

The Jewish Roots, and the Catholic Failure, on Abortion

Have you ever wondered why the US Supreme Court suddenly took a cold and dark view of the baby in the womb? Have you ever wondered why, after almost four decades of fighting against abortion, we have come no closer to overturning *Roe v. Wade*, and have, in all practicality, lost ground on the ongoing debate? Well, here is one of the most cogent and revealing articles I have ever read on the subject, written by an attorney who has been studying this issue for quite some time. His name is David A. Wemhoff. He heartily agreed to allow me to quote extensively from his two excellent articles that were recently published in *Culture Wars* for September and October 2009.

First, David will reveal to you facts about the Jewish involvement in the original *Roe v. Wade* decision, information that heretofore has been covered up prior to his exposé. He will reveal to you that Jews in politics, the medical professions, the media, and the three branches of Judaism (Orthodox, Conservative and Reformed) all promote abortion on demand in one form or another and they have heavily influenced every stage of the 40-year debacle. He will show you that abortion stems from deep in Jewish history, going back for centuries.

Second, David will reveal to you how the Catholic response to the pro-abortion forces has been severely compromised in recent years. He will show you how some of the leading figures, who on the surface appear to be waging a worthy battle, have in reality been bowing to political and financial pressures and have become useful idiots for a system that is corrupt at its core. Without further ado, here is David A. Wemhoff.

Robert Sungenis

October 5, 2009

Abortion is from the Jews

Without the light of Truth, Jewish ethics and activities will easily turn from love. The most obvious example of this, and definitely the most timely given the brouhaha at Notre Dame in the Spring coupled with the American Church's repeated insistence that it is the fundamental issue of the day, is the Jewish support for abortion, embryonic stem cell research and host of other attacks on human life and traditional morality.

In October, 2002, the Indiana University Center for Bioethics Stem Cell Study Group released a report entitled "Diverse Perspectives: Considerations about Embryonic Stem Cell Research." The report noted that

Both the Jewish and Catholic traditions work from stable Biblical and theological points of view. Both traditions have clear orthodox perspectives, which they offer within the public arena. Both traditions seek clear, reliable, and logical propositions to guide behavior. And yet their conclusions, prohibitions, and sanctions differ dramatically.ⁱ

One dramatic difference is the idea of the natural law, which Dr. Charles Rice of the University of Notre Dame has made a career in teaching. "There is no 'natural law' in Judaism. Jews neither worship nor degrade nature. God created the world incomplete, with much left to be done. As partners of God, humans are the appropriate actors in the completion of creation. Accordingly, even Orthodox Jewish leaders have endorsed therapeutic cloning as a means of obtaining stem cells for research and medical therapy...."ⁱⁱ

The Study Group found that,

In the Talmud and rabbinic writings, the embryo and fetus are seen as limbs, as extensions of the life of the mother (Rosner 1978, 257-259). While the fetus is potential human life and deserving of special moral consideration and protection, it is not regarded as independent human life; it is a part of the body of the mother and has no 'legal' status of its own. Thus, in issues such as abortion, the presumption is always in favor of the mother. Jewish religious law permits abortion whenever the pregnancy poses a threat to the physical or, according to some interpretations to the psychological well-being of the mother (Feldman 1986, 79-90)....

“This earliest source of this teaching is found in the Torah...Later, in the rabbinic tradition, it was taught that if a woman has life-threatening difficulty in childbirth, the child should be aborted (Mishna, Oholot 7:6). Once its head has emerged, however, it may not be harmed. The Talmud explains that the embryo may be seen as a 'pursuer' and one is justified in defending one's life against a pursuer....

“While the Talmud briefly discusses the issue of ensoulment, it dismisses it as ultimately unanswerable (Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 110b). According to accepted Jewish teaching the soul enters at birth, and this matter is irrelevant to the question of abortion, since the life and health of the mother are the issues at stake.ⁱⁱⁱ

Can anyone doubt, having read the conclusions of the Indiana University report, that the rationale for legal abortion and for partial birth abortion is Jewish? Even the United States Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade* took the side of the Jews when it decided that the unborn could be destroyed since it is not a human being and life had not yet begun: “There has always been strong support for the view that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics. It appears to be the predominant, though not the unanimous, attitude of the Jewish faith.” *Id.*, 410 US 113, 160.

The Supreme Court in *Roe* referred on at least five occasions to *Abortion*, a book by Lawrence Lader, a Jew,^{iv} and a bitter opponent of the Roman Catholic Church. Justice Blackmun noted the book with authority when discussing the history of abortion particularly as it was “practiced in Greek times as well as in the Roman era, and that ‘it was resorted to without scruple’” (*Roe v. Wade* 410 US, at 130). Blackmun also referred to *Abortion* as authority for the statements that abortion was not an indictable offense under the common law and that the states had enacted laws limiting the same around the time of the American Civil War (*Roe v. Wade* 410 US, at 139). Perhaps most significantly, Blackmun cited Lader’s book as authority for the proposition that “Mortality rates for women undergoing early abortions, where the procedure is legal, appear to be as low as or lower than the rates for normal childbirth. Consequently, any interest of the state in protecting the woman from an inherently hazardous procedure, except when it would be equally dangerous for her to forgo it, has largely disappeared” (*Roe v. Wade* 410 US, at 149). And, perhaps equally significantly Blackmun accepted Lader’s argument that opposition to abortion was only a Catholic thing (*Roe v. Wade* 410 US, at 160).

According to Lader’s obituary in *The Washington Post* on May 11, 2006, he tried to destroy the tax status of the Roman Catholic Church for opposing abortion. His book, *Abortion*,

was published in 1966 and made the argument for the legalization of abortion, while also presenting the Jewish position on abortion. Lader wrote:

Although Judaism has no central authority, and its congregations are organized into three branches, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed, often differing in interpretation of Jewish tradition, its position on the beginnings of human life contrasts sharply with Catholic theology.

“Judaism has never been concerned with the concept of soul and the moment of its infusion in the fetus; nor does it treat the fetus as a human entity apart from its mother. (p. 97)

Lader explained that the “...fetus is part of its mother, and just as a person may choose to sacrifice a limb of his body in order to be cured of a worse malady, so may the fetus be destroyed for the sake of its mother,’ [Rabbi Israel] Margolies concludes....The chief Talmudic source on abortion is the Mishna, a collection of early religious-legal decisions, in which it is stated: ‘A woman that is having difficulty in giving birth is permitted to cut up the child inside her womb and take it out limb by limb because her life takes precedence.’....”^v It was the Talmud who gave authority to destroy the child in the womb of the mother: “The chief Talmudic source on abortion is the Mishna, a collection of early religious-legal decisions, in which it is stated: ‘A woman that is having difficulty in giving birth is permitted to cut up the child inside her womb and take it out limb by limb because her life takes precedence.’”^{vi} Rashi, a Jewish scholar of the eleventh century, held that the unborn child is not a life or a living thing until “its

greatest part has emerged from the womb.”^{vii} Maimonides codified these authorities, thereby making them Jewish law, in 1168.^{viii}

In Judaism, there is something called a “response.” According to the *Encyclopedia Judaica*, the word is Hebrew and means “queries and replies.” It is defined as “a rabbinic term denoting an exchange of letters in which one party consults another on a halakhic matter.”^{ix} Halakhah is Jewish law and is founded in the 613 Mitzvot or five books of Moses (the Torah).^x Lader pointed out that the most noted Jewish rabbis over the course of about 800 years wrote responsas approving of abortion.

Reverend Isaac Klein, a Conservative Rabbi wrote in a responsa that the unborn child is a “pursuer” and since the child is “regarded as one pursuing her and trying to kill her” it may be aborted.^{xi} Rabbi Elizer Deutsch in the Nineteenth Century approved the taking of a drug to induce miscarriage if a woman spit blood early in a pregnancy, and if the woman took the drug herself, it was a matter of self-preservation.^{xii} Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof wrote that “that if it is within the first forty days of the pregnancy, there is no possible objection to an abortion; but even if it is older, the danger to the mother’s life and health determines if an abortion may be performed.”^{xiii} Sephardic Chief Rabbi Ben Zion Uziel ““decided that since the fetus is not an independent *nefesh* but is only a part of the mother, there is no sin in destroying it for her sake.”^{xiv} And, quoting again to Rabbi Freehof, Lader wrote that “In the case of German measles, `since there is strong preponderance of medical opinion that the child will be born imperfect physically, and even mentally, then for the mother’s sake (*i.e.*, her mental anguish now and in the future), she may sacrifice this part of herself.”^{xv} Rabbi Armond F. Cohen wrote that, ““To the psychiatrically orientated [sic] Jewish authority of our time...a definitely established suicidal tendency relating to pregnancy would warrant a therapeutic abortion.”^{xvi}

The Jews have seen the legalization of abortion as a matter of religious freedom. Rabbi Robert Loewy in early 1990 testified in favor of abortion rights before the Louisiana Legislature. He did so in the name of the *New Orleans Jewish Federation*, “the central organization of the local Jewish community.”^{xvii} The rabbi testified that “Judaism rules that the mother’s needs automatically take precedence until the moment of birth. ‘There is...a moral and ethical basis for a woman to undergo an abortion. Do not impose the view of some on all of us.’”^{xviii}

Goldberg noted that Jews were “represented disproportionately in the leadership of major pro-choice groups like *Planned Parenthood* of Louisiana, the *League of Women Voters*, and *People for the American Way*. The *ad hoc* coalition against the bill, *Citizens for Personal Freedom*, was run by a board member of the Jewish federation. Among the thirty groups on the coalition’s steering committee were the federation’s community-relations committee; three synagogue sisterhoods; and the local chapters of the *Anti-Defamation League*, the *National Council of Jewish Women*, and *Hadassah*.”^{xix}

The Jews seek to impose their values on the rest of the society through their various initiatives and support for legislation, and they let the world know that. Embryonic stem cell research is one such area. In a press release dated May 25, 2005, the *Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations* (UOJC) supported the introduction and passage by the US House of Representatives of the Stem Cell research Enhancement Act or HR 810. The UOJC stated that “The traditional Jewish perspective thus emphasizes that the potential to save and heal human lives is an integral part of valuing human life. Moreover, the traditional Jewish perspective does not accord an embryo outside of the womb the full status of humanhood and its attendant protections. Thus, stem cell research may be consistent with and serve these moral and noble goals....”^{xx}

Many American Catholics, priests, and pro-lifers cite to how the Orthodox Jews are pro-life. But that is just not true. The UOJC has something called an *Institute for Public Affairs* (IPA) and the IPA formulates the issues for involvement in American politics by the Orthodox Jews. A quick review of the IPA's website reveals a number of links in support of embryonic stem cell research and cloning of human beings. For instance, the first link is to an article by Dr. Daniel Eisenberg dated January 8, 2001 and entitled "Stem Cell Research in Jewish Law." The article provides the justification under Judaism for killing innocent human beings during the course of embryonic stem cell research: Dr. Eisenberg writes "If the pre-embryo may be destroyed, it certainly may be used for research purpose and other life-saving work."^{xxi} Dr. Eisenberg undertakes a long and convoluted analysis under Jewish law to arrive at this conclusion, and of great note is this comment: "While the practical aspects of the Jewish approach to abortion are relatively agreed upon, the exact source and nature of the prohibition [to taking of pre-born life] is not. Depending on the origin of the prohibition, the application to the pre-embryo will differ."^{xxii} In other words, the Jews cannot find the authority for giving life to the unborn, and the tenets of Judaism are up for debate – a not unlikely result given that the Jews reject Christ, the Logos, and with Him, the Advocate. What can be given in one argument based on interpretation of arcane documents can be taken in another argument based on a different interpretation. The practical result (and, according to Dr. Eisenberg the Jews agree on certain practical approaches) is support for embryonic stem cell research and the creation and support of an entire industry engaged in the slaughter.

Other postings to the IPA webpage dealing with "Life Issues" come after Dr. Eisenberg's piece. There is a "Letter to President Bush Regarding Stem Cell Research" dated July 26, 2001; a statement from the Orthodox Union dated July 12, 2006 entitled "OU Asks Senators to Support

Stem Cell Research”; and a “Letter to Congress in Support of HR 3, ‘Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act 2007’” dated January 8, 2007. All of these are supportive of embryonic stem cell research. The OU supports cloning, too. Now while it caveats support for cloning only for therapeutic purposes and not for reproductive purposes, the Orthodox Jews call on Congress to permit it.^{xxiii}

The Conservative Jews are themselves avidly pro-abortion. The *United Synagogues of Conservative Judaism* (USCJ) issued “The Abortion Controversy: Jewish Religious Rights and Responsibilities.”^{xxiv} The USCJ stated with seeming authority and definitiveness: “While Judaism sees the fetus as valuable and sacred as potential life, the sources indicate that it is not equivalent to a person.”^{xxv} It only goes downhill from there for pro-lifers. In their own style of double-talk, the Conservative Jews hold “Jewish tradition is sensitive to the sanctity of life, and does not permit abortion on demand. However, it sanctions abortion under some circumstances because it does not regard the fetus as an autonomous person.”^{xxvi} With concepts and language so bitterly well-known to those opposed to abortion, the Conservative Jews state:

The fetus is a life in the process of development, and the decision to abort should never be taken lightly. Before reaching her final decision, the mother should consult with the father, other members of her family, her physician, her spiritual leader and any other person who can help her in assessing the many grave legal and moral issues involved.^{xxvii}

So, the USCJ in a 1991 resolution did resolve the following, among others:

“WHEREAS, Judaism does not believe that personhood and human rights begin with conception (the premise that personhood begins with conception is founded on a religious position which is not identical with Jewish tradition); and

WHEREAS, under special circumstances, Judaism chooses and requires abortion as an act which affirms and protects the life, well being and health of the mother; and

WHEREAS, to deny a Jewish woman and her family the ability to obtain a safe, legal abortion when so mandated by Jewish tradition, is to deprive Jews of their fundamental right of religious freedom;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism continues to affirm its strong opposition to any further weakening, limitation, or withdrawal of the 1973 Supreme Court decision of *Roe v. Wade*....^{»xxviii}

Reform Judaism has an umbrella organization called the *Union for Reform Judaism* (URJ). According to its website, the URJ provides the “vision and leadership to Reform Jews and congregations on spiritual, ethical, social justice and management issues.” The URJ seeks to inspire Jews into living Jewish lives. Noting that Reform Judaism is the largest Jewish religious movement on the continent, and that each of the 900 or so congregations is autonomous and individualistic in its programs, the URJ website sets out certain principles. These include being “committed to inclusion, not exclusion”; being committed to “the absolute equality of women in all areas of Jewish life....[such as to] ordain women rabbis, invest women cantors, and elect

women presidents of our synagogues”; and being committed to “the full participation of gays and lesbians in synagogue life as well as society at large.”^{xxix}

The URJ operates a *Religious Action Center* (RAC) that engages in issues advocacy. One of the issues which the URJ supports is the expansion of access to emergency contraception (Plan B). In a March 24, 2009 press release, the URJ stated,

We applaud yesterday’s ruling...that orders the FDA to lower the age at which young women can purchase over the counter emergency contraception from 18 to 17....By allowing for expanded access to emergency contraceptives, we can provide young women with the resources necessary to make decisions about their own reproductive health. Yesterday’s decision is a crucial step toward reducing the number of unintended pregnancies and, by extension, of abortions....[W]e...will continue to work tirelessly to ensure reproductive rights to women worldwide.

Then, finally, the reason for this position by the URJ is because, as the press release says, “Jewish tradition teaches that it is the responsibility of the entire community, not just a patient and doctor, to provide health care.”

Another issue the URJ supported was Obama’s repeal of the “Global Gag Rule” in January, 2009. The Rule had banned those foreign “family planning” organizations that lobbied their own governments for changes in the abortion laws to permit abortion from receiving US money. The URJ applauded this decision and wrote, “We hope this is the first step toward a new

era of US partnership in global cooperation to ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and the advancement of women's sexual and reproductive rights worldwide."^{xxx}

The URJ also staked out a position on women's health in which it opposed the "So-Called 'Unborn Victims of Violence Act.'"^{xxxii} The URJ is notably in favor of abortion as mentioned under its "Reproductive Rights" section: "With the election of anti-choice president and Congress, there have been increased challenges to a woman's right to choose."^{xxxii} And, the URJ makes clear the "Jewish Perspective" or the "relationship between Jewish values and Reproductive Rights".^{xxxiii} The URJ is not shy about saying abortion is a Jewish value.

The URJ even opposed the "Right of Conscience" regulation proposed by the Department of HHS under GW Bush on December 19, 2008. It issued a press release which stated:

We are deeply concerned by the Bush Administration's 'Right of Conscience' rule, as its overly broad definition and diminished right of patients' access to services is profoundly troubling. Unless reversed, this regulation will alarmingly narrow patients' access to a wide range of basic health services and information, including reproductive health services, by allowing physicians, pharmacists and other health providers to refuse to offer services they deem morally objectionable....

The Reform Jewish Movement's longstanding commitment to the principles of religious liberty and reproductive freedom are not mutually exclusive....[F]or decades, the Reform Movement has supported a woman's right to control her own reproductive health decisions....In the continued battle over reproductive rights,

we, as Reform Jews and as people of faith, stand firmly in our commitment to protect women's access to reproductive health services.^{xxxiv}

The URJ's position, typical of the other Jewish traditions, was diametrically opposed to the position taken by the USCCB that welcomed the decision by the Department of Health and Human Services to implement the conscience rule. According to the USCCB's press release of the same date as the press release from the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, "The U.S. Catholic bishops' spokesperson on abortion, Deirdre A. McQuade, welcomed the published regulation as a way to protect medical personnel from being coerced to violate their consciences in federally funded programs....Catholic health care providers will especially welcome this mark of respect for the excellent life-affirming care they provide to all in need."^{xxxv}

With this position, the kind of power the Jews have in society, and the state of the law, it is no wonder that Jewish beliefs have made America Jewish. America does not need a "pro-life movement." The Jews just need to be converted to the Faith.

Politics, More Misshapen Souls, and Abortion

American politics is not really about change, regardless of what the Obama campaign said. If anything, it is a powerful tool that the Regime uses to reinforce America's revolutionary nature, and to keep people divided and at cross-purposes so as to keep them from focusing on the real issues. The people are given an illusion that they are in control, but they are not. Perhaps one of America's greatest contributions to politics is the high degree of sophisticated manipulation it represents. The pro-life movement is an example.

There is a powerful, visceral, and enduring response of many people to abortion. Recognizing this, the Regime controls, or channels, this rage into a way that does not threaten the Regime directly or the American construct that allows the Regime to wield so much power. This includes harnessing the pro-lifers' enthusiasm and emotions to support the Regime's initiatives and projects that have nothing to do with abortion. One of the best ways to do that is with elections. Rank and file pro-lifers willingly engage in electoral politics because they really believe in America and their leaders do not disabuse their naïve faith in something man-made. During the 2008 presidential election, a "prayer" was circulated by Fr. Frank Pavone, Director of Priests for Life. Here's the prayer:

Oh God, we acknowledge you today as Lord,
Not only of individuals, but of nations and governments.
We thank you for the privilege
Of being able to organize ourselves politically
And of knowing that political loyalty
Does not have to mean disloyalty to you... (emphasis added)

This prayer, sent to millions in the weeks leading up to the 2008 presidential election, is a political prayer. Its real meaning is understandable on two levels. The first is loyalty to a political party (Republican). It is a not so subtle attempt to keep pro-lifers, and Catholics in particular, in line and loyal to the Republican Party. Abortion and same sex marriage have been the top political issues for Catholics, as well as white evangelicals, noted Jeff Diamant of *Religion News Service*. Bill Berkowitz in a September 23, 2007 article for Media Transparency noted that the

GOP had spent years organizing and wooing the Catholic vote and used “allies” like Michael Novak, Deal Hudson, Fr. Richard Neuhaus, and Ralph McInerny to corral the Catholic voters for the Republican party. However, in spite of loyalty to the abortion and same sex marriage issues, the power of the “allies” seemed to wane amongst Catholics commencing with the 2006 election. Berkowitz noted that in 2000 Bush had received only 47 percent of the Catholic vote but in 2004 he got about 52 percent. By 2006, Catholics favored Democrats over Republicans by 55 to 45 percent thereby revealing a very troubling change in electoral dynamics for the GOP. Something had to be done.

During the 2008 Presidential campaign, Karl Rove encouraged Republican donors with strong pro-life positions to give money to the *National Right to Life Committee* as part of an effort to elect conservatives. The *Washington Times* in a September 1, 2008 piece noted that in response to these comments by Rove “the National Right to Life Committee...declined to comment.” The Republicans have given money to the National Right to Life Committee for many years, though. Cynthia Cooper, a correspondent for *Women’s E News* in an article posted March 18, 2003 quoted Deborah Goldberg, the acting Director of the Democracy Program of the Brennan Center for Justice in New York City as saying that “We know that the Republican Party gives money to the right to life groups.” She cited an affidavit filed in a Federal Court in October, 2002 by David N. O’Steen Executive Director of the *National Right to Life Committee* (NRLC) that stated the NRLC “has received donations from political parties or committees” and that “persons associated with political parties” assisted in the raising of funds for the NRLC. The article proceeds to detail how a Congressional report released in 1998 by the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee on campaign finance showed that the Republican National Committee contributed \$ 650,000 to the NRLC. Additionally, GOP Representative Chris Shays

gave \$250,000 to the NRLC in 1999, and in 1994 the Republican Senatorial Committee contributed \$175,000 to the NRLC. A *Los Angeles Times* article by Ruth Marcus published October 23, 1997 documented how Deputy Finance Director Jo-Anne Coe and RNC chairman Haley Barbour “tapped big GOP donors to make large contributions to the outside groups” to include NRLC. Marcus wrote that “Coe passed on checks for \$100,000 each to the Right to Life Committee and Americans for Tax Reform from Carl Lindner of the *American Financial Group*, a major donor to both parties.”

OpenSecrets.org calls itself the “Center for Responsible Politics” and it keeps records of contributions by various organizations to different candidates. It tallied the money given by the NRLC to Democrats and Republicans for the 2006 and 2008 elections and found the following: In 2006, the NRLC gave \$3,436,285 to Republican candidates and only \$1,633 for Democrat candidates. In 2008, the NRLC funded GOP candidates to the tune of \$2,607,048 and Democrat candidates only \$38,876.

Brian Rohrbaugh is the President of *American Right to Life*, and according to their website Rohrbaugh “became active in the fight to end our culture of death” after his son, Danny, was murdered at Columbine High School in 1999. Rohrbaugh wrote a commentary piece entitled “The Legacy of Judas: National Right to Life” in which he excoriated the NRLC for opposing the efforts of South Dakota legislatures to conduct a referendum on a ban on abortions and opposing efforts in Colorado to grant personhood to the unborn. Rohrbaugh writes that while NRLC attorney James Bopp praised the *Gonzalez v. Carhart* decision by the United States Supreme Court banning partial birth abortions, scholars like Dr. Charles Rice of Notre Dame, and activists like Judie Brown of *American Life League*, and Fr. Thomas Euteneuer of *Human Life International*, condemned the decision as not saving a single human life. Indeed, Rohrbaugh

noted that Dr. Rice opined that “not one of the US Supreme Court justices, which includes those supported by NRTL, has ever affirmed personhood and the right to life for the unborn.”

Second, the Pavone prayer is a celebration of America. It unites loving and serving God with loyalty to the State, its political processes, and the very political system that brought abortion. The prayer does not criticize the United States, nor does it explain how America, as an ideological nation, is different than more traditional nation states, but seems to elevate it, and this is in keeping with the error of Americanism. Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical, *Immortale Dei* (“On the Christian Constitution of States,” 1885) taught: “every body politic must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and has, consequently, God for its Author. Hence, it follows that all public power must proceed from God. For God Alone is the true and supreme Lord of the world. Everything, without exception, must be subject to Him, and must serve Him so that whosoever holds the right to govern holds it from one sole and single source, namely, God, the sovereign Ruler of all” (para. 3.). Pope Leo XIII also cited to Romans 13:1 in which St. Paul wrote “There is no power but from God.”

For a government of a country to be legitimate, the first principle is that there must be public recognition that its power comes from God. Closely and logically allied to this is that the government must also publicly accept the proper purpose of human life, it must assist citizens to achieve this ultimate purpose, and it must acknowledge and accept the proper role of the Roman Catholic Church. These factors are essential for establishing a sound societal foundation for the material, emotional, psychological, and spiritual health of the people, and these principles are required by God for any government to be morally legitimate. The United States has never officially recognized that its power comes from God, nor has it ever given pre-eminence to the Roman Catholic Church and the Roman Catholic Faith, which is the One, True Faith and

Christ's own Church. Instead, the Declaration of Independence holds that "Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." In other words, numbers are what matters, and those who can get the most numbers, can wield the most power and can rule. It is this error that logically leads to the legalization of abortion, euthanasia, and the culture of death because power, not truth, becomes the organizing and operative principle of the society and its political processes.

The United States and the society known as America did not come with instruction manuals or with a reliable, credible, and independent referee as did the countries of Europe. Europe had the Faith and the Church, but America had neither. And, without an agreed upon way to interpret the meaning of the foundational documents of the United States, each person reads into the Constitution what he or she wants. With religious liberty, or freedom, indifferentism (a heresy defined by Pope Gregory XVI in *Mirari Vos*) takes over and the loss of faith in any religion results. A practical effect is that there is no unified view of the world by the inhabitants of the land. This is disunity in the most basic of things for a group of people, or country, spells trouble and it belies the "United" in "United States." And so Americans had to make it up as they went along. Logically, the powerful would be presented with an unprecedented opportunity to control when one also considers that revolutionary ideas characterized the founding of the political entity. When the questions arose as to whether contraception or abortion are fundamental rights guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land – the Constitution – the deck was stacked against doing God's will. The sexual revolution was bound to win with the beneficiaries of it all being the elites.

Pavone's prayer is also a reflection of the soul of its promoter. "Fr. Frank" as he is known, is revered by most in the "pro-life" movement as the example of what a Catholic priest

should be like. Some hang on to his every word, many consider him a great man, and hundreds will crowd into a room to just be near or catch a glimpse of the man. He garnered a number of awards and recognition early on in his career at *Priests for Life* to include being named among the Top 100 Catholics of the Century in 1999 and the *National Right to Life Committee's* Proudly Pro-Life Award in 2001. He traveled around the country and internationally, and he became a spokesman for the pro-life movement with regular appearances on the O'Reilly Factor, *Larry King Live*, *Good Morning America*, EWTN and more. Regularly quoted in major newspapers, Pavone rose to be President of the *National Pro-Life Religious Council*. And, he is credited with growing Priests for Life from a small organization staffed by unpaid volunteers to one having 40 full time employees and an extensive headquarters in Staten Island.

A visit to the offices of *Priests for Life* several years ago showed just how appreciated Fr. Frank is. In the hallway around the building are photographs of him visiting or speaking with a number of people. One gets the sense, after having seen that and the website of *Priests for Life*, that an important part of the work of Priests for Life is to promote Fr. Frank Pavone. "Fr. Frank" is undoubtedly a key leader of the pro-life movement, and so his soul is reflected in the movement, and his soul is a reflection of America. Though a priest, "Fr. Frank" could very well be a real American with dreams of personal glory. A biography of him by *Daily Catholic* allows us a glimpse into this man who as a teenager had written a personal letter to then "President Richard Nixon requesting the opportunity to go along on one of the space shuttles." He studied at the St. Joseph's Theological Seminary beginning in 1984 and studied under the likes of the late Monsignor William Smith, Father Andrew Apostoli (an EWTN personality), Monsignor Eugene Clark (ultimately accused of sexual scandal with a secretary) and Father Benedict Groeschel (an EWTN personality). Fr. Frank was ordained a priest by Cardinal John O'Connor who appointed

him national director of *Priests for Life*, and who, from all indications, was supportive of Fr. Frank's pro-life work.

Just days before 9/11, Greg Cunningham, President of the *Center for Biothecal Research* and an advisor to Pavone's *Priests for Life*, told the author of this article that there was an effort afoot to remove Fr. Pavone from *Priests for Life*.^{xxxvi} What he did not say is that Pavone's superior, Cardinal Edward Egan, exercising his episcopal powers granted him by the Roman Catholic Church, was ordering Pavone, who was bound by a vow of obedience, to "resume full-time work within the Archdiocese of New York and leave his present position with *Priests for Life*."^{xxxvii} According to the *Priests for Life* Press Release and a posting on *Free Republic*, "The reason for the decision is the need for parish priests in New York, and is consistent with similar decisions of the Cardinal to call back many other New York priests who are on a special assignment."

Anthony DeStefano, the Executive Director of *Priests for Life*, and a long-time associate of Pavone, stated, "We are shocked at what has happened and frankly can't make heads or tails of it." DeStefano, who according to the latest *Priests for Life* Form 990 filed in November, 2008, makes about \$199,000 per year, went on to say that Pavone had transferred the leadership of *Priests for Life* to DeStefano in September, 2001, but that Pavone was "continuing to negotiate with the Cardinal through all proper channels" (emphasis added). From these and other indications, Pavone did not readily comply with the Cardinal's order. A review of the biography of Fr. Pavone of the *Priests for Life* website reveals the following comment: "In 1993, with the permission of Cardinal OConnor [sic], he became the National Director of *Priests for Life*." There is no mention that he stepped down in 2001 pursuant to Cardinal Egan's direction, and so

one is left to conclude that he has remained the leader of *Priests for Life* without interruption since 1993.

A number of reports from the Autumn of 2001 indicate some sort of negotiation was ongoing between Pavone and the Archdiocese. A press release from the *Institute for Democracy Studies* dated November 9, 2001 quoted from a letter Pavone wrote to New York State Senator Eric Schneiderman in which Pavone said, “if in fact I am in a different assignment....then I will be free of the restrictions that sometimes accompany such a position of leadership, and more capable of doing various types of pro-life activism. This, of course, includes political activity.” A story published by *Life Site News.com* on November 29, 2001 quoted Pavone as saying in a talk to *Civitas Dei*, a Catholic business group in Indianapolis, Indiana, that “his parish assignment in the diocese of New York ‘will be compatible’ with continuing his ‘pro-life leadership.’” On December 14, 2001, *Pro-Life Infonet* released a story entitled “Father Frank Pavone Will Continue [sic] Pro-Life Work,” in which Fr. Pavone is quoted as saying that Cardinal Egan had assigned him to “assist the pastor of a small parish near the Priests for Life headquarters.” This would allow him to continue Pavone’s “pro-life work, both with *Priests for Life* and with the many other pro-life projects in which he is involved nationwide.”

Pavone, who had been incardinated in the Archdiocese of New York in 1988, was re-incardinated into the Diocese of Amarillo, Texas. Bishop Yanta of Amarillo, listed as an episcopal advisor of *Priests for Life* since 1998, allowed Pavone to become one of his diocesan priests in 2004. It was shortly thereafter, in March, 2005, that Fr. Pavone announced that Bishop Yanta granted Pavone permission to establish a new community of priests “permanently dedicated to full time pro-life work,^{”xxxviii} and to be named the Missionaries of the Gospel of Life. This was quite a grand scheme, and a different one too, when compared with the stated

purpose or mission of *Priests for Life* which is to “help priests around the world spread the Gospel of Life to their people” and to “unite and encourage all clergy to live special emphasis to the life issues in their ministry.”^{xxxix}

As part of the establishment of a new community of priests dedicated to advancing one teaching of the Church, the Missionaries of the Gospel of Life broke ground in August, 2006 on an \$11 million dollar “gothic seminary” that would be the start of a large campus in Amarillo. According to an Amarillo Globe-News article of February 25, 2007 by Karen Smith Welch, Pavone planned to spend \$70 million to \$130 million in building the complex on 60 acres east of St. Laurence Cathedral. Welch documented how politically active Pavone had been in the pro-life movement to include attending a Christmas Party in 2006 at the White House where he thanked President Bush “for his stand on behalf of unborn children.” Additionally, in January 2007, Pavone personally endorsed Sam Brownback for president and served in a “personal capacity” on Brownback’s campaign committee.

By September 2008, plans for the complex and for the Missionaries were scrapped. Pavone threw out the idea of a separate apostolic and priestly society within a few short years of conceiving the idea. According to *The Washington Post* on September 27, 2008, the religious community was “diverting attention and resources from his primary goal: ending abortion.” The *Catholic Key*, the diocesan newspaper for the Diocese of Kansas City – St. Joseph, reported that Pavone had “decided not to seek church recognition as a society of apostolic life that would accept and ordain its own seminarians.” Instead, in a joint communiqué from *Priests for Life* and the Diocese of Amarillo, the Missionaries and Priests for Life would be one entity, and the nine studying at Pavone’s headquarters would be sent home. Pavone wrote in a commentary for the *National Catholic Register* posted on September 23, 2008 that “Forming a community and

training men for ordination is a long-term process, and there is an inherent urgency to the mission of defending the unborn and vulnerable, and that goal is within reach now” (emphasis in original). He described how *Priests for Life* “has met with significant success within the bounds of its current structure, activities and assets” and that “*Priests for Life* makes extensive use of media, therefore making a specific geographical locale less necessary.” And, he compared the pro-life movement to “the abolitionist movement and the civil rights movement.” Certainly, neither St. Francis, nor St. Dominic, nor St. Ignatius Loyola quit the plans for creating their respective religious communities to engage in social and political activism.

Disordered souls will spread disorder and so cannot be expected to affect lasting, fundamental, and positive change. These souls will keep the status quo of America. The day after the disastrous 2008 election, Pavone hosted a telephone/internet conference to discuss the state of the pro-life movement. It was a polite call. There was no name-calling, no finger-pointing, no trying to figure out why the pro-life banner went down in defeat – along with the Republican banner. There were no questions about the apparently indissoluble union of the “pro-life” cause with the Republican Party. What was discussed was a Plan to End Abortion. The plan was light on euthanasia, the growing, silent killer given the closely intertwined demographic and economic collapse. Instead, the Plan seemed mostly to be a re-iteration of the same failed mantra for stopping abortion: education, finding alternatives to abortion, and, oh yes, getting ready for the next round of elections.

The leaders of the pro-life movement channel the fury people have at the very obvious injustice of abortion into activities that do not harm the political and social status quo in America but instead harms the Church. These leaders do not explain the connection between abortion and the foundational errors of America, and these leaders offer no other alternative consistent

principle for social-economic-cultural-political organization. These leaders keep alive the fiction that America represents the best and greatest achievement of humanity and they ignore the apostasy that lies at the heart of it.

The post-abortive healing push is another way to defuse a potentially dangerous situation for the Regime. While the healers and social workers involved in the counseling of hurting men and women are sincere and dedicated, and while they do help some of the wounded, the model for the healing is a focus of the victims on themselves, their own feelings and faults, and an emphasis on the principles of individual psychology. What seems to be overlooked is that abortion is a symptom of a deeper spiritual issue that begs for a spiritual solution. Those who counsel or undergo abortions suffer from a seriously misshapen soul, and only through the grace of God during the course of a long process can these souls be healed and conformed to do the will of God. The best example of the misshapen souls is that many of the victims engage in, and continue to engage in, promiscuous sex while leading materialistic existences.

Additionally, the men and women wounded by abortion are not allowed to understand the societal or cultural dimensions of the actions in which they have engaged and the hurt that they have endured. Were they allowed to see such and to understand how they were deceived into destroying their own children, they would come to understand that legalized abortion (and legalized contraception) is a weapon. They would then ask who and why and once they understood that the Regime did so to control them by destroying their offspring and their ability to have children and families, they would become angry. Real, real angry. This anger could be turned on the very system that made this holocaust possible and so widespread. Were that to happen, coupled with the fact that about 40 percent of the adults walking around have an abortion in their past, the Regime would lose control. So, while the social structure keeps the

vener of civility it has these days, not far from the surface is a white hot rage that could be triggered to spill out over the landscape by the right turn of events.

The Sterile Pro-Life Movement

The leading pro-life organizations publicly claim that they seek to restore legal protection to the unborn, but they have failed to date. The real issue is unity. The Catholic hierarchy has never been united in opposition to the sexual revolution of the '60s. The battle for the legal protection of the innocents was effectively lost by 1971 in the United States, and any attempt at a successful counter-attack to obtain an amendment to the Constitution restoring the right to life was finished by September, 1982.

Engel recounts how McHugh went on to become the Holy See's representative on matters of population control at a number of international conferences to include Mexico City (1984), the Rio Earth Summit (1992), and Cairo (1994). The result was always the same. Amidst a lot of talk and a great show of resistance by the Vatican, the final documents that those conferences produced only provided an illusion of victory as population planning remained intact as an acceptable goal of international organizations and national regimes. Randy Engel correctly points out that "Lost to all but a few diehard pro-lifers was the fact that genuine victory over the anti-life forces lay not in the regulation of government and UN population control programs, but in their absolute prohibition."^{xli} Abortion for therapeutic reasons, or eugenic reasons as well as sterilization and contraception were all permitted under these agreements – just like McHugh and Cody and the American Catholic Bishops had done with Title X and other legislation in the

United States. The killing could continue, only the reasons, and the conditions, or circumstances, for the killing would change.

The pro-life movement in the United States has not been able to obtain an absolute prohibition of the killing. Crutcher of *Life Dynamics* complained at one point that the pro-life movement was reduced to arguing about when and how children were aborted. That is the conclusion one must draw even after reviewing the writings and research of pro-life apologist Dr. Michael New, author of a 2008 election pamphlet entitled “Pro-life Politicians Have Made a Difference, Pro-life laws work.” Dr. New, who is a regular speaker in pro-life circles, found that abortion rates fell in those states that had, and enforced, informed consent laws, restricted partial birth abortion, and enforced parental involvement statutes. He also found that public funding of abortions increased the incidence of abortion – a principle that seems to hold true in other areas. Dr. New agreed with Catholic Professors Kmiec and Cafardi who opined that reversing *Roe v. Wade* would not end abortion, but would only throw the matter to the states where “enacting pro-life laws and changing the culture are battles that will engage the right-to-life movement for years to come.” Dr. New admits that abortion has become a staple of American culture and society while emphasizing the primacy of political action of pro-lifers. Yet somehow, this political action never results in the passage of a pro-life amendment to the United States Constitution despite the fact that according to the *National Committee for a Human Life* (NCHLA) Amendment a human life amendment bill has been introduced into every Congress since the 101st Congress. The bills just go to committee to die according to the NCHLA. The reasons are that politics always follows the culture, and the Republicans are liars. Catholics do not control the culture and so with a pro-abortion, materialistic, contraceptive, pleasure-oriented

society, the bills will never get out of committee especially when the “party of life” does not fight for the protection of this most fundamental of rights.

GW Bush was supposed to be the great pro-life president, but even his record is questionable. Fr. Peter West, an associate of *Priests for Life*, kept a running list of Bush’s “pro-life efforts and accomplishments.” The first entry was for January 22, 2001 and was entitled “President Bush Reinstates Mexico City Policy” with a link to the article. The last entry I saw was dated May 18, 2004 and was entitled “Nerve gas sarin is found in Iraq Bomb” with a link to *The Washington Post* article. A review of the articles and links in between the two show that Fr. West included all manner of references to the War in Iraq – as though being pro-life meant being pro-war. All of this serves as proof of the co-option of pro-life leaders by the Republicans and the powers of the day. According to Steve Lefemine who ran for Congress in South Carolina in 2004, Bush increased funding for contraception under the Medicaid and Title X programs, and actually sent more money to the *Planned Parenthood* coffers under the rubric of birth control. That did not make the list of Fr. Peter West.

Life is neither protected nor encouraged while the political game is played. Newspapers, television stations and radio stations often post articles or stories on line and allow the public to comment to the stories. With the Obama controversy at Notre Dame in the Spring, a lot of people added comments to the numerous stories posted on line by the South Bend media, and with this exchange of comments the essence of the real fight over abortion became evident.

The conflict is being couched, more than ever, in pro-choice versus no-choice terms. America is about choice, and it was founded on choice – freedom to choose one’s religion, job, place to live, *etc.* Pro-choicers are logically defending the uniquely American value of freedom to choose whatever one wants, and this freedom to choose is an organizing principle that infuses

and informs American life and institutions. Pro-lifers, while they may not realize it (due largely to their co-opted leadership) are essentially calling into question this fundamental reason for the existence of America. Pro-lifers, whose position is based on God's will, are saying to pro-choicers, and to America, that "you got it all wrong" at least in this one important issue. Pro-lifers are saying that God's will is paramount, not man's. This simple point is enough to start the unraveling of the American experiment in the minds and hearts of millions.

As a result of this sensed conflict and real threat to America's philosophical foundation, the positions and opinions of the pro-choicers are as hardened and determined as ever before. They admit that abortion is killing of unborn children, and they are willing to allow the killing of unborn children in defense of America's fundamental principle of freedom of choice, which is man's will elevated above God's.

Pro-life groups estimate that around 53,000,000 unborn children have been killed since 1973, which is at the same rate that Jews were killed during the Shoah. Given that about 40 percent of these are Catholic children, and that another 40 percent are children of other denominations that may consider themselves Christian, these numbers indicate a failure of Catholics, and others, to protect their own. This is not something to be proud of, nor is it a sign of progress. The *World Almanac and Book of Facts 2009* shows that the most dangerous place for an American to be is in the womb of his mother. In 1980, near the height of the abortion boom in the USA, there were 3.6 million live births and about 1.3 million abortions. In 1997, the last year abortion statistics were received from all 50 states by the *Center for Disease Control*, there were 3.88 million live births and about 1.2 million abortions. While the number of abortions dropped, a full 21 percent of all pregnancies resulted in the child being sucked into a sink before birth.

There is a bigger problem here. The pro-choicers have always called for “every child a wanted child.” The pro-lifers should call for “every woman should want a child.” The birth rate itself fell in 1997 to 14.2 live births per 1,000 women from the 15.9 live births per 1,000 women in 1980, and the fertility rate (live births per 1,000 women between the ages of 15 and 44) fell from 68.4 to 63.6. Women are just not giving birth to children, which means they do not want children and are not open to life for whatever reasons. Encouraging, and increasing, births and women wanting children seem to be important objectives for a movement that wants to call itself pro-life. But if the “pro-life” movement got into the business of encouraging fertility which would mean denouncing contraception, it would run afoul of the Regime’s desire for sustainable development, and it would interfere with another revolutionary ethos – that of women wanting to have careers.

Revolution is Satan’s way to destroy souls and the human race which is God’s creation. Revolutions end up destroying the revolutionaries, and things like sexual liberation, contraception, and abortion are weapons. Both the Communists and Hitler knew that contraception and abortion would either destroy families or lessen the numbers of enemy populations. In America, Margaret Sanger, Paul Blanshard and the powerful socio-economic interests (mostly WASP) they served recognized that contraception and abortion were weapons that could be used against the undesirables – Negroes and Catholics primarily. The best weapon devised is one that the enemy will gladly use on themselves, and that is what abortion and contraception are. Sexual liberation, women’s rights, contraception, and abortion are weapons of mass destruction crafted by the American Regime so that the citizens (especially Catholics and Negroes) of the United States will use them on each other. And it works very well.

The losses through abortion and the low fertility of American women are strong indications that America is dying and that America is destroying itself. Fewer children, and fewer women wanting children, evidence a lack of faith, hope and charity. This means that like the Roman Empire and Ancient Greece, both of which suffered from declining populations, America is headed for the dustbin of history.

A Pro-Life Leader's Dishonesty

The late Fr. Richard John Neuhaus, editor of *First Things*, conceded the point of how pro-choicers are in power and the “establishment media massively” supports them. He gave a consolation prize to the pro-life movement and especially “the Christian Right [which] has helped revive participatory democracy in America by overcoming citizens’ alienation from politics.”^{xlii} In one of the last pieces that he wrote and published, Neuhaus positively crowed about how the “Christian Right has been much more successful than its political rivals at fulfilling New Left hopes for American democracy.” He cites to the research contained in *The Democratic Virtues of the Christian Right* written by Jon Shields as authority that the pro-lifers are deeply engaged in politics in America as they challenge the status quo pro-choicers who, he admits, have little to gain by engaging the pro-lifers. Neuhaus did not, and could not, write that Pro-lifers and the Christian Right are ending abortion because there is no indication that we are any closer today to prohibiting abortion than we were 35 years ago. So, he only glorified the American political system, not the truths of the Roman Catholic Faith nor the results of pro-life efforts. One is left to conclude that the result of the political involvement of the “Christian Right,” Catholics, and pro-lifers in the political system of a country and society that holds

contrary values is to serve to waste energy and resources. The purpose of such fruitless work is to show the “system” works because there is involvement (albeit fruitless) in the system. A corollary of Neuhaus’ article is that the pro-life movement and the Christian Right have only served to provide false hope, money for the sterile political parties, and votes for candidates pursuing the agendas of those truly in power.

Neuhaus was said to be the man who craftily delivered the Catholics to the Neocons in an effort to get abortion thrown out, and then shortly after the Neocons were themselves thrown out decisively in 2008, Neuhaus died. He had an opportunity to call the Neoconservatives what they were and that the cause of life was not advanced by a Catholic–Neoconservative alliance. Judging by his many public pronouncements on TV and in print, Neuhaus apparently ignored that call, was struck down with the cancer that had been in control for so long, and died about two months after the great defeat of November, 2008 which confirmed the break-up of the Catholic-Neoconservative affiliation. Neuhaus could have used his powerful bully-pulpit to speak against the real reason for the culture of death in the USA and he could have worked to get people to see the errors of the American Catholic bishops and of America itself. He could have called Jews and Protestants to conversion, and he could have pronounced the primacy of the Faith which would have been the only way to reform society and end things like abortion. He could have publicly repented of his error after seeing his handiwork go to pieces. But he didn’t. As a result, Catholics will be manipulated into thinking that the best way to be a Catholic, or perhaps the only way to be a Catholic, is to oppose abortion (be “pro-life”) and go to Mass. They will subsequently be exhausted and drained of their resources in a fight against over inflated dangers such as FOCA, which, if one reads the language of the Senate and House bills, says nothing about what many pro-lifers, and the USCCB, claim it will do. Indeed, there is a

good argument that were Obama stupid enough to sign it (recent indications are that he will not) it could be struck down by a Court as a violation of the Constitution and principles of Federalism.

The pro-life movement has been flawed from the start as it was designed by those who had embraced revolution through primary loyalty to America or by sexual perversion. These men could only serve Mammon and the powerful forces of their day and so they devised the pro-life movement – an American response to serious moral failings of the American experiment. From the beginning, the pro-life movement did not address the root causes of abortion, euthanasia, and more evils of the day. It only addressed some of the symptoms, and even then it did not, it could not, present a complete and coherent world view in opposition to the one characterized by feminism, choice, and individualism.

The pro-life movement gave itself over to protesting and quasi-revolutionary tactics and rhetoric that made it sterile in the deepest sense. Fr. A. B. Klyber, a Jew who converted to the Roman Catholic Faith and became a Redemptorist priest, recounted the reasons for the conversion to the Faith of Eugenio Zolli, previously Dr. Israel Zolli, Chief Rabbi of Rome. When asked why he did not become a Protestant, Zolli said “Because protesting is not attesting.”^{xliii} Yet that is exactly what the pro-life movement does: it protests. That is because the pro-life movement’s leaders strive to make the movement an accommodation to America, if not a celebration of America and things American, and also because some of these same leaders, being Americans themselves, cannot see the right way to go. The lessons of history are written in the blood, sweat, and suffering of the saints and martyrs, and it is that example that must be followed by those who wish to see abortion and other evils come to an end. The way for Roman

Catholics, and of Roman Catholicism, has always been to live Reality, to teach the Truth, to stick together, and to suffer with and for Our Lord.

The pro-life movement has been and will continue to be subject to manipulation and control by the powerful of the day unless pro-lifers wake up and do something about it. In the 1960s, the powerful were White Anglo-Saxon Protestants who wanted contraception, loved sexual degeneracy, and wanted power and control to bring about the “American Century.” They got what they wanted with the pro-lifers and the American Catholic Bishops who saw contraception, abortion, sex education, and divorce as separate and distinct problems, and not all part of the same web of destruction that was engulfing the Catholic youth, and others.

By 2008, the pro-life movement, which never seemed to go away, had become a way for Jews, who replaced the WASPs, to enlist Catholic support, or, perhaps more properly, gain further control of Catholics. In any event, the one consistent accomplishment of the pro-life movement has been to get a lot of well-meaning, good-hearted people involved in a political system that serves only the most powerful and at the same time destroys the very people who comprise the pro-life movement. The movement has consumed a lot of energy and resources while directing attention away from the real work needed to end abortion and to transform society, which is the work of the Roman Catholic Church in converting souls to the One, True Faith. And, too often than not, the movement has served as an incubator for those who desire personal glory and advancement while encouraging attacks against the Church’s shepherds.

Perhaps one of the most meaningful and lasting result of the pro-lifers’ involvement in America to date, has been, and continues to be, encouraging participation in the political system. By doing so, pro-lifers unwittingly lend an air of legitimacy to the very society that permits, and even encourages, the slaughter of millions of innocents. The pro-life movement is not meant by

many of its leaders to save babies, if it ever was. Even though the essence of the pro-life position is to call into question the reason for America's existence, the Regime uses the movement to mute that message and to perpetuate the lie that each man is the sole arbiter of right and wrong.

David Wemhoff

ⁱ "Diverse Perspectives: Considerations about Embryonic Stem Cell Research" Indiana University Center for Bioethics Stem Cell Study Group, October 2002, p. 11.

ⁱⁱ *Id.*, p. 12

ⁱⁱⁱ *Id.*, p. 12

^{iv} *The Revolutionary Jewish Spirit* by Dr. E. Michael Jones (Fidelity Press, 2008) p. 941.

^v *Abortion* by Lawrence Lader (Bobbs-Merrill 1966) p. 97.

^{vi} *Id.*

^{vii} *Id.*

^{viii} *Id.*

^{ix} *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971), vol. 14, pp. 83-84

^x *Id.* vol. 7, pp 115-116

^{xi} *Abortion*, p. 98.

^{xii} *Id.*

^{xiii} *Id.*

^{xiv} *Id.*

^{xv} *Id.*

^{xvi} *Id.*

^{xvii} *Jewish Power* (Perseus 1996) J. J. Goldberg, p. 41.

^{xviii} *Id.*

^{xix} *Id.*, 43.

^{xx} "Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations Welcomes US House Passage of Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act" May 25, 2005, Orthodox Union Institute for Public Affairs.

^{xxi} <http://www.jlaw.com/Articles/stemcellres.html> as of August 19, 2009

^{xxii} *Id.*

^{xxiii}

http://www.ou.org/public_affairs/article/ou_rca_joint_statement_on_cloning_research_jewish_tradition_public_policy/ as of August 19, 2009.

^{xxiv} http://www.uscj.org/The_Abortion_Controv5481.html as of August 19, 2009

^{xxv} http://www.uscj.org/The_Abortion_Controv5481.html as of August 19, 2009

^{xxvi} *id.*

^{xxvii} *id.*

^{xxviii} *Id.*

^{xxix} <http://urj.org/about/reform/whatisreform/> as of August 22, 2009.

^{xxx} "President Obama's repeal of Global Gag Rule a Major Victory for Women's Right", RAC, January 23, 2009.

^{xxxi} April 12, 2009, <http://rac.org/advocacy/issues/issuewh/>

^{xxxii} April 12, 2009, <http://rac.org/advocacy/issues/issuerepts/>

^{xxxiii} *Id.*

^{xxxiv} "Reform Jewish Movement Opposes Attack on Women's Health" December 19, 2008 News Release from the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, http://rac.org/Articles/index.cfm?id=3158&pge_prg_id=4448

^{xxxv} USCCB News Release 08-203, December 18, 2008, “Bishops Welcome HHS Regulation Protecting Conscience Rights in Health Care.”

^{xxxvi} Telephone conversation between David Wemhoff and Greg Cunningham, September 6, 2001.

^{xxxvii} Priests for Life Press Release, September 10, 2001, posted on *Free Republic*

^{xxxviii} Catholic Citizens of Illinois announcement for Catholic Citizens of Illinois Annual Awards Banquet on September 25, 2007.

^{xxxix} www.priestsforlife.org “What is the Purpose of Priests for Life?”

^{xl} Deborah Lipstadt may consider this a form of “holocaust denial”; the use of this term has not been cleared.

^{xli} *McHugh Chronicles*, p. 104.

^{xlii} ***First Things***, “The Pro-Life Movement as The Politics of the 1960s”, January 2009, p. 70.

^{xliii} *Before the Dawn* by Eugenio Zolli (Ignatius Press, 2008) p. 17.