest child all the encouragement she needed to pursue her love of learning.²⁶ A reader before the age of 3, she was soon fluent in French and Italian, and later acquired proficiency in Latin and Greek. Her first book of poems, published when she was 30, won wide acclaim. An adoptive parent, she ran a school for boys and later wrote *Lessons for Children* (1778) and *Hymns in Prose for Children* (1781), both of which went through many editions. In 1804 she edited Richardson's letters in six volumes. In addition to winning the praise of Coleridge and Wordsworth, she was friendly with Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and Sir Walter Scott. Yet when Lady Mary urged her to join a proposed academy for women, Barbauld refused. As Lonsdale remarks, "she saw no point in producing *femmes savants* rather than 'good wives or agreeable companions.'" ²⁷ She never considered herself merely a writer and poured scorn on those who even suggested that she might wish to be known as a woman writer. In 1804 she wrote a number of letters to Maria Edgeworth and her husband in which she made it clear, to quote Lonsdale, "that she had little sense of a tradition of women's writing, felt no common cause with other literary women ('There is no bond of union among literary women'), and believed that it would be pointless to 'provoke a war with the other sex.'" ²⁸ These are not views likely to endear her to feminists but they are nothing as objectionable as her musings on the life of the unborn.

What powers lie folded in thy curious frame,—
 Senses from objects locked, and mind from thought!
 How little canst thou guess thy lofty claim
 To grasp at all the worlds the Almighty wrought!

And see, the genial season's warmth to share,
 Fresh younglings shoot, and opening roses glow!
 Swarms of new life exulting fill the air,—
 Haste, infant bud of being, haste to blow! . . .

THE HUMAN LIFE REVIEW

Come, reap thy rich inheritance of love!
Bask in the fondness of a Mother's eye!
Nor wit nor eloquence her heart shall move
Like the first accents of thy feeble cry.

Haste, little captive, burst thy prison doors!
Launch on the living world, and spring to light!
Nature for thee displays her various stores,
Opens her thousand inlets of delight.

If charmed verse or muttered prayers had power
With favouring spells to speed thee on thy way,
Anxious I'd bid my beads each passing hour,
Till thy wished smile thy mother's pangs o'erpay.²⁹

There is nothing here or in Baillie's poem about the oppressiveness of pregnancy or the nastiness of childbirth. There are no complaints against the unfair demands of motherhood, nor any foreshadowing of reproductive rights. Vickery would doubtless counter that these were *acquiescent* women, resigned to what they could not change. But were they? What evidence, after all, does she uncover to substantiate that 18th-century women found motherhood anything other than joyful and life-affirming? However much one might admire the scholarship of Vickery's book, it is replete with feminist spin. If we go to primary sources, we find a very different story. In a poem, entitled "To an Unborn Infant," Isabella Kelly (1759-1857) addresses her unborn child with a solicitude that no amount of feminist polemics can discredit. Here is the real voice of Georgian motherhood.

To an Unborn Infant

Be, still, sweet babe, no harm shall reach thee,
Nor hurt thy yet unfinished form;
Thy mother's frame shall safely guard thee
From this bleak, this beating storm.

Promised hope! expected treasure!
Oh, how welcome to these arms!
Feeble, yet they'll fondly clasp thee,
Shield thee from the least alarms.

EDWARD SHORT

Loved already, little blessing,
Kindly cherished, though unknown,
Fancy forms thee sweet and lovely,
Emblem of the rose unblown.

Though thy father is imprisoned,
Wronged, forgotten, robbed of right,
I'll repress the rising anguish,
Till thine eyes behold the light.

Start not, babe! The hour approaches
That presents the gift of life;
Soon, too soon thou'lt taste of sorrow
In these realms of care and strife.

Share not thou a mother's feelings,
Hope vouchsafes a pitying ray;
Though a gloom obscures the morning,
Bright may shine the rising day.

Live, sweet babe, to bless thy father,
When thy mother slumbers low;
Slowly lisp her name that loved him,
Through a world of varied woe.

Learn, my child, the mournful story
Of thy suffering mother's life;
Let thy father not forget her
In a future, happier wife.

Babe of fondest expectation,
Watch his wishes in his face;
What pleased in me mayst thou inherit,
And supply my vacant place.

Whisper all the anguished moments
That have wrung this anxious breast:
Say, I lived to give thee being,
And retired to endless rest.³⁰

Some might argue that this is hardly representative: Not all Georgian women would have been faced with crisis pregnancies—though Isabella Kelly herself was left with two small children after her husband, a major in the British army, went missing in Madras.³¹ Nevertheless, the poem captures the courage of maternal love, without ever denying the difficulties described by Vickery. Feminists dwell on such difficulties to insinuate that if women had been given more of a choice in such matters they would never have given birth so frequently—or perhaps at all. But this is not an insinuation that the primary sources corroborate. Eighteenth-century women were tougher than present-day feminists imagine. They knew that giving birth to children required manifold sacrifice; that keeping them healthy was a Sisyphean task; that giving them life might imperil their own lives.³² But there is nothing in their letters or their poems or their other writings to suggest that they agreed with the feminist claim that so-called reproductive rights trump the life of unborn children. No “anguished moments” beguiled them into subscribing to that grave fallacy.

NOTES

1. James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed. Hill and Powell, Vol. 4 (Oxford, 1934) 313.
2. Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (Yale, 1998) 278.
3. *Ibid.*, 279-80.
4. In *Mont-Saint Michel and Chartres* (1904), Henry Adams looked at the influence of the Virgin Mary on the civilization of 13th-century Europe and found that it had made for an enviable unity. Adams, of course, was not Catholic; indeed, he was scarcely Christian. But his is precisely the sort of intellectually honest, unprejudiced history that feminists have shown themselves unwilling or perhaps incapable of producing. Apropos Vickery's use of “Madonna,” G. K. Chesterton makes an interesting observation in his essay, “Mary and the Convert,” from *The Well and the Shallows* (1935): “I was brought up in a part of the Protestant world which can be described by saying that it referred to the Blessed Virgin as the Madonna. Sometimes it referred to her as a Madonna; from a general memory of Italian pictures. It was not a bigoted or uneducated world; it did not regard all Madonnas as idols or all Italians as Dagoes. But it had selected this expression, by the English instinct for compromise, so as to avoid both reverence and irreverence. It was, when we come to think about it, a very curious expression. It amounted to saying that a Protestant must not call Mary “Our Lady,” but he may call her “My Lady.” This would seem, in the abstract, to indicate an even more intimate and mystical familiarity than the Catholic devotion. But I need not say that it was not so. It was not untouched by that queer Victorian evasion of translating dangerous or improper words into foreign languages.” Vickery is an unsuspecting legatee of this Victorian tradition.
5. Henry Adams, quoted in Ernest Samuels, *Henry Adams* (Harvard, 1989), 270.
6. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *Letters* (Knopf Everyman, 1992), 471. Sir Horace Walpole, *Letters*, vol. vi (Oxford, 1903-05), 163.
7. Thomas Babington Macaulay, “Speech on Copyright,” *Speeches* (London, 1854), 241.
8. Samuel Richardson, *History of Sir Charles Grandison*, vol. 3 (London, 1754), Letter 32.
9. Patrick Parrinder, *Novel and Nation: The English Novel from its Origins to the Present Day* (Oxford, 2006), 112.
10. Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (Yale, 1998), 98. Referring to children as having “pet-like appeal” is an ugly denigration of their dignity. What could have compelled Vickery to use such language? She pinched it from the historian

EDWARD SHORT

Roy Porter. See his *England in the Eighteenth Century* (1982): “Ladies were beginning to make more time for their children. . . . From the mid-century it became the done thing for well-bred ladies to interest themselves with nursing babies and training toddlers—more with the exquisite delight of discovering a new pet under one’s nose than with the dutifulness of the Victorian matriarch.” It is a shame that Georgian women cannot somehow be summoned to answer this charge. Their testimony, I suspect, would make mince-meat of the polemical conjectures of Porter and Vickery. In any case, the argument that Porter mounts here and that Vickery accepts is that Georgian motherhood was the result of cultural conditioning; there was nothing merely natural in the solicitous love that Georgian women exhibited for their children.

11. *Ibid.*, 98.
12. *Ibid.*, 106.
13. *Ibid.*, 99.
14. *Ibid.*, 113.
15. *Ibid.*, 117.
16. *Ibid.*, 117.
17. *Ibid.*, 118.
18. *Ibid.*, 123.
19. *Ibid.*, 120.
20. *Ibid.*, 124.
21. *Ibid.*, 126.
22. Joanna Baillie, “A Mother to Her Waking Infant” (1790) from *Women Poets of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Roger Lonsdale (Oxford, 1989), 442.
23. Byron quoted in Fiona McCarthy, *Byron: Life and Legend* (London, 2002), 391.
24. See Lord Byron, *Selected Letters*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand (London, 1982), 258.
25. Anna Laetitia Barbauld, “To a Little Being Who Is Expected Soon to Become Visible” (1795) from *Women Poets of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Roger Lonsdale (Oxford, 1989), 307-08.
26. Roger Lonsdale recently edited a superb edition of Johnson’s *Lives of the Poets* in 5 volumes for Oxford University Press (2006). He was also the editor of *The New Oxford Book of Eighteenth-Century Verse* (OUP, 1984), which was full of hitherto-undiscovered gems.
27. *Women Poets of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Roger Lonsdale (Oxford, 1989), 300.
28. *Ibid.*, 300.
29. *Ibid.*, 307-08.
30. Isabella Kelly, “To an Unborn Infant” (1794), from *Women Poets of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Roger Lonsdale (Oxford, 1989), 482-83.
31. *Ibid.*, 482.
32. Lonsdale also includes in his anthology (p. 377) a moving little poem by Jane Cave (1754-1803) entitled “Written a Few Hours Before the Birth of a Child” (1786), the last two stanzas of which give no support to the advocate of reproductive rights:

Come pain, or agony, or death
If such the will divine;
With joy shall I give up my breath,
If resignation’s mine.

One wish to name I’d humbly dare,
If death my pleasure be;
O may the harmless babe I bear
Haply expire with me.

APPENDIX A

[*Paul Kengor has most recently published* *God and Hillary Clinton and The Judge: William P. Clark, Ronald Reagan's Top Hand. He is professor of political science at Grove City College. This essay was published April 9, 2008 on National Review Online and is reprinted with permission (nationalreview.com).*]

Keystone Culture of Death

Paul Kengor

At the 1992 Democratic National Convention, the Democratic governor of the state of Pennsylvania, Robert Casey, was prohibited from speaking. The Clintons and their associates had blacklisted Casey because he wanted to speak against legalized abortion—as a pro-lifer, Casey was an increasing oddity in the modern Democratic party. The governor, engaged in a simultaneous fight to preserve his own life from a rare and fatal disease, never stopped lamenting how his party, which claimed to champion the little guy, utterly refused to defend the most innocent and defenseless.

After the incident, Governor Casey sensed things would only get worse in his party, which was now totally beholden to a radical feminism. His worst nightmares materialized in 1993, when the new first lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, sought to revolutionize the American health-care and abortion industries. In a televised forum discussing her national health-care plan that October, Mrs. Clinton said that abortion services “would be widely available.”

Pro-lifers like Casey were distraught; they could not fathom that their tax dollars might be used to fund abortions. They also feared the sudden availability of the abortion pill, RU-486, under the first lady's health-care plan—one of Bill Clinton's first acts in office was to push the pill to market through an expedited FDA approval process that, pro-lifers charged, did not take enough time to adequately consider women's safety.

There were many counter-reactions to all of this. Republicans introduced the Coates Amendment in the U.S. House of Representatives, which sought to strip abortion funding from the first lady's “health-care” plan. On the Democratic side, there was, of course, little objection—with a notable exception: Casey was so enraged that he considered a 1996 run for the presidency. This would prove impossible, principally because of Casey's declining health. Casey died on May 30, 2000.

In 2006, another Bob Casey rose to national prominence: the late governor's son, Robert P. Casey Jr., also a committed pro-life Irish Catholic. Casey had his eyes on a U.S. Senate seat, and challenged and defeated Senator Rick Santorum (R., Pa.)—ousting the Senate's best defender of unborn human life. This thrilled abortion-rights supporters, but Casey himself was pro-life. The anti-abortion movement hoped Casey Jr. might pick up the torch from Santorum, and might even shake up his own party on the issue.

Thus far Casey has been a disappointment. And now, alas, Senator Casey has stepped up to endorse the most radical supporter of abortion to ever come close to

APPENDIX A

a major-party presidential nomination: Barack Obama.

Sen. Barack Obama is so extreme on abortion that he has managed to achieve what I once thought impossible: He is to the left of Hillary Clinton on abortion. I say that as someone who has written a book on Hillary Clinton, with a special focus on her abortion fanaticism.

How extreme is Obama? His short U.S. Senate record is as Planned Parenthood-perfect as Senator Clinton's and other abortion extremists'. Yet there is one area where he surpasses even the zealots: In the Illinois senate, Obama led the charge against legislation that would have ensured medical care to babies who survived abortions. Let me explain.

Most Americans have no clue that in their country since *Roe v. Wade*, countless babies have survived abortion attempts. An unknown number have been left to die alone on tables, in trash cans, in dark rooms—no medical care offered. Alas, mercifully, the U.S. Congress finally came along in 2002 and unanimously (both houses) passed the Born Alive Infants Protection Act. The legislation mandates that born-alive infants be given the full protection of federal laws.

Who could possibly oppose something like this? The answer is Barack Obama, who in Illinois sought to prevent the adoption of similar statewide legislation. In 2002 and 2003, he voted against such legislation twice, and then blocked the bill as chair of the Health and Human Services Committee. He denounced the bill on the floor of the state senate. Keep in mind that this is a man who supports government intervention for everything under the sun, particularly in health care—with the exception of unborn babies, or in this case, born babies.

When it comes to abortion, Barack Obama is to the left of not just Hillary Clinton, Barbara Boxer, and Ted Kennedy, but even NARAL. Yes, not even NARAL opposed the Born Alive Infants Protection Act.

And this is an individual Sen. Casey chose to endorse last Friday before a cheering, roaring crowd of Pennsylvania Democrats.

Now he has joined Obama on a six-day bus tour through Pennsylvania in advance of the state's crucial April 22 primary, where Obama has trailed Clinton.

Does Casey not understand the threshold upon which he and his nation now stand? *Roe v. Wade* is at last in peril, but if he achieves his dream of an Obama presidency, Obama can tip the Supreme Court's balance in a pro-*Roe* direction for decades to come. There have been 40 million abortions since 1973.

Consequently, Senator Casey's endorsement of Obama is an undeniable betrayal of his, his father's, and his church's pro-life work and commitment.

APPENDIX B

[Michelle Malkin is a syndicated columnist, broadcaster, and author, most recently, of Unhinged: Exposed Liberals Gone Wild. This column was published February 27, 2008 and is reprinted with permission. Copyright 2008 Creators Syndicate, Inc. Reprinted by permission of Michelle Malkin and Creators Syndicate, Inc.]

The Suicide of Emma Beck and Silence No More

Michelle Malkin

She didn't have to die. And neither did her unborn children. Over the weekend, London newspapers reported on the 2007 suicide of 30-year-old Emma Beck, a young British artist who hung herself after the abortion of her twin babies. Perhaps the retelling of her suffering can prevent more needless deaths.

The agony and loneliness in Emma Beck's suicide note resonate across the pond, across racial and class lines, across generations. She was distraught over a breakup with her boyfriend, who didn't want the children. She was suffering intense grief from her decision to end the lives inside her. And so she ended her own.

"I should never have had an abortion. I see now I would have been a good mum," Beck wrote. "I told everyone I didn't want to do it, even at the hospital. I was frightened, now it is too late. I died when my babies died. I want to be with my babies—they need me, no one else does."

Beck's family blames the medical establishment. The judicial system, as is so often the case, has become a coping mechanism. A British court recently held a hearing on Beck's suicide. Beck's mother revealed that her daughter "was not given the opportunity to see a counselor."

When a professional "counselor" can't be found, isn't that what mothers are for?

But it's not just jaded abortion providers and medical assistants, AWOL counselors and MIA parents who need to look in the mirror. We have tolerated a culture of callousness and nurtured an entitlement to convenience for decades. Feminists shush women with post-abortion regrets. Population control zealots and Planned Parenthood drum it into the heads of young women around the world: "The fewer, the merrier" and "Why carry more burdens?" their T-shirts and bumper stickers proclaim.

Last fall, in Emma Beck's homeland, the British press went gaga over an environmental nitwit who had an abortion and got her tubes tied to "protect the planet." She told the London Daily Mail: "Every person who is born uses more food, more water, more land, more fossil fuels, more trees and produces more rubbish, more pollution, more greenhouse gases, and adds to the problem of over-population."

That came on the heels of a British think tank report on how children are bad for the environment.

Said John Guillebaud, emeritus professor of family planning at University College London: "The effect on the planet of having one child less is an order of magnitude

APPENDIX B

greater than all these other things we might do, such as switching off lights. . . . The greatest thing anyone in Britain could do to help the future of the planet would be to have one less child.”

And who gets premium op-ed space in America’s newspaper of record to talk about abortion? Idiots like University of Iowa adjunct assistant writing professor Brian Goedde, who shared his festive thoughts surrounding the New Year’s Eve before his girlfriend’s abortion in an essay a few months ago in *The New York Times*. “The abortion is scheduled for two days from now, and we’re holing up,” he reminisced. “We do the dishes . . . brush our teeth, climb into bed and have unprotected sex. ‘I’m not going to get more pregnant,’ Emily says. I’ve never felt pleasure more guiltily.”

What you rarely hear are the voices telling you that such self-indulgence is wrong. What you rarely read are the stories of untold women (and men) around the world who know the vaunted choice they made was wrong and need help. What you rarely see are the studies showing that with abortion come lifelong costs and consequences—high levels of post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, grief, ostracism, guilt and, in at least one study in Finland, higher suicide rates.

Delivering that message here in the United States are preventive groups like the National Institute of Family and Life Advocates (nifla.org), which donates ultrasound equipment and training to open up a “window to the womb” for women in crisis pregnancies, and post-abortion healing organizations like Silent No More (silentnomoreawareness.org). To combat abortion glorifiers, the Silent No More Awareness campaign makes the public aware that abortion is emotionally, physically and spiritually harmful to women and others; reaches out to women who are hurting from an abortion and lets them know help is available; and invites women to join us in speaking the truth about abortion’s negative consequences.

What Emma Beck most needed to hear is the message abortion pushers most desperately want to drown out: You are not alone.

APPENDIX C

[*Ian Marcus Corbin is an M.A.R. candidate at Yale Divinity School. This essay is reprinted, with permission, from the First Things website (firstthings.com, April 23, 2008).*]

On the Banality of Abortion as Art

Ian Marcus Corbin

Yale senior Aliza Shvarts has gone too far—or maybe she hasn't. According to a press release that Shvarts sent to the *Yale Daily News* on Wednesday, April 16, over a recent nine-month period, the senior art major artificially inseminated herself “as often as possible” and then induced miscarriages by means of herbal abortifacient pills. At first blush, her actions bespeak a morbidly unsound mind, but what makes Shvarts' actions even more outrageous is that she is—by all appearances—a perfectly normal young woman. This was not, it seems, a cry for help. Rather, Shvarts says it was abortion for art's sake—indeed, it *was* art. Shvarts claims to have filmed herself bleeding into a cup each month and to have saved the products of that bleeding to display as part of her upcoming senior thesis presentation.

April 17, the day after the *Yale Daily News* first publicized Shvarts' project, university officials responded to a storm of outrage both within and without the university by announcing that Shvarts had confessed to fabricating the whole affair. It was, they said, a piece of “creative fiction.” The very next day, Shvarts published an op-ed in the same paper. She repudiated that claim and gave an explanation of her actions and of their value as artistic performance. She also claimed that her project went ahead with the full approval of her academic adviser.

Whether Shvarts' story is a hoax is a matter of the highest moral import; we can all hope that Shvarts did not do what she says she did. But her alleged actions are not the whole story. Indeed, fabricated or not, the Shvarts affair has ignited a row at Yale that demonstrates a disquieting impoverishment of moral reasoning among Yale students. Whether or not the alleged impregnations and abortions actually happened, it is shocking how *unremarkable* Ms. Shvarts' project is.

In her op-ed, Shvarts wrote that for her the “most poignant” aspect of her performance was “the impossibility of accurately identifying the resulting blood.” Because she took the unnamed abortifacient at the end of her cycle each month, “it remains ambiguous whether there was ever a fertilized ovum or not.” This ambiguity is the main thrust of the piece, serving to transfer “the locus of ontology to an act of readership.” That is, Shvarts wishes to show that the viewer of a piece of art, or indeed of a biological process, determines the identity of that phenomenon by naming it one thing or another. For those who believe it, a miscarriage has occurred. For those who believe otherwise, mere menstruation has taken place. Shvarts hopes that, as one views her artwork, he will come to realize how arbitrary this process of naming is. In this realization, he will come to further realize that “normative understandings of biological function are a mythology imposed on form, [and] it is this mythology that creates the sexist, racist, ableist, nationalist and homophobic perspective, distinguishing what body parts are ‘meant’ to do from their physical

APPENDIX C

capacity.” Shvarts is well aware of how much weight “naturalness” and “normalcy” bear in contemporary ethical and political discourse, and she hopes her art will influence this discourse.

Ms. Shvarts is obviously an intelligent young woman, and she articulates her moral vision with vigor. And yet one is struck by how tired that vision is. Anyone who has been paying a modicum of attention to the warp and woof of postmodern thought will already have learned Ms. Shvarts’ manifesto by heart. One can hardly imagine a moral project more at home in the contemporary academy than that of Shvarts. Thus it makes sense that those who breathe this same intellectual air would have great difficulty rationally repudiating what she did—or did not—do. Indeed, according to the *Yale Daily News*, staff members from the Yale Women’s Center went on record defending Shvarts’ work as “an appropriate exercise of her right to free expression.” Such casual, blanket approbation of personal choice is so familiar as to seem a mantra, but it does not represent the mainstream response at Yale. The *Yale Daily News* story from which the above quote is taken is titled “Reaction to Shvarts: Outrage, Shock, Disgust.” According to the paper, the vast majority of Yale students interviewed for the story expressed strong disapproval of Shvarts’ purported actions.

Unsurprisingly, then, in the days following Shvarts’ press release, the opinion pages of the Yale paper were flooded with angry condemnations of Aliza Shvarts. And yet, with the exception of a few conservative, pro-life standbys, Shvarts’ critics seem unable to augment their outrage, shock, and disgust with a proportionately strong argument as to *why* Ms. Shvarts’ “art” is so very outrageous. One columnist, Anthony LeCounte, did express vague aesthetic disgust with Shvarts’ “art” but spent his column excoriating those who would censor Shvarts based on the immorality of her alleged actions. He closed his column by saying that indeed he found Shvart’s actions “abhorrent, but that’s just my aesthetics (not morality), which warrant no right to unfairly attack or attempt to silence Shvarts or any other similarly distasteful artist for offending my sensibilities.”

It is worth noting that LeCounte imported a typically moral adjective—*abhorrent*—into the supposedly amoral arena of aesthetics. There is an imbalance here between the verdict—“abhorrent”—and the action—offense of “sensibilities.” This is a bit mysterious, and yet, in a conversation about Shvarts’ work, it is not surprising. Reasonable people may disagree about the relationship between aesthetic and moral judgments in general, but due to the unmistakably moral thrust of Shvarts’ project, and the fact that it was carried out using means that are themselves morally dubious (to say the least), the attempt to keep the moral and the aesthetic separate in this case becomes difficult, if not impossible.

Elsewhere in his column, LeCounte offered a welcome analysis of the uproar, writing that “a lot of people are just spouting emotional sentiments and then demanding that everyone subscribe to the same sentiments and reach the same (irrational) conclusions.” As a general rule, attempts to paint moral judgments as mere emotional reactions fail to impress, but in this case LaCounte is on to

something. Another pro-choice commentator, Molly Clark-Barol, wrote in to call Shvarts' actions "disgusting" and "repellent on every level," and ended her letter with a message for Aliza Shvarts: "Shame on you." And yet Clark-Barol seems, to me at least, to be unable to formulate a crime proportionate to her opprobrium. The best she could muster was the charge that Shvarts' work will cause some people to frown on abortion, thereby undoing many years of progress in the area of reproductive rights. For all her disgust, Clark-Barol could not find any legitimately pro-choice way to condemn Shvarts for the alleged actions *themselves*. Whatever visceral disgust she might have felt as an individual, as a participant in a public discussion, Clark-Barol had to content herself with bemoaning the anticipated public reception of Shvarts' actions. The actions themselves do not come in for censure.

If Aliza Shvarts did what she says she did, I think her actions were morally repugnant. If she didn't, her "art" is still faddish and hackneyed, and it paints a picture of a sharp young mind woefully corrupted. But the distressing thing is that, in her moral and aesthetic commitments, Shvarts is a genuine product of America's elite culture. My classmates and teachers at Yale rightly recognize, on some level, the moral recklessness of the actions Shvarts describes, but the moral and aesthetic visions to which they are, for the most part, committed give them no rational grounds on which to condemn Shvarts' performance. She is, if you will, a *reductio ad absurdum*, carrying contemporary artistic and moral ideologies past the point of politeness but not past the point of internal consistency. The Yale community is, understandably, unable to make sense of its own anger. It is a cause for sadness that, while the best and brightest of my generation can *express* their "outrage, shock and disgust," they cannot *think* about why Shvarts was, and is, wrong.



"We use animals in our labs, yes—but only to test their response to needlessly painful experiments."

APPENDIX D

[Kristin Hansen is vice president of communications for Care Net, an umbrella organization supporting 1,100 pregnancy centers across North America. This column is reprinted, with permission, from National Review Online (nationalreview.com, April 10, 2008).]

A Life Win

Kristin Hansen

You'd think that Maryland state legislators would have more important issues to deal with—considering the subprime mortgage crisis, and all—instead of listening to legal challenges to the pro-life work of pregnancy centers in the state. But the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws is engaged in an ongoing national effort to disparage the reputation of pregnancy centers and deter women from visiting them for help. Fortunately, the showdown in Annapolis didn't turn out as NARAL expected.

It all began when NARAL Pro-Choice Maryland released an undercover “investigation” claiming that pregnancy centers misled women about their services and provided false information about abortion risks. The report was based on 11 visits to pregnancy centers by women pretending to be pregnant—hardly scientific research, and yet it was enough for NARAL to accuse 42 Maryland pregnancy centers, serving some 30,000 clients annually, of wrongdoing.

NARAL used the report to gin up Senate Bill 690 and House Bill 1146 in the Old Line State. These bills would force pregnancy centers to provide a disclaimer saying that, among other things, “we are not required to provide medically accurate information” to all potential clients upon first contact. In other words, “Welcome to our center. We're here to lie to you!”

The purpose of pregnancy centers is to empower women with accurate information about abortion risks and abortion alternatives so that they can make an informed choice. Pregnancy-center counselors are the embodiment of compassion, and to trick or lie to women about abortion risks is inconsistent with their mission. Exit surveys show that clients consistently give pregnancy centers high marks. Care Net Pregnancy Center of Frederick, Maryland reports that 99 percent of their clients provide overwhelmingly positive feedback. One woman, named Rachael has said that her counselor “felt like mom,” and that her center visit “felt like the first time someone really cared about” her.

Considering the tremendously positive feedback from the pregnancy-center clients of Maryland, NARAL's unfair caricature had to be countered. When the Maryland bills hit, Care Net—the national umbrella group for pregnancy centers for which I work—helped to prepare local and national pregnancy centers to oppose the legislation. In March, we joined a united front for hearings in both Maryland's Senate and House of Delegates. We were warned that the hearings could get nasty and might not necessarily be based on logic. That turned out to be true.

Pregnancy-center staff and volunteers don't normally make trips to the state capital for funds and other goodies—unlike Planned Parenthood. Without local

pro-life groups like Maryland Right to Life and Maryland Catholic Conference showing them the ropes, they wouldn't have known their way around. Nevertheless, their rapid organization and willingness to stand and face hostile criticism was a testament to their deeply held convictions.

In both chambers, 45 to 50 witnesses testified against NARAL's bill, from pregnancy-center staff, volunteers, board members, former clients, and community leaders—who all were grateful for the centers' service to women in their community. From the national level, we brought attorneys, published experts on abortion risks to women, and organization leaders who could speak to the integrity and high standards of pregnancy centers. The Senate Finance Committee hearing turned out so positively that our folks actually applauded at the end, prompting some of the legislators to chuckle in surprise.

The House hearing was more of a muddy skirmish—or a spiritual battle. Members of the Health and Government Operations Committee fired hostile questions to members of my organization, in particular, and of groups providing education and oversight to the national pregnancy-center movement. Medical experts who had flown in to speak to the accuracy of information provided in pregnancy centers were generally ridiculed.

But when a pair of African-American leaders—Pastor Luke Robinson and Renee Joseph—got their allotted two minutes to testify against the bill, they let loose their fury over the fact that abortion has taken the lives of so many African-American babies, and decried the legacy of Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger, a proponent of eugenics.

Following their testimony, a young and poised African-American teen told her horrific story of taking the abortion pill RU-486 without knowing the potential for negative emotional consequences. She mourned having “poisoned” her child and “flushed her down the toilet,” never getting the opportunity “to braid her hair, like other mothers do.” You could hear a pin drop in the room, and the eyes of many legislators were wide open. In all my years working in the pro-life movement meeting post-abortive women, I've never heard a story that made me want to fall on my face like this one did.

At this point in the hearing, one had to ask: What was the greater travesty? Whether pregnancy centers were misleading women by telling them that they might have negative feelings after an abortion, or whether an unknown multitude of women are quietly suffering after realizing the lives of their own children have been knowingly snuffed out?

As of April 7, the Maryland bills have been soundly defeated.

This follows another defeat of anti-pregnancy-center legislation in Oregon in 2007—an encouraging fact for Care Net, which has taken part in both state skirmishes. When legislators who have been fed misinformation about pregnancy centers actually get a chance to meet and hear from their directors and clients, they realize that they are led by good-hearted, professional people providing a tremendous service to their communities—and that dragging them into hearings to rake them

APPENDIX D

over the coals is a waste of taxpayer money.

It is likely that NARAL Pro-Choice Maryland will renew their efforts next year. However, they may have more difficulty persuading those legislators who have already heard our side of the story. Pregnancy centers will continue to educate legislators and those in positions of influence, so that people better understand and come to support their work. Their story is a compelling one and—knowing NARAL—I’m certain that it will continue to be heard in statehouses across the country.



“Somehow, I assumed Hillcrest Country Club would be free from that sort of thing.”

APPENDIX E

[*Maggie Gallagher, a nationally syndicated columnist, is co-author of The Case for Marriage: Why Married People Are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially. The following was published on April 22, 2008. Taken from the Maggie Gallagher column by Maggie Gallagher © 2008 Dist. by Universal Press Syndicate. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.*]

Is Planned Parenthood Above the Law?

Maggie Gallagher

Planned Parenthood likes to think of itself as above all reproach—a champion of women’s rights and also (as its annual report claims) the nation’s “social justice movement.”

But this week, in front of Planned Parenthood offices at 1108 16th St. NW in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, a group of black pastors and pro-life activists (joined by two GOP congressmen) will demand a congressional audit of what the group alleges are a pattern of racist practices, funded by taxpayers, at Planned Parenthood abortion clinics.

Planned Parenthood’s latest trouble began when a feisty pro-life student magazine called Planned Parenthood offices in seven states, posing as an openly racist donor seeking to make sure his check could be earmarked to abort “a black baby.” The resulting phone conversations are horrifying listening. (Judge for yourself at www.youtube.com/watch?v=zwif0vmw3c4.)

According to the group, Planned Parenthood officers in at least four states agreed not only to accept the racist’s check, but to actually earmark the donation for that purpose. “The less black kids the better,” the caller tells one Planned Parenthood employee. “For whatever reason we’ll accept the money,” was one typical response.

The Planned Parenthood Action Fund is promising to spend \$10 million this election cycle. “These donations come even as Planned Parenthood is defending itself against a range of civil and criminal complaints in several states, and critics charge that the organization is trying to buy influence in Congress,” notes ABC News.

It’s a smart investment for an affluent organization (a budget surplus of \$114 million and assets of more than \$1 billion) that gets more than one-third of its income, or almost \$337 million in 2006, from the taxpayers.

The current racism charge can’t help but revive memories of a similar sting operation that revealed many Planned Parenthood clinic employees were willing to tell a caller posing as a 13-year-old girl with a 22-year-old boyfriend how she could avoid triggering mandatory child sex abuse reporting requirements at the clinic.

In each case, Planned Parenthood’s national leaders have responded poorly, seeking to deflect attention away from the behavior of its own employees to the motivations of those who made the phone calls.

Sure, these are pro-life activists doing these sting operations. But here’s the real question: What is it about Planned Parenthood employees that makes them so easy

APPENDIX E

for pro-life activists to target? Why do Planned Parenthood officers lack the minimal sense of decency to tell a man who wants to make sure there are fewer black kids in the world where he can go with his money? Or even worse: When faced with a child sexually exploited by a pedophile, why didn't Planned Parenthood employees want to call the police?

I do not believe that Planned Parenthood is explicitly racist (though its founder, Margaret Sanger, certainly was), any more than I believe that Planned Parenthood workers actively want to encourage pedophilia.

But here's what we've learned: Planned Parenthood is an organization staffed by people committed to the proposition that there is never a good reason not to have, support, fund or perform an abortion. In their own minds, their sacred mission to destroy human life puts them above the normal rules and even laws that any minimally decent person (whether pro-choice or pro-life) would recognize.

Help pedophiles and racists? For too many Planned Parenthood employees, it's apparently all in a day's work.

That's a clear product of a corporate culture created by Planned Parenthood, which views the organization as above normal rules and laws.

And the vast right-wing conspiracy cannot possibly do more damage to this organization's reputation than its own leadership does in dismissing the indefensible.



"We're not on particularly firm legal ground, either."

APPENDIX F

[Father Thomas Berg, L.C. is executive director of the Westchester Institute for Ethics & the Human Person and a member of the Ethics Committee of the Empire State Stem Cell Board. This essay was published on National Review Online (nationalreview.com) on May 12, 2008 and is reprinted with permission.]

New York's \$600 Million Question

Father Thomas Berg

When Dr. Bertram Lubin, head of the Children's Hospital Oakland Research Institute, applied for a \$5 million facilities grant last fall from the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) to support his research on sickle-cell anemia, his colleagues thought the application was a slam dunk.

The CIRM—the agency that distributes grants and loans under California's voter-approved \$3 billion stem-cell initiative—thought otherwise. As narrated in the just-published May edition of the journal *Nature*, Lubin appeared personally before the CIRM Board in January to make his case. The CIRM Board responded by rejecting Lubin's application on a 10-5 vote. (Never mind that four of the board members voting against Lubin's application represented institutions that were competing directly against Lubin for CIRM money.)

So, why was Lubin's application shot down?

Lubin's clinical data, in the opinion of his colleagues and independent observers, was solid. His request—in response to an RFA for facilities grants—was modest in comparison to the eight-figure grants the CIRM eventually approved. He just wanted to build new labs for the Children's Hospital. And Lubin is no second-string researcher: His work is supported by the NIH, and he has served on many NIH peer-review committees. Lubin's research, which focuses on adult stem cells derived from the placenta, could arguably translate almost immediately into therapeutic applications to the benefit of millions of black children who suffer atrociously from the effects of sickle cell anemia. About 1,000 babies a year are born with the genetic disease in the United States.

As it turns out, Lubin's work was faulted among other things, according to a summary on the CIRM website, for showing “no evidence of current use or planned expansion into the use of human embryonic stem cells.”

Now, I can already hear the chorus of scientists who will cry foul if I suggest that this was the real reason why Lubin's application was shot down. They will no doubt accuse me of setting up and knocking down a straw man. They will point out that the CIRM also supports human adult-stem-cell research.

So be it. My intense exposure to the field of stem-cell research over the past eight years has too often revealed a largely unsubstantiated bias favoring work on human embryonic stem cells over other types of research—especially work on adult stem cells. And today, this is a bias turned scientific and political ideology, one that too often dominates the imaginations of those who hold the purse strings on private and State funding.

APPENDIX F

Even if we grant that there were reasonable grounds for rejecting Lubin's application, faulting it for lack of embryonic-stem-cell work is specious. Even the journal *Nature* thought so. And if I've learned anything during these years, it's that scientists are very clever and sophisticated at covering their muddy tracks: Almost anything can be easily veiled with science talk.

Nor can Lubin—who supports embryonic-stem-cell research—be accused of trying to make a political statement with his application. All he expected of the CIRM was a genuine diversity in its research portfolio that would reflect the reality of stem-cell science, and genuinely support research for cures.

But perhaps he was expecting too much. "We're not in the 'in' crowd," Lubin told *Nature*. "So a project that was really going to go into patients was essentially triaged."

And how.

One has to wonder whether a similar ideology will not take hold at New York's own stem-cell board. Last year, New York followed California's lead in providing state funding for stem-cell research. The Empire State Stem Cell Board (ESSCB) was brought into existence on April 1, 2007, composed of two committees—a Funding Committee and an Ethics Committee. I serve on the latter.

The ESSCB was empowered to oversee the funding of a \$600 million, ten-year stem-cell-research initiative. On Thursday, May 8 Governor David Paterson announced that the next portion of the pie—nearly \$109 million in new state funding—is now being made available to support stem-cell-research initiatives, including facilities grants.

I am convinced that my colleagues on the funding committee are equitable and intellectually honest. I am confident they can rise far above the sophomoric and unconscionable conflicts of interest that are becoming characteristic of the CIRM. They are also genuinely interested in promoting stem-cell research that can quickly translate into therapies and cures. But can they withstand the bias toward embryonic-stem-cell research? On that question I remain uncertain.

Last December, our Ethics Committee unanimously recommended to the Funding Committee a brief six-month moratorium on the funding of controversial research projects (such as the creation of new lines of human embryonic stem cells) so that we could have time to make recommendations on the serious ethical issues involved in such research. We were roundly rebuffed, however. Such a moratorium, they argued, "would send the wrong signal to the scientific community in the State."

The Empire State Stem Cell Board next meets on Tuesday. I can only hope that in future funding decisions, the Board will be cognizant of three realities: (1) the statute under which the ESSCB functions establishes that any type of stem-cell research can be funded in the State; (2) arguably two thirds stem-cell researchers in the State who work with cells from human sources do so on adult stem cells according to a recent ESSCB survey; and (3) that, according to initial drafts of our strategic plan, one of the goals of promoting stem-cell science in New York State is

THE HUMAN LIFE REVIEW

to translate basic research into therapies as fast as possible.

The quickest way to achieve that goal, of course, is by funding projects like Dr. Lubin's.

The \$600 million question is whether the ESSCB will allow a blind scientific ideology to trump cures, or whether it will direct monies toward research that holds out the greatest short-term hope for clinical successes. It would be a defeat for humanity if this board were ever to give a cold shoulder to researchers who have their fingers on promising new therapies, but who fail to toe the embryonic-stem-cell line.



“Some nut’s demanding an Egg McMuffin, even though it’s after 11 A.M.”

*The Human Life Foundation
is proud to host*

**THE SIXTH ANNUAL
GREAT DEFENDER OF LIFE DINNER**

honoring

RITA L. MARKER AND WESLEY J. SMITH

*Two long-time Human Life Review contributors and
tireless opponents of euthanasia and assisted suicide*

Rita L. Marker has been the executive director of the International Task Force on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide since its inception in 1987. A practicing attorney and frequent public speaker, she has written many articles for the *Human Life Review* and is the author of the critically acclaimed book *Deadly Compassion*, lauded by reviewers as a compelling discussion of both the personal and public sides of the euthanasia debate.

Wesley J. Smith is a Senior Fellow at the Discovery Institute and an attorney for the International Task Force on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide. His book *Forced Exit: Euthanasia, Assisted Suicide, and the New Duty to Die* (updated in 2006) has become a classic in anti-euthanasia advocacy. He also serves as a special consultant for the Center for Bioethics and Culture, and has been a frequent contributor to the *Review*.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2008

THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB, NEW YORK CITY

Individual Tickets—\$250

Sponsor Table—\$2,500

Benefactor Table—\$5,000

*For more information, or if you would like to receive an invitation, please call
212-685-5210; or email humanlifereview@verizon.net*

APPENDIX G

[*Yuval Levin is a fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center and senior editor of The New Atlantis magazine. He is a former executive director of the President's Council on Bioethics. The following essay appeared May 14, 2008 on National Review Online (nationalreview.com) and is reprinted with permission .]*

Indignity and Bioethics

Yuval Levin

Human dignity has long been a contentious subject in American bioethics. A frequently employed if ill-defined concept in European political life, in international law, and in the ethical tradition of the West, dignity has had a particularly hard time finding its precise meaning and place in the Anglo-American sphere. Is it just a synonym for equality or autonomy, or does it describe something else—a concept foreign to our political vocabulary? And either way, does it belong in an American bioethics, or is it best left safely across the pond? Different scholars and observers through the years have taken for granted quite different definitions of the term, while others have simply denied its utility altogether.

To try to organize the dispute and help to make sense of the term, the President's Council on Bioethics—established by President Bush in 2001 to, among other things, “provide a forum for a national discussion of bioethical issues”—recently produced a collection of essays laying out the range of views on human dignity for public examination. The council (for which I served as executive director during part of the president's first term) invited two dozen experts, including members of the council itself as well as outside academics and writers, to offer their thoughts on human dignity and bioethics.

The volume has so far drawn a modest response from bioethicists and others, some applauding the effort to lay out the range of opinions, and some bemoaning the lack of agreement on so seemingly basic a concept. But this week, in the latest issue of *The New Republic*, the volume has also elicited a bizarre and astonishing display of paranoid vitriol from an academic celebrity. Steven Pinker, the Harvard psychologist and best-selling author of books on language, cognition, and evolutionary biology, seems to have decided that the concept of human dignity is not only “stupid” but is a weapon of aggression in the arsenal of a religious crusade intent on crushing American liberty and “imposing a Catholic agenda on a secular democracy.”

Pinker's essay is a striking exhibit of a set of attitudes toward religion and the West's moral tradition that has become surprisingly common among America's intellectual elite. It is a mix of fear, suspicion, and disgust that has a lot to do, for instance, with the Left's intense paranoia about the Bush administration, and with the peculiar notion that American conservatives have declared a “war on science”; and it involves more generally an inclination to reject any idea drawn in any way from a religiously inspired tradition—which unfortunately includes just about everything in the humanities.

APPENDIX G

These elements are all powerfully evident in Pinker's screed. After briefly introducing the subject, his essay manages almost entirely to ignore the substance of the volume under consideration (taking up no particular essay in the book, for instance) and addresses itself instead to what the author imagines is a sinister Catholic conspiracy to subject the nation to a papist theology of death. With deep alarm Pinker informs his readers that some of the contributors to the volume make their living at such "Christian institutions" as Georgetown University and that some of the essays even mention the Bible, which leads him to conclude that the work of the bioethics council, in this book and in general, "springs from a movement to impose a radical political agenda, fed by fervent religious impulses, onto American biomedicine."

This is, to begin with, patent nonsense. Even a cursory review of the council's reports and deliberations will demonstrate it has spent significantly less time than even its Clinton administration predecessor considering any explicitly religious views or discussing religious issues, and has in no way sought to ground any positions, arguments, or recommendations in religion. Huffing in his panicked flight from an imaginary inquisition, Pinker seems unable to distinguish between an openness to learning from the insights of the Western tradition and an assertion of sectarian theology. He even rejects the pedagogical value of literature (hectoring one contributor to the volume who has dared mention a novel), and seems to treat as a noxious pollutant any artifact of our civilization that has not been peer-reviewed by a committee of tenured biologists.

This leaves Pinker in the peculiar position of denying the grounds for even his own standards of ethics, though he is blissfully blind to the difficulty. Rather than human dignity, he wants to lean for support upon "personal autonomy—the idea that, because all humans have the same minimum capacity to suffer, prosper, reason, and choose, no human has the right to impinge on the life, body, or freedom of another." But why not? Why should minimum capacities demand maximal protections if not for reasons rooted in the very traditions and sources he declares out of bounds, or a Popish cabal?

But Pinker will not wait to hear the answer. He rushes on to paint the bioethics council as a committee of pious executioners, arguing that "this government-sponsored bioethics does not want medical practice to maximize health and flourishing; it considers that quest to be a bad thing, not a good thing," and asserting without basis that the council (which, more than all of its predecessors in previous administrations, was designed to provide a diversity of opinion and not merely support for the positions of the president who appointed it) was "packed" with "conservative scholars and pundits, advocates of religious (particularly Catholic) principles in the public sphere, and writers with a paper trail of skittishness toward biomedical advances, together with a smattering of scientists (mostly with a reputation for being religious or politically conservative)." Pinker might have examined the record of the council's discussions (including its devastating grilling of him in 2003, which may help explain some of his vehemence), its reports, and the backgrounds of its

members, especially the scientist members, for a sense of how absurdly misinformed is this diatribe.

He is not much better informed about the book he claims to have read, asserting, for instance, that no one was given an opportunity to defend the view that dignity means essentially nothing more than autonomy or is a useless or pernicious concept, though several of the essays in the volume (most notably Patricia Churchland's contribution, and elements of Daniel Dennett's, among others) do just that.

But Pinker saves his most brazenly venomous and disingenuous assault for one of the volume's contributors in particular: Leon Kass, the council's former chairman. He begins with a sweepingly inaccurate survey of Kass's views and works, and misleadingly implies that a passage he quotes from Kass's 1994 book about eating is from Kass's essay on dignity in the volume being reviewed, later referring again to the passage while never offering any context. He says Kass has "pro-death anti-freedom views," and asserts that Kass is a "vociferous advocate of a central role for religion in morality and public life." A vociferous person is publicly insistent—can Pinker point to a single instance of Kass calling for a central role for religion in public life? Pinker concludes by repeating the scurrilous lie that Kass "fired" two members of the bioethics council who disagreed with him "on embryonic stem-cell research, on therapeutic cloning (which Kass was in favor of criminalizing), and on the distortions of science that kept finding their way into Council reports." Disagreement on stem-cell research and therapeutic cloning were an intentional function of the original design of the council's membership, as about half its members disagreed with President Bush's views on one or another of those issues, and were chosen with that disagreement in mind. Neither of the two members Pinker has in mind was by any means the most vocal or active of these opponents, their departures had nothing to do with their substantive views, and several of the members named to the council since their departure have also opposed the President's views on these issues. Scientific content in all of the council's reports, meanwhile, was carefully vetted with outside experts before publication, and it is no surprise that Pinker offers no specific instances of "distortions of science"—there are none he could offer.

Loath to rest easy with religious bigotry and slander, however, Pinker concludes with a stunning display of confusion, managing to mystify himself with simple questions and to dismiss centuries of debate with a shrug. He then informs us that dignity is relative and fungible, and—at last, the punch line—that it is in any case just a phenomenon of human perception. He says those who disagree with him have blood on their hands ("even if progress were delayed a mere decade by moratoria, red tape, and funding taboos (to say nothing of the threat of criminal prosecution), millions of people with degenerative diseases and failing organs would needlessly suffer and die") and so, by implication, that no limit on scientific research could be justified on any grounds other than safety.

It would be hard to answer the bioethics council's thoughtful and varied collection with a less appropriate rejoinder than Pinker's insulting, ill-informed, and

APPENDIX G

anti-intellectual tirade. He misrepresents the most elementary facts about the council's work and intentions, repeating baseless charges and engaging in crude character assassination; and his assertion that the council is intolerant of dissenting opinion is belied by the fact that his rant is based on remarks he actually delivered at a council meeting, by invitation. His fears of a religious, and especially a Catholic, plot to overthrow democracy are absurd. And his insistence on filtering out of American life any hint of religious influence is badly misguided.

Even if dignity remains difficult to define, undignified public discourse is easy to discern, and Pinker has offered an obvious example.



“Why me? Why not one of you?”

APPENDIX H

[Steven Pinker is Johnstone Professor of Psychology at Harvard and the author of *The Stuff of Thought*. This essay appeared in the May 28, 2008 issue of *The New Republic* and is reprinted with permission. Copyright © 2008 *The New Republic*. All rights reserved.]

The Stupidity of Dignity

Steven Pinker

This spring, the President's Council on Bioethics released a 555-page report, titled *Human Dignity and Bioethics*. The Council, created in 2001 by George W. Bush, is a panel of scholars charged with advising the president and exploring policy issues related to the ethics of biomedical innovation, including drugs that would enhance cognition, genetic manipulation of animals or humans, therapies that could extend the lifespan, and embryonic stem cells and so-called "therapeutic cloning" that could furnish replacements for diseased tissue and organs. Advances like these, if translated into freely undertaken treatments, could make millions of people better off and no one worse off. So what's not to like? The advances do not raise the traditional concerns of bioethics, which focuses on potential harm and coercion of patients or research subjects. What, then, are the ethical concerns that call for a presidential council?

Many people are vaguely disquieted by developments (real or imagined) that could alter minds and bodies in novel ways. Romantics and Greens tend to idealize the natural and demonize technology. Traditionalists and conservatives by temperament distrust radical change. Egalitarians worry about an arms race in enhancement techniques. And anyone is likely to have a "yuck" response when contemplating unprecedented manipulations of our biology. The President's Council has become a forum for the airing of this disquiet, and the concept of "dignity" a rubric for expounding on it. This collection of essays is the culmination of a long effort by the Council to place dignity at the center of bioethics. The general feeling is that, even if a new technology would improve life and health and decrease suffering and waste, it might have to be rejected, or even outlawed, if it affronted human dignity.

Whatever that is. The problem is that "dignity" is a squishy, subjective notion, hardly up to the heavyweight moral demands assigned to it. The bioethicist Ruth Macklin, who had been fed up with loose talk about dignity intended to squelch research and therapy, threw down the gauntlet in a 2003 editorial, "Dignity Is a Useless Concept." Macklin argued that bioethics has done just fine with the principle of personal autonomy—the idea that, because all humans have the same minimum capacity to suffer, prosper, reason, and choose, no human has the right to impinge on the life, body, or freedom of another. This is why informed consent serves as the bedrock of ethical research and practice, and it clearly rules out the kinds of abuses that led to the birth of bioethics in the first place, such as Mengele's sadistic pseudoexperiments in Nazi Germany and the withholding of treatment to indigent black patients in the infamous Tuskegee syphilis study. Once you recognize the

APPENDIX H

principle of autonomy, Macklin argued, “dignity” adds nothing.

Goaded by Macklin’s essay, the Council acknowledged the need to put dignity on a firmer conceptual foundation. This volume of 28 essays and commentaries by Council members and invited contributors is their deliverable, addressed directly to President Bush. The report does not, the editors admit, settle the question of what dignity is or how it should guide our policies. It does, however, reveal a great deal about the approach to bioethics represented by the Council. And what it reveals should alarm anyone concerned with American biomedicine and its promise to improve human welfare. For this government-sponsored bioethics does not want medical practice to maximize health and flourishing; it considers that quest to be a bad thing, not a good thing.

To understand the source of this topsy-turvy value system, one has to look more deeply at the currents that underlie the Council. Although the Dignity report presents itself as a scholarly deliberation of universal moral concerns, it springs from a movement to impose a radical political agenda, fed by fervent religious impulses, onto American biomedicine.

The report’s oddness begins with its list of contributors. Two (Adam Schulman and Daniel Davis) are Council staffers, and wrote superb introductory pieces. Of the remaining 21, four (Leon R. Kass, David Gelernter, Robert George, and Robert Kraynak) are vociferous advocates of a central role for religion in morality and public life, and another eleven work for Christian institutions (all but two of the institutions Catholic). Of course, institutional affiliation does not entail partiality, but, with three-quarters of the invited contributors having religious entanglements, one gets a sense that the fix is in. A deeper look confirms it.

Conspicuous by their absence are several fields of expertise that one might have thought would have something to offer any discussion of dignity and biomedicine. None of the contributors is a life scientist—or a psychologist, an anthropologist, a sociologist, or a historian. According to one of the introductory chapters, the Council takes a “critical view of contemporary academic bioethics and of the way bioethical questions are debated in the public square”—so critical, it seems, that Macklin (the villain of almost every piece) was not invited to expand on her argument, nor were mainstream bioethicists (who tend to be sympathetic to Macklin’s viewpoint) given an opportunity to defend it.

Despite these exclusions, the volume finds room for seven essays that align their arguments with Judeo-Christian doctrine. We read passages that assume the divine authorship of the Bible, that accept the literal truth of the miracles narrated in Genesis (such as the notion that the biblical patriarchs lived up to 900 years), that claim that divine revelation is a source of truth, that argue for the existence of an immaterial soul separate from the physiology of the brain, and that assert that the Old Testament is the only grounds for morality (for example, the article by Kass claims that respect for human life is rooted in Genesis 9:6, in which God instructs the survivors of his Flood in the code of vendetta: “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God was man made”).

The Judeo-Christian—in some cases, explicitly biblical—arguments found in essay after essay in this volume are quite extraordinary. Yet, aside from two paragraphs in a commentary by Daniel Dennett, the volume contains no critical examination of any of its religious claims.

How did the United States, the world's scientific powerhouse, reach a point at which it grapples with the ethical challenges of twenty-first-century biomedicine using Bible stories, Catholic doctrine, and woolly rabbinical allegory? Part of the answer lies with the outsize influence of Kass, the Council's founding director (and an occasional contributor to TNR), who came to prominence in the 1970s with his moralistic condemnation of in vitro fertilization, then popularly known as "test-tube babies." As soon as the procedure became feasible, the country swiftly left Kass behind, and, for most people today, it is an ethical no-brainer. That did not stop Kass from subsequently assailing a broad swath of other medical practices as ethically troubling, including organ transplants, autopsies, contraception, antidepressants, even the dissection of cadavers.

Kass frequently makes his case using appeals to "human dignity" (and related expressions like "fundamental aspects of human existence" and "the central core of our humanity"). In an essay with the revealing title "L'Chaim and Its Limits," Kass voiced his frustration that the rabbis he spoke with just couldn't see what was so terrible about technologies that would extend life, health, and fertility. "The desire to prolong youthfulness," he wrote in reply, is "an expression of a childish and narcissistic wish incompatible with devotion to posterity." The years that would be added to other people's lives, he judged, were not worth living: "Would professional tennis players really enjoy playing 25 percent more games of tennis?" And, as empirical evidence that "mortality makes life matter," he notes that the Greek gods lived "shallow and frivolous lives"—an example of his disconcerting habit of treating fiction as fact. (Kass cites *Brave New World* five times in his Dignity essay.)

Kass has a problem not just with longevity and health but with the modern conception of freedom. There is a "mortal danger," he writes, in the notion "that a person has a right over his body, a right that allows him to do whatever he wants to do with it." He is troubled by cosmetic surgery, by gender reassignment, and by women who postpone motherhood or choose to remain single in their twenties. Sometimes his fixation on dignity takes him right off the deep end:

Worst of all from this point of view are those more uncivilized forms of eating, like licking an ice cream cone—a catlike activity that has been made acceptable in informal America but that still offends those who know eating in public is offensive. . . . Eating on the street—even when undertaken, say, because one is between appointments and has no other time to eat—displays [a] lack of self-control: It beckons enslavement to the belly. . . . Lacking utensils for cutting and lifting to mouth, he will often be seen using his teeth for tearing off chewable portions, just like any animal. . . . This doglike feeding, if one must engage in it, ought to be kept from public view, where, even if we feel no shame, others are compelled to witness our shameful behavior.

APPENDIX H

And, in 2001, this man, whose pro-death, anti-freedom views put him well outside the American mainstream, became the President's adviser on bioethics—a position from which he convinced the president to outlaw federally funded research that used new stem-cell lines. In his speech announcing the stem-cell policy, Bush invited Kass to form the Council. Kass packed it with conservative scholars and pundits, advocates of religious (particularly Catholic) principles in the public sphere, and writers with a paper trail of skittishness toward biomedical advances, together with a smattering of scientists (mostly with a reputation for being religious or politically conservative). After several members opposed Kass on embryonic stem-cell research, on therapeutic cloning (which Kass was in favor of criminalizing), and on the distortions of science that kept finding their way into Council reports, Kass fired two of them (biologist Elizabeth Blackburn and philosopher William May) and replaced them with Christian-affiliated scholars.

Though Kass has jawboned his version of bioethics into governmental deliberation and policy, it is not just a personal obsession of his but part of a larger movement, one that is increasingly associated with Catholic institutions. (In 2005, Kass relinquished the Council chairmanship to Edmund Pellegrino, an 85-year-old medical ethicist and former president of the Catholic University of America.) Everyone knows about the Bush administration's alliance with evangelical Protestantism. But the pervasive Catholic flavoring of the Council, particularly its Dignity report, is at first glance puzzling. In fact, it is part of a powerful but little-known development in American politics, recently documented by Damon Linker in his book *The Theocons*.

For two decades, a group of intellectual activists, many of whom had jumped from the radical left to the radical right, has urged that we rethink the Enlightenment roots of the American social order. The recognition of a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and the mandate of government to secure these rights are too tepid, they argue, for a morally worthy society. This impoverished vision has only led to anomie, hedonism, and rampant immoral behavior such as illegitimacy, pornography, and abortion. Society should aim higher than this bare-bones individualism and promote conformity to more rigorous moral standards, ones that could be applied to our behavior by an authority larger than ourselves.

Since episodes of divine revelation seem to have decreased in recent millennia, the problem becomes who will formulate and interpret these standards. Most of today's denominations are not up to the task: Evangelical Protestantism is too anti-intellectual, and mainstream Protestantism and Judaism too humanistic. The Catholic Church, with its long tradition of scholarship and its rock-solid moral precepts, became the natural home for this movement, and the journal *First Things*, under the leadership of Father Richard John Neuhaus, its mouthpiece. Catholicism now provides the intellectual muscle behind a movement that embraces socially conservative Jewish and Protestant intellectuals as well. When Neuhaus met with Bush in 1998 as he was planning his run for the presidency, they immediately hit it off.

Three of the original Council members (including Kass) are board members of

First Things, and Neuhaus himself contributed an essay to the Dignity volume. In addition, five other members have contributed articles to First Things over the years. The concept of dignity is natural ground on which to build an obstructionist bioethics. An alleged breach of dignity provides a way for third parties to pass judgment on actions that are knowingly and willingly chosen by the affected individuals. It thus offers a moralistic justification for expanded government regulation of science, medicine, and private life. And the Church's franchise to guide people in the most profound events of their lives—birth, death, and reproduction—is in danger of being undermined when biomedicine scrambles the rules. It's not surprising, then, that "dignity" is a recurring theme in Catholic doctrine: The word appears more than 100 times in the 1997 edition of the Catechism and is a leitmotif in the Vatican's recent pronouncements on biomedicine.

To be fair, most of the chapters in the Dignity volume don't appeal directly to Catholic doctrine, and of course the validity of an argument cannot be judged from the motives or affiliations of its champions. Judged solely on the merits of their arguments, how well do the essayists clarify the concept of dignity?

By their own admission, not very well. Almost every essayist concedes that the concept remains slippery and ambiguous. In fact, it spawns outright contradictions at every turn. We read that slavery and degradation are morally wrong because they take someone's dignity away. But we also read that nothing you can do to a person, including enslaving or degrading him, can take his dignity away. We read that dignity reflects excellence, striving, and conscience, so that only some people achieve it by dint of effort and character. We also read that everyone, no matter how lazy, evil, or mentally impaired, has dignity in full measure. Several essayists play the genocide card and claim that the horrors of the twentieth century are what you get when you fail to hold dignity sacrosanct. But one hardly needs the notion of "dignity" to say why it's wrong to gas six million Jews or to send Russian dissidents to the gulag.

So, despite the best efforts of the contributors, the concept of dignity remains a mess. The reason, I think, is that dignity has three features that undermine any possibility of using it as a foundation for bioethics.

First, dignity is relative. One doesn't have to be a scientific or moral relativist to notice that ascriptions of dignity vary radically with the time, place, and beholder. In olden days, a glimpse of stocking was looked on as something shocking. We chuckle at the photographs of Victorians in starched collars and wool suits hiking in the woods on a sweltering day, or at the Brahmins and patriarchs of countless societies who consider it beneath their dignity to pick up a dish or play with a child. Thorstein Veblen wrote of a French king who considered it beneath his dignity to move his throne back from the fireplace, and one night roasted to death when his attendant failed to show up. Kass finds other people licking an ice-cream cone to be shamefully undignified; I have no problem with it.

Second, dignity is fungible. The Council and Vatican treat dignity as a sacred value, never to be compromised. In fact, every one of us voluntarily and repeatedly

APPENDIX H

relinquishes dignity for other goods in life. Getting out of a small car is undignified. Having sex is undignified. Doffing your belt and spread-eagling to allow a security guard to slide a wand up your crotch is undignified. Most pointedly, modern medicine is a gantlet of indignities. Most readers of this article have undergone a pelvic or rectal examination, and many have had the pleasure of a colonoscopy as well. We repeatedly vote with our feet (and other body parts) that dignity is a trivial value, well worth trading off for life, health, and safety.

Third, dignity can be harmful. In her comments on the *Dignity* volume, Jean Bethke Elshtain rhetorically asked, “Has anything good ever come from denying or constricting human dignity?” The answer is an emphatic “yes.” Every sashed and be-medaled despot reviewing his troops from a lofty platform seeks to command respect through ostentatious displays of dignity. Political and religious repressions are often rationalized as a defense of the dignity of a state, leader, or creed: Just think of the Salman Rushdie fatwa, the Danish cartoon riots, or the British schoolteacher in Sudan who faced flogging and a lynch mob because her class named a teddy bear Mohammed. Indeed, totalitarianism is often the imposition of a leader’s conception of dignity on a population, such as the identical uniforms in Maoist China or the burqas of the Taliban.

A free society disempowers the state from enforcing a conception of dignity on its citizens. Democratic governments allow satirists to poke fun at their leaders, institutions, and social mores. And they abjure any mandate to define “some vision of ‘the good life’” or the “dignity of using [freedom] well” (two quotes from the Council’s volume). The price of freedom is tolerating behavior by others that may be undignified by our own lights. I would be happy if Britney Spears and “American Idol” would go away, but I put up with them in return for not having to worry about being arrested by the ice-cream police. This trade-off is very much in America’s DNA and is one of its great contributions to civilization: my country ’tis of thee, sweet land of liberty.

So is dignity a useless concept? Almost. The word does have an identifiable sense, which gives it a claim, though a limited one, on our moral consideration.

Dignity is a phenomenon of human perception. Certain signals from the world trigger an attribution in the mind of a perceiver. Just as converging lines in a drawing are a cue for the perception of depth, and differences in loudness between the two ears cue us to the position of a sound, certain features in another human being trigger ascriptions of worth. These features include signs of composure, cleanliness, maturity, attractiveness, and control of the body. The perception of dignity in turn elicits a response in the perceiver. Just as the smell of baking bread triggers a desire to eat it, and the sight of a baby’s face triggers a desire to protect it, the appearance of dignity triggers a desire to esteem and respect the dignified person.

This explains why dignity is morally significant: We should not ignore a phenomenon that causes one person to respect the rights and interests of another. But it also explains why dignity is relative, fungible, and often harmful. Dignity is skin-deep: it’s the sizzle, not the steak; the cover, not the book. What ultimately matters is

respect for the person, not the perceptual signals that typically trigger it. Indeed, the gap between perception and reality makes us vulnerable to dignity illusions. We may be impressed by signs of dignity without underlying merit, as in the tin-pot dictator, and fail to recognize merit in a person who has been stripped of the signs of dignity, such as a pauper or refugee.

Exactly what aspects of dignity should we respect? For one thing, people generally want to be seen as dignified. Dignity is thus one of the interests of a person, alongside bodily integrity and personal property, that other people are obligated to respect. We don't want anyone to stomp on our toes; we don't want anyone to steal our hubcaps; and we don't want anyone to open the bathroom door when we're sitting on the john. A value on dignity in this precise sense does have an application to biomedicine, namely greater attention to the dignity of patients when it does not compromise their medical treatment. The volume contains fine discussions by Pellegrino and by Rebecca Dresser on the avoidable humiliations that today's patients are often forced to endure (like those hideous hospital smocks that are open at the back). No one could object to valuing dignity in this sense, and that's the point. When the concept of dignity is precisely specified, it becomes a mundane matter of thoughtfulness pushing against callousness and bureaucratic inertia, not a contentious moral conundrum. And, because it amounts to treating people in the way that they wish to be treated, ultimately it's just another application of the principle of autonomy.

There is a second reason to give dignity a measure of cautious respect. Reductions in dignity may harden the perceiver's heart and loosen his inhibitions against mistreating the person. When people are degraded and humiliated, such as Jews in Nazi Germany being forced to wear yellow armbands or dissidents in the Cultural Revolution being forced to wear grotesque haircuts and costumes, onlookers find it easier to despise them. Similarly, when refugees, prisoners, and other pariahs are forced to live in squalor, it can set off a spiral of dehumanization and mistreatment. This was demonstrated in the famous Stanford prison experiment, in which volunteers assigned to be "prisoners" had to wear smocks and leg irons and were referred to by serial numbers instead of names. The volunteers assigned to be "guards" spontaneously began to brutalize them. Note, though, that all these cases involve coercion, so once again they are ruled out by autonomy and respect for persons. So, even when breaches of dignity lead to an identifiable harm, it's ultimately autonomy and respect for persons that gives us the grounds for condemning it.

Could there be cases in which a voluntary relinquishing of dignity leads to callousness in onlookers and harm to third parties—what economists call negative externalities? In theory, yes. Perhaps if people allowed their corpses to be publicly desecrated, it would encourage violence against the bodies of the living. Perhaps the sport of dwarf-tossing encourages people to mistreat all dwarves. Perhaps violent pornography encourages violence against women. But, for such hypotheses to justify restrictive laws, they need empirical support. In one's imagination, anything can lead to anything else: Allowing people to skip church can lead to indolence;

APPENDIX H

letting women drive can lead to sexual licentiousness. In a free society, one cannot empower the government to outlaw any behavior that offends someone just because the offende can pull a hypothetical future injury out of the air. No doubt Mao, Savonarola, and Cotton Mather could provide plenty of reasons why letting people do what they wanted would lead to the breakdown of society.

The sickness in theocon bioethics goes beyond imposing a Catholic agenda on a secular democracy and using “dignity” to condemn anything that gives someone the creeps. Ever since the cloning of Dolly the sheep a decade ago, the panic sown by conservative bioethicists, amplified by a sensationalist press, has turned the public discussion of bioethics into a miasma of scientific illiteracy. *Brave New World*, a work of fiction, is treated as inerrant prophesy. Cloning is confused with resurrecting the dead or mass-producing babies. Longevity becomes “immortality,” improvement becomes “perfection,” the screening for disease genes becomes “designer babies” or even “reshaping the species.” The reality is that biomedical research is a Sisyphean struggle to eke small increments in health from a staggeringly complex, entropy-beset human body. It is not, and probably never will be, a runaway train.

A major sin of theocon bioethics is exactly the one that it sees in biomedical research: overweening hubris. In every age, prophets foresee dystopias that never materialize, while failing to anticipate the real revolutions. Had there been a President’s Council on Cyberethics in the 1960s, no doubt it would have decried the threat of the Internet, since it would inexorably lead to 1984, or to computers “taking over” like HAL in 2001. Conservative bioethicists presume to soothsay the outcome of the quintessentially unpredictable endeavor called scientific research. And they would stage-manage the kinds of social change that, in a free society, only emerge as hundreds of millions of people weigh the costs and benefits of new developments for themselves, adjusting their mores and dealing with specific harms as they arise, as they did with in vitro fertilization and the Internet.

Worst of all, theocon bioethics flaunts a callousness toward the billions of non-geriatric people, born and unborn, whose lives or health could be saved by biomedical advances. Even if progress were delayed a mere decade by moratoria, red tape, and funding taboos (to say nothing of the threat of criminal prosecution), millions of people with degenerative diseases and failing organs would needlessly suffer and die. And that would be the biggest affront to human dignity of all.

APPENDIX I

[*Christopher Tollefsen is associate professor of philosophy at the University of South Carolina and co-author, with Robert P. George, of Embryo: A Defense of Human Life (Doubleday, 2008). The following appeared on the website of First Things (firstthings.com) on May 28, 2008, and is reprinted with the magazine's permission.*]

Cloning Without Conscience: The New British Embryology Bill

Christopher Tollefsen

For several hundred years, beginning in the fourteenth century, Spanish kings prohibited the breeding of mules, a practice that was thought to jeopardize the purity of Spanish horses. The Jesuit political philosopher Francisco Vitoria, lecturing in the first half of the sixteenth century, evidently found these prohibitions amusing and, in his discussions of the nature of law, made somewhat merciless fun of them: "Human laws derive in some way from the natural law. It is a natural law that the commonwealth be defended; from this derives the human law which prohibits mules."

The prohibition does seem comical. Yet Diana Schaub, a member of the President's Council on Bioethics, suggested in 2005 in a council meeting that the well-known ill temper of the mule might have its source in discontent with its betwixt and between status. Being a hybrid might not be so funny after all.

And indeed, recent news from the United Kingdom on the subject is anything but amusing. Last week, the British Parliament voted to allow the creation of "cytoplasmic hybrids," which are being reported in the popular press as "part cow, part human."

Even if one does not share Dr. Schaub's general concerns about hybrids, one is likely to be very concerned about the creation of anything "part human." Our respect for the barriers between species, and the profound differences between human beings and the other animals, seems to have taken a direct hit.

Moreover, other parts of the bill move us even further down the road toward "designer babies" than before. The bill permits the creation of so-called "savior siblings"—children created through IVF who are tested to ensure that they are genetically compatible with older siblings who might need a tissue match for therapeutic purposes. These IVF children are certainly being treated as means and not ends in themselves.

These worries—about the future of human nature and about the design of our children—are real and profound. Unfortunately, they are not the most important part of the story here. Rather, what is central, and easily lost sight of amid the hype about anything interspecies, is twofold: first, that the procedure being used is really only a barely modified form of human cloning; and second, that the outcome, as in cloning, is a human embryo—an individual human being at the earliest stages of his or her existence.

Some scientists will deny this on grounds that these embryos will never be

APPENDIX I

implanted, and will thus never in fact grow to more mature stages of human existence. But these same scientists would not deny that these embryos, if they were implanted, would, if all went well, grow in the way characteristic of every other member of the human species—first into a fetus, then into a newborn, then a child, an adolescent, and so on. These embryos are like any other member of the human species: They require a congenial environment in which to flourish, and, if denied that, they will die.

This only makes sense given the nature of the scientific process by which these “cytoplasmic hybrids” are created. The technique is a version of somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT), or cloning. In the “traditional” mode of SCNT, the nucleus of an ovum is removed and replaced with the nucleus of a “somatic” cell—one containing the full genome of the species being cloned. Upon being electrically stimulated, the ovum’s cytoplasm reprograms the inserted DNA back to a totipotent, or an undifferentiated, state; the cell will now divide and develop as an embryo.

In interspecies SCNT, the only difference is that the ovum now comes from a member of a different species. So in human-bovine SCNT, human DNA is inserted into an enucleated cow ovum. But the genetic information that the embryo uses to pursue its developmental trajectory is entirely human. Otherwise, interspecies SCNT would not be all that desirable, since the stated purpose for this procedure is to provide embryos from which human embryonic stem cells can be derived. But, because researchers at the University of Newcastle, in England, found it difficult to persuade enough women to donate their eggs for cloning purposes, an end run was made around the egg problem by going to cow eggs, easily procured from abattoirs.

If one objects on principle to the cloning of human beings, one should then object to Britain’s endorsement of the creation of these cytoplasmic hybrids. Cloning has struck many as morally problematic because it seems to involve the manufacture of human beings. But human beings are persons, not things; they deserve to come to be as the fruit of parental love, expressed and made bodily in their physical embrace. Interspecies SCNT deviates even more from this normative pattern: The human beings who are created are made, not with the cooperation of one’s loving spouse, but by means of the technical joining of man and beast. Is it too old-fashioned to think that human beings ought not to beget with beings with which they can have no real reciprocity?

Even more important, if one holds that all human beings are worthy of full human respect, and that it is mere arbitrariness to withhold that respect on the grounds of an individual’s race, sex, or stage of development, then one should be aghast at what is being proposed in Newcastle and endorsed in the British Parliament. For that bill, and the work of the scientists at Newcastle, bring us all one further step toward the mass creation and destruction of human beings in their earliest stages of development. And this is, unlike quandaries over mules, no laughing matter.

APPENDIX J

[Wesley J. Smith is a senior fellow in bioethics at the Discovery Institute, an attorney for the International Task Force on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide, and a special consultant for the Center for Bioethics and Culture. The following essay appeared on firstthings.com May 15, 2008 and is reprinted with the magazine's permission.]

Assisted Suicide and the Corruption of Palliative Care

Wesley J. Smith

For the past two decades, euthanasia/assisted-suicide ideologues have worked overtime to conflate palliative care—the medical alleviation of pain and other distressing symptoms of serious illness—with intentionally ending the life of the patient. The movement's first target was the hospice, a specialized form of care for the dying created forty years ago in the United Kingdom by the late, great medical humanitarian Dame Cicely Saunders. Determined to treat what she called the “total pain” of dying patients, Saunders' great innovation was to bring a multidisciplinary team to the task of ensuring that their physical pain, existential suffering, spiritual needs, and mental health are all properly attended.

Saunders believed that suicide prevention, when needed, is an essential part of the package, crucial to fulfilling a hospice's call to value the lives and intrinsic dignity of each patient until the moment of natural death. Indeed, when I was trained as a hospice volunteer, my instructor pounded into my head the importance of reporting to the hospice team any suicide threats or yearnings my patient might express so they could initiate proper intervention. As a consequence of this philosophy, many patients who might have killed themselves were later very glad still to be alive to get the most of the time they had remaining.

But assisted-suicide advocates wish to transform hospice into “hemlock” (as one advocate once put it), a facilitator of suicide rather than a preventer. They believe that access to lethal prescriptions should be considered merely another menu item available for dying patients (and ultimately others) “to control the timing and manner of their deaths.”

Toward this end, advocates often point to a statistic involving assisted-suicide deaths in Oregon. According to the state, approximately 86 percent of people who died by swallowing poisonous overdoses under the Oregon law were receiving hospice care at the time they committed assisted suicide. Promoters of such “aid in dying” claim that this proves dying patients need the additional choice of a lethal prescription to ensure a “good death” if hospice care does not suffice.

But there is another way to look at it. What advocates don't mention—and this is an issue about which the state bureaucrats seem utterly indifferent—is that most of Oregon's assisted suicides were facilitated in some way by people affiliated with the assisted-suicide advocacy group Compassion and Choices (formerly the Hemlock Society), either as end-of-life “counselors” or as prescribing doctors after the patient's own physician refused to write a lethal prescription. This means that the patients in the hospice who committed assisted suicide under Oregon's law

APPENDIX J

most likely did not receive suicide prevention—either because the hospice team was not alerted to their patient’s suicidal desire or perhaps the Oregon law has effectively short-circuited the prevention response by hospice professionals. In other words, rather than showing the need to expand hospice “services,” Oregon demonstrates how assisted suicide actually interferes with the proper delivery of hospice services—at least as the hospice was envisioned by Saunders.

If undercutting proper hospice medical practice were not bad enough, now assisted-suicide advocates have launched an effort to shanghai an important *but rarely needed* method of end-of-life pain and symptom control known as “palliative sedation” into the assisted-suicide cause. Palliative sedation offers relief for the very few cases in which either agonizing pain or other symptoms such as severe agitation cannot be alleviated through more conventional medical methods at the very end of life. In such cases, the patient is placed into a drug-induced coma until death comes from the underlying disease.

But assisted-suicide advocates want to give patients a right to demand palliative sedation whether they actually need it or not. In California, for example, Assembly members Patti Berg (D-Mill Valley) and Lloyd Levine (D-Van Nuys)—who have tried for years without success to pass an Oregon-style assisted-suicide law through the California legislature and are soon to be term-limited out of office—have sponsored AB 2747, a bill to establish the legal right of dying patients to demand palliative sedation and then refuse medically supplied sustenance so they dehydrate to death.

The effect of the bill would be insidious. If AB 2747 becomes law, doctors would be required to facilitate death by dehydration on demand for terminally ill patients—and this “treatment” would not be reserved only for those at the very end of life, since the bill defines terminal illness as having *one year* or less to live. Moreover, if the doctor believes that palliative sedation is medically unnecessary and/or believes it to be ethically wrong under the circumstances, he or she would still be legally required to be complicit in the patient’s dehydration death under the requirement that refusing doctors refer a requesting patient to another doctor willing to go along.

Anyone who cares about the proper practice of medicine should be up in arms about the assisted-suicide movement’s attempt to make hospice and palliative sedation stalking horses for backdoor assisted suicide. Not only do such schemes subvert medicine by transforming legitimate medical interventions into life-terminating protocols, but proposals such as AB 2747 effectively deprofessionalize medical practice by reducing physicians to mere order-takers. Alas, this is par for the course for a movement obsessed with transforming killing into a legitimate answer to the problems of human suffering.

APPENDIX K

[*Nat Hentoff, the author of many books, recently celebrated his 50th anniversary as a columnist for the Village Voice. A Voice special section (January '08) titled "Nat Hentoff's Greatest Hits" featured excerpts from a selection of Hentoff's work, including this essay which we have reprinted, with Mr. Hentoff's permission, in its entirety. Nat Hentoff received our Great Defender of Life Award in 2005.*]

How can the left be against life?

Nat Hentoff

It is out of character for the Left to neglect the weak and helpless. The traditional mark of the Left has been its protection of the underdog, the weak, and the poor. The unborn child is the most helpless form of humanity, even more in need of protection than the poor tenant farmer or the mental patient . . . the basic instinct of the Left is to aid those who cannot aid themselves—and that instinct is absolutely sound. It is what keeps the human proposition going.

—Mary Meehan, "Abortion: The Left has betrayed the sanctity of life,"
The Progressive, September, 1980

On a Saturday morning at the end of April in Columbus, Ohio, a woman was standing outside an abortion clinic as she does every Saturday. She calls herself a counselor, and tries, with only very occasional success, to persuade women coming in for an abortion to turn back.

During a slow stretch that morning, a cop guarding the clinic asked a question of the pro-lifer. His tone, lightly sardonic, indicated he figured he knew the answer:

"Are you against capital punishment?"

"Yes," the woman said. "No one, including the state, has the right to take human life."

Surprised, the policeman asked, "What about the MX? You for that?"

"I have four children," the woman said. "I don't want them incinerated."

The woman told me about the conversation with the cop when she picked me up at the airport that afternoon. I was in Columbus to talk at the annual Ohio Pro-Life Convention. I asked her if many members of the pro-life forces in the state shared her view that capital punishment and nuclear armament are, like abortion, a violation of the pro-life ethic. She was amused. "You'll find out," she said.

Did I ever! Not since the 1960s when I was speaking both against the war in Vietnam and against the use of violence to silence supporters of that war—when you do that, you become the enemy you're fighting—have I run into an audience like the one in Columbus. The shouts of "No!" started early in my talk, and were followed by growls, scowls, a few clenched fists, and from the back of the room, various exclamations, which I couldn't quite understand but which were decidedly unfriendly.

I enjoy a hostile audience, and so I spoke longer than I'd intended, and then took all the questions and denunciations anyone wanted to shoot at me. The obligato of growls and "No!"s continued during the interrogation period.

APPENDIX K

The uproar was not because I had come out in favor of abortion. I had done quite the opposite. My sin was that I had forced them to face a number of fundamental contradictions in their pro-life work.

Having pointed out that I am a member of this ancient and proud order of stiff-backed Jewish atheists, I went on to say that as a Left secularist, I agreed with Joseph Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago that to be consistently pro-life, it is necessary to extend the definition to include more than abortion. And I quoted Bernardin to my surly listeners:

“Nuclear war threatens life on a previously unimaginable scale; abortion takes life daily on a horrendous scale; public executions are fast becoming weekly events in the most advanced technological society in history, and euthanasia is now openly discussed and even advocated. Each of these assaults on life has its own meaning and morality; they cannot be collapsed into one problem, but they must be confronted as pieces of a larger pattern.”

Bernardin and other Catholic bishops who agree with him have also expanded the meaning of “pro-life” work to include protection of the poor against Ronald Reagan’s war against them. And that night in Columbus, I listed a number of the life-constricting results of the Age of Reagan, the man most of those pro-lifers had voted for:

The direct relationship between the national hunger epidemic, affecting 20 million people, and Reagan’s cold economics in these matters; the link between Reagan and the horrifying black infant mortality rate (19.6 per 1000 nationally and 33 per 1000 in places like Detroit); and on and on.

Furthermore, since this was an audience intent on protecting fetuses so they can become infants, I told the Ohio pro-lifers that a key reason for the high infant mortality rate in this country is low birth weight (the cause of three-quarters of neonatal deaths). But what has Reagan done about this? I quoted from a *New York Times* editorial:

“The WIC (Women-Infant-Children) program provides diet supplements and checkups for poor pregnant and nursing women and their children—but it has only enough money to reach a third of those eligible. The Administration now proposes more [cuts]—a limit on Federal Medicaid grants to the states, and a cut that would drop a million participants from WIC by 1986.”

It was at this point that the howls and growls directed at me from the audience reached a crescendo. Hitting a fundamental contradiction in someone’s morality is not unlike poking at a very sore tooth.

At the end of the night, about a dozen people in attendance came over and said they agreed with what I was trying to get the pro-life movement in Ohio to do—be consistent.

“We needed that!” a couple of them said. Also approving was a very influential pro-life leader who was sitting next to me—Dr. J. C. Willke, President of the National Right to Life Committee. (I hereby suggest to Dr. Willke that he reprint this very article in *NRL News* to help spread the indivisible word.)

THE HUMAN LIFE REVIEW

A week before the night in Columbus, I had spoken in New Haven at the annual conference of the Pro-Life Council of Connecticut. A considerable number of the folks at the luncheon were manifestly, though softly, displeased at my bringing them the news and use of Cardinal Bernardin's consistent ethic of life. ("The seamless garment," he calls it.) But a larger number than in Columbus agreed that both morally and strategically the seamless garment argument made sense because the anti-abortion forces would never have the numbers they need unless they broaden and deepen their understanding of the meaning of life. For them to prevail, they have to come to the realization of Archbishop John Roach of St. Paul and Minnesota:

"Selective reverence for human life is a kind of contradiction in terms, not only as a matter of logic but also as a matter of existential reality."

At the New Haven conference, among those in the audience were a number of Democrats, several pacifists, and others who also do not fit many pro choicers' mechanical stereotypes of anti-abortionists as crazed bombers, insatiable hawks, worshipers of William Bradford Reynolds, and savage opponents of the Equal Rights Amendment.

As the pro-life movement slowly becomes more heterogeneous, members of the Left within it are underlining the contradictions of the majority of pro-lifers on the Right while also illuminating the contradictions of the pro-choice Left on the other side of the barricades.

That's what I intend to keep on doing too. For instance, I recently discovered that one of the oldest and most consistently honorable antiwar organizations in the United States—the War Registers League—has a pro-abortion policy. Their sign is a broken rifle, which surely signifies a preference for life. Yet WRL comes down on the side of "choice" in the matter of abortion, and one of those two choices is death.

In her speaking at college campuses and in her writing, Juli Loesch is an unusually persuasive opponent of war and other forms of violence, but unlike the WRL, she is against death all the way and so is the founder of the growing Pro-Lifers for Survival. The group describes itself as "a network of women and men supporting alternatives to abortion and nuclear arms." (The address is P.O. Box 3316, Chapel Hill, NC 27615.)

During an interview in *U.S. Catholic* (May 1984), Loesch told how she had come to her own recognition of the indivisibility of life:

"I had been developing this Helen Caldicott-type rap about radiation and human health. If you're going to make a dramatic point on radiation, particularly low-level, you have to talk about prenatal effects because those are the most dramatic. The unborn child is hurt first and worst by radiation so you have to talk about things like how the plutonium is going to get this kid's arm buds; then you'll have a kid that doesn't have an arm. That happened at Hiroshima.

"In the middle of this dramatic talk, a woman raised her hand and said, 'Where do you stand on abortion?'

"And I thought, 'Oh, God, one of those right-to-life, single-issue fanatics.' I

APPENDIX K

said, 'I'm not really prepared to get into that kind of discussion; and frankly, I think that's really just the concern of the pregnant woman herself.'

"'I don't think you really believe that yourself,' she said, 'because if you think it's wrong to injure these kids accidentally with radiation—'

"I said, 'Those are two completely different things. You can't compare those two things.'

"'If Plutonium 239 would destroy the kid's arm buds,' another woman said, 'you should see what a suction curette would do to its whole body.' Then she went into a description."

A feminist, Loesch has been working on a feminist critique of what she calls "the abortion mentality." For instance, she notes that in many cases, "abortion becomes part of the female-body-as-recreational-object syndrome. The idea is that a man can use a woman, vacuum her out, and she's ready to be used again. It's like she is a rent-a-car or something."

(According to an April 26, 1985, report by the Alan Guttmacher Institute, which is associated with Planned Parenthood, American women obtained abortions in 1,577,340 out of 6.1 million pregnancies in 1981. Unmarried women obtained 81.1 per cent of the abortions. About 35 per cent of the abortions were for women who had had them previously.

(On October 14, 1981, Dr. Irving Cushner, Professor of Obstetrics at the UCLA School of Medicine, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee's subcommittee on the Constitution of the United States Senate. Dr. Cushner is strongly pro-abortion. He was asked how often abortions are necessary to save the life of the mother or insure her physical health.

(His answer: "In this country, about one percent.")

Another member of the Left who has spoken against the cheapening of human life through abortion-as-convenience is Elizabeth Moore, who organized Feminists for Life in the Washington, D.C., area. Recalling her life in the South during segregation, Moore said, "I knew first-hand the effects of legal nonprotection under the Constitution, and from my point of view, the basic value upon which just law must rest is not 'choice' but equality. I cannot tolerate the destruction of life in a society where I find myself among the expendable."

Elizabeth Moore also believes that the pro-choice argument based on a woman's right to control her own body is a right-wing concept that puts property rights over the right to live.

Jo McGowan, a pacifist/feminist, adds—in a *Commonweal* interview with Mary Meehan (January 18, 1980)—"I can no more control my body by destroying my child than I can insure my safety by building Trident submarines." McGowan's prison record includes sentences for demonstrating at a Trident plant, at Seabrook against nuclear power, and at an abortion clinic.

Elizabeth McAlister, whose name will be familiar to those of you who were in the peace and civil rights movements in the 1960s and 1970s, is currently serving a three-year term in the Federal Prison for Women in Alderson, West Virginia, for

having damaged the cones of nuclear missiles in a witnessing for life. McAlister also is pro-life on the question of abortion.

In “A Letter from a Women’s Prison” that appeared in the *National Catholic Reporter* (November 16, 1984), McAlister lines out her consistent ethic of life, calling “into unity all who struggle against the probability of nuclear annihilation . . . All who struggle against the oppression of colonial seizures, who struggle against capital punishment, who struggle in behalf of life, for the born and the unborn . . .

“We must widen the frame,” says Elizabeth McAlister.

And not hide from what we do by using newspeak. As Mary Meehan puts it:

“Many abortion supporters say ‘termination of pregnancy’ or ‘interruption of pregnancy’ instead of ‘abortion.’ The fetus is called ‘productions of conception’ or ‘contents of the uterus.’ Even when the fetus is known to be either female or male, he or she is called ‘it.’ Abortion clinics have names like ‘Women’s Reproduction Health Center’ and ‘Preterm’ and ‘Birth Control Institute.’

“Pro-life people who are active in the antiwar movement have been through all of this before. They remember ‘interdiction’ (bombing), ‘pacification’ (military occupation), and ‘selective ordnance’ (napalm).”

Let me show you the naked lunch at the end of the fork.

Much has been made of Dr. Bernard Nathanson’s *The Silent Scream*, a film of the killing by abortion of a 12-week-old unborn child. I’ve seen all of it once, and parts of it several times. I do not see everything he says I should see. I also think, as I have told Nathanson, that he deflects the impact of the film by focusing on the question of whether the fetus can feel pain and did indeed scream, silently. There are experts on both sides of that argument, and the debates obscure the main issue. The question of fetal pain is less important than the actual dismemberment of this living being.

The victim is a new and unique being—complex and growing rapidly until the abortion. Use whatever newspeak you like, but the fetus is human. This is what happens—from a section of *The Silent Scream*, a section that no one has refuted because it can’t be refuted:

The body is no longer discernible. It has now been torn from the head. What we see now is the head itself with what is called the mid-line echo of the head and the spicules or fragments of bone. Now this head . . . on this 12-week-child is simply too large to be pulled in one piece out of the uterus.

The abortionist is going to have to employ this instrument, the polyp forcep, in an attempt to grab the head. The abortionist will attempt to crush the head with this instrument, in this manner, and remove the head piecemeal from the uterus.

The abortionist and the anesthesiologist have a secret language between them which shields them from the grisly reality of what is going on. [They] refer to the head of this child, which is now being sought, as Number One. And the anesthesiologist will inquire of the abortionist, ‘Is Number One out yet? Are we finished?’

. . . The head is now locked on by this polyp forcep and the head is being pulled down toward the cervix. Now all we see remaining are simply the shards, the broken

APPENDIX K

fragments, the pieces of tissue which document that there was once a living defenseless tiny human being here.

Ah, but good liberal pro-choice folk deny that this was really a human being. In 1973, the Supreme Court had said it was not. Just as in 1857, the Supreme Court had said that people of African descent had “Never been regarded as a part of the people or citizens of the State, nor supposed to possess any political rights which the dominant race might not withhold . . .”

The majority of the Supreme Court, back then, had actually seen these black people but did not see them as human. They saw them as property to be disposed of in any way the owner chose. And now, although the Supreme Court and the other pro-choicers can see into the womb through ultrasound—or have seen color photographs of what’s in there in widely available books—they do not see the unborn as human, and they strongly advocate the killing go on and on.

If only the pro-choice Left could think of the fetus as a baby seal, *in utero*.

* * * * *

Mary Meehan, having played the overture to this article about the hole in the soul of the Left, now provides the coda:

“In the late 1960s, I marched down Pennsylvania Avenue against the war in Vietnam. The other day I marched down the same route against abortion, accompanied by a friend who had also been active in the antiwar movement. We couldn’t help but wonder, ‘Where are the others?’ . . . We thought that most people in the antiwar movement shared a conviction that life is a great good, that we should, as some of the peace signs declared, ‘Celebrate life!’”

But there still are such celebrators—for instance, the Sojourners, an ecumenical group of radical evangelicals. At the end of May they gathered in Washington in nonviolent resistance to nuclear arms, the death penalty, South Africa, Reagan’s “diplomacy” of death in Central America, the casualties of poverty at home, the Soviet murders in Afghanistan—and abortion.

The Sojourners are unashamedly consistent. But is the Left?

APPENDIX L

[Nat Hentoff is a long-time Village Voice columnist and author of many books, including The War on the Bill of Rights and the Gathering Resistance (Seven Stories Press, 2003). The following columns appeared in the Washington Times on March 31, 2008 and April 28, 2008 respectively, and are reprinted with Mr. Hentoff's permission.]

Playing games with innocent life

Nat Hentoff

While Barack Obama is disengaging himself from some of the sulfurously disuniting remarks of his former pastor, Jeremiah Wright, he has shown in a February debate with Hillary Clinton his own disturbing ignorance of why disability-rights communities across the nation so vigorously protested the official starvation and dehydration of disabled Terri Schiavo. I described this as “the longest public execution in American history.”

When moderator Tim Russert asked Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Obama if “there are any words or votes that you’d like to take back . . . in your careers in public service,” Mr. Obama answered that in his first year in the Senate, he joined an agreement “that allowed Congress to interject itself (in the Schiavo case) into the decision-making process of the families.” Mr. Obama added: “I think that was a mistake, and I think the American people understood that was a mistake. And as a constitutional law professor, I knew better.” When he was a professor of constitutional law, Mr. Obama probably instructed his students to research and know all the facts of a case.

The reason Congress asked the federal courts to review the Schiavo case was that the 41-year-old woman about to be dehydrated and starved to death was breathing normally on her own and was not terminal. There was medical evidence that she was responsive, not in a persistent vegetative state.

One of the leading congressional advocates of judicial review was staunchly liberal Sen. Tom Harkin, Iowa Democrat, because he is deeply informed about disability rights. By contrast, in all of this inflamed controversy, the mainstream media performed miserably, copying each other’s errors instead of doing their own investigations of what Terri’s wishes actually were. Consequently, most Americans did not know that 29 major national disability-rights organizations filed legal briefs and lobbied Congress to understand that this was not a right-to-die case, but one about the right to continue living.

Among them were: The National Spinal Cord Injury Association; the National Down Syndrome Congress; the World Association of Persons with Disabilities; Not Dead Yet; and the largest American assembly of disability-rights activists, the American Association of People with Disabilities. AAPD’s head, Andrew J. Imparato, has testified before the Senate that: “When we start devaluing the lives of people with disabilities, we don’t know where that’s going to stop. You also need to take into account the financial implications of all of this. We have an economy that is not doing as well as it once was and . . . one way to save money is to make it

APPENDIX L

easier for people with disabilities to die.”

I recommend to Mr. Obama if he wants to make amends that he consult the disability-rights experts at Not Dead Yet for the facts of the Terri Schiavo case and its acute relevance to many Americans in similar situations. Not Dead Yet is about 12 miles from Chicago at 7521 Madison St., Forest Park, Ill.

If this presidential contender and former law professor had bothered to do his own research, he would have discovered as I did in four years of covering this story and interviewing participants, including neurologists, on both sides, that the husband of the brain-damaged Terri Schiavo, Michael Schiavo, had stopped testing and rehabilitation for her in 1993, 12 years before her death. Moreover, for years he had been living with another woman, with whom he had two children and has since married. Michael Schiavo has continually insisted that he succeeded in having Terri’s feeding tube removed because he was respecting Terri’s wishes, which she could no longer communicate, that she did not want to be kept alive by artificial means.

But at a January 2000 trial, as reported by Notre Dame Law School Professor O. Carter Snead in “Constitutional Quarterly” (published by the University of Minnesota Law School in its winter 2005 issue) five witnesses testified on whether Terri would have refused artificial nutrition, including water, in the condition she was in. Her mother and a close friend of Terri testified that she had said clearly she would want these essential life needs. The other three witnesses said Terri would have approved the removal of her feeding tube.

These last three were in alliance on what became a death penalty: Michael Schiavo, his brother and his sister-in-law. It was on the basis of that 3-to-2 vote that Florida state Judge George Greer ruled that “clear and convincing evidence” allowed him to remove her from life, and then 19 judges in six courts, including federal courts agreed. Like the press, those judges did no independent investigations of their own. And those careless judges are now joined by the equally irresponsible robot-like judgment of Sen. Barack Obama. He should be proud of the Senate vote he now recants and learn a lot more about the disabled.

Abortion senator to abortion president

Nat Hentoff

My initial inclination to support Sen. Barack Obama's road to the White House came from his work as a Chicago community organizer and his record in the Illinois legislature. He actually worked to rescue school dropouts from a lifetime dead end as well as provide job training for the unemployed. Later, in the Illinois state Senate, he was able to get a law passed requiring police to electronically record interrogations and confessions in homicide cases. But my view of him changed as I learned his record on abortion.

I am a nonreligious pro-lifer, my only religion being the Constitution. And I am not a single-issue voter, having often supported candidates who are pro-choice because I knew their civil liberties and civil-rights records. For one example, I was a great admirer of the late Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan. (New York, where I live, has had no senators of his quality and principles since.) Although Mr. Moynihan was pro-abortion, he strongly opposed partial-birth abortion, which he described as "only minutes away from infanticide," since the fetus (whom I regard as a human being) was already clearly among us.

I oppose extremists on all sides of issues, having, for instance, argued for hours with and against some so-called pro-lifers who considered part of their mission to commit violence, even homicide, where abortions were performed.

I admire much of Mr. Obama's record, including what he wrote in "The Audacity of Hope" about the Founders' "rejection of all forms of absolute authority, whether the king, the theocrat, the general, the oligarch, the dictator, the majority . . . George Washington declined the crown because of this impulse." But on abortion, Mr. Obama is an extremist. He has opposed the Supreme Court decision that finally upheld the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act against that form of infanticide. Most startlingly, for a professed humanist, Mr. Obama in the Illinois Senate also voted against the Born Alive Infant Protection Act. I have reported on several of those cases, when, before the abortion was completed, an alive infant was suddenly in the room. It was disposed of as a horrified nurse who was not necessarily pro-life followed the doctors' orders to put the baby in a pail or otherwise get rid of the child.

As a longtime columnist, John Leo, has written of this form of fatal discrimination, these "mistakes" during an abortion, once born, cannot be "killed or allowed to die simply because they are unwanted." Furthermore, as National Right to Life News in its April issue included in its account of Mr. Obama's actual votes on abortion, he "voted to kill a bill that would have required an abortionist to notify at least one parent before performing an abortion on a minor girl from another state." These are conspiracies (and that's the word) by pro-abortion extremists to transport a minor girl across state lines from where she lives, unbeknownst to her parents. This assumes that a minor fully understands the consequences of that irredeemable act.

APPENDIX L

As I was researching this presidential candidate's views on the unilateral "choice" that takes another's life, I heard on the radio what Mr. Obama said during a Johnstown, Pa., town-hall meeting on March 29 as he was discussing the continuing dangers of exposure to HIV/AIDS infections: "When it comes specifically to HIV/AIDS, the most important prevention is education, which should include abstinence education and teaching children, you know, that sex is not something casual. But it should also include other, you know, information about contraception because, look, I've got two daughters, 9 years old and 6 years old. I am going to teach them first of all about values and morals.

"But if they make a mistake," Mr. Obama continued, "I don't want them punished with a baby." Among my children and grandchildren are two daughters and three granddaughters; and when I hear anyone, including a presidential candidate, equate having a baby as punishment, I realize with particular force the impact that the millions of legal abortions in this country have had on respect for human life.

On Feb. 27, testifying before the Wisconsin Senate Committee on Health and Human Services, were a number of young witnesses from a pro-life organization, among them 15-year-old Mariah Smet: "Whenever we talk about abortion, suddenly it's not an unborn child anymore. Instead, people use words like 'fetus' or 'embryo' or 'blob of tissue.' . . . After an abortion, there is nothing except death . . . 22 percent of all pregnancies end in abortion, and 47 percent of women having abortions have had more than one."

And in a letter to the *Washington Times* published April 12, Lawrence Finer of the essentially pro-choice Guttmacher Institute (whose research is nonpartisan) said, in the interests of accuracy, that "Black women accounted for 37 percent of abortions performed in the United States in 2004" (the most recent year for which data are available).

Is Mr. Obama the candidate pleased those women were not "punished" with babies?



"It's a simple procedure, really. We begin by band-sawing the top of your skull off."

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND BOUND VOLUMES

Subscriptions: the *Human Life Review* accepts regular subscriptions at the rate of \$25 for a full year (four issues). Canadian and all other foreign subscriptions please add \$5 (total: \$30 U.S. currency). Please address all subscription orders to the address below and enclose payment with order. You may enter gift subscriptions for friends, libraries, or schools at the same rates.

Additional Copies: this issue—No. 2 Volume XXXIV—is available while the supply lasts at \$7 per copy; 10 copies or more at \$5 each. A limited number of back issues from 1996 to this year are also available at the same prices. We will pay all postage and handling.

Bound Volumes: we now have available bound volumes of the years 1992 through 2001 at \$50 each. The volumes are indexed, and bound in permanent library-style hardcovers, complete with gold lettering, etc. (they will make handsome additions to your personal library). Please send payment with order to the address below. We will pay all postage and handling.

Earlier Volumes: while several volumes are now in very short supply, we can still offer some of the volumes for the first 16 years (1975-1989) of this *Review* at \$50 each.

Selected articles from the current issue of the *Review* are available on our website, www.humanlifereview.com. Older articles may be viewed on the site's *archives* page.

Address all orders to our NEW address:

The Human Life Foundation, Inc.

353 Lexington Avenue

Suite 802

New York, New York 10016

Phone: 212-685-5210

humanlifereview@verizon.net