

NKRTL

Vol 34, No. 5
1822 MADISON AVE., P.O. BOX 1202, COVINGTON, KY 41012
Web Page Address: www.nkrtl.org

December 2005
(859) 431-6380
Email Address: postmaster@nkrtl.org

THE TRUE MEANING OF CHRISTMAS

Whether people realize it or not, our celebration of Christmas acknowledges the anniversary of the greatest

event that ever took place in human history: **The Incarnation — God became man.**

The Incarnation demonstrates how precious God values human life. It is such a wonderful creation that the Creator became His creation.

So why do we celebrate Christmas?

Christianity proclaimed the natural law found in everyone's heart: each person's life needs to be respected and served. From this Judeo-Christian principle, there sprang forth the obligation to care for the needs of others.

Although we are gifted differently, some with superior intellects, some good health, and some great wealth, while others have none of these, our hearts tell us we are no better or no more important than anyone else. We all know our good fortunes do not prove God has a greater love for us.

Have We Forgotten?

Our culture has forgotten the reason why we celebrate Christmas. This is why our society has hardened its heart to the value of each human life.

Forty-four hundred surgical abortions each day, added to thousands of abortions by chemicals or abortifacients, reveal how little we, as a people, remember the event we are celebrating.

We now debate the "benefits" of assisted suicide. Denial of food and hydration from a comatose patient is now seen by some as "an act of compassion."

Out of fear of God's gifts to them, many couples have contracepted away some, if not all, of their children.

For 2000 years, Christendom has been a sign of contradiction to the world. For those who proclaim that Jesus Christ is in fact the God-Man, the obligation is especially great to give witness that every human life is unique and precious, and that every person, because they are made in the image of God, will live forever.

Whether a person lives for 100 seconds after conception or 100 years, his physical life is still the beginning of eternity for him. Man, through an evil act, may destroy an innocent human life and thus frustrate God's plan for that person, but that person will still exist forever. That is why human life is sacred.

This is the greatest reason to celebrate: 2000 years of Christendom — two millennia of proclaiming that everyone, without exception, has a life worth living —

Jesus Is Love card

THE TRUE MEANING OF CHRISTMAS
A "TURN AROUND": PRAYER CHANGES HEARTS
JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS - "PLACE NOT YOUR TRUST IN PRINCES" (PSALM 145:3)
AFTER ROE?: A COUNTER OPINION
"POLITICAL CORRECTNESS" PRODUCES BAD POLICY AND MAKES FOR BAD MEDICINE
"CAN YOU NOT WATCH ONE HOUR WITH ME?" - MONTHLY LITURGY FOR LIFE
ABORTION CENTER SIDEWALK COUNSELING MINISTRY
THE RIGHT TO LIFE ACT (HR 552)
YOUR ONE-STOP SHOP — NKRTL OFFICE, 1822 MADISON AVE., COVINGTON, KY
NKRTL CHRISTMAS CARDS
NKRTL MARCH FOR LIFE NEWSPAPER AD

because it is a life that begins eternity for someone God has loved forever and will love forever.

Ralph and Joan Arnsperger, Grace Dillon, Dorothy Grothaus, Ruth Higdon, Jim Johnson, Jack Kenkel, Mark Kloeker, Jim O'Neil, Lou Poole, Rob & Paul Rohling, Kathy Ryan, Omer & Marian Scharold, plus all those who come in to work on the newsletter, and from our Board of Directors, President Robert C. Cetrulo, Vice President Fred Summe, Treasurer Robert Hofacre, Secretary Kathy Murphy, Corresponding Secretary Marge Huth, and Board Members Ralph Arnsperger, Stan Barczak, Dr. Arthur Kunath, Marian Scharold, and Tony Summe.

Additional volunteers are always needed. If you can cover the office one day a month, or work on the newsletter assembly team, please call us: 431-6380.

A "TURN AROUND": PRAYER CHANGES HEARTS

The red 5:15 on the alarm clock stared back at me, while it screeched, demanding that I get up and get moving. All the while I was pondering, "Why am I doing this?" I somehow vaguely remember moving from the hotel room to Christ the King Chapel at Franciscan University in Steubenville, Ohio, and then wondering how I was going to even stay awake through the 6 a.m. Mass.

At the arrival of about 100 students, the Franciscan priest began Mass. Father commented on the sanctity of all human life and our call to give witness. Prayers were offered for young mothers contemplating an abortion, for those who fail in offering her true advice and support, for those who profit from the destruction of an unborn child, and especially for the unborn children.

After the final blessing, the students divided into their cars, anxious to get to their destination. With my daughter, Monica, and with Jessica, a pre-pharmacy student from Montana, I drove out of Steubenville through a dense fog and headed toward Pittsburgh, all the while thinking, "What motivates these college students to do this?"

Within a half hour, rugged Pittsburgh greeted us through the fog, as we continued driving through the streets of this city which had already become alive with traffic, to arrive at a simple building.

After the students greeted each other, they took their positions.

"Wait a minute. Wait a minute," I thought. "Wasn't anybody going to stop and get something to eat for breakfast, not even a doughnut?"

A majority of the students lined up along the sidewalk, and commenced bombarding the abortion clinic on the opposite side of this narrow street with a quiet barrage of prayers and hymns.

Other students, armed with literature, guarded the surrounding corners of the intersection, while a few marched in front of the clinic, waiting for an opportunity to serve.

Christmas Blessings and Best Wishes to All from Northern Kentucky Right to Life volunteers, without whom our organization could not exist:

From the doors of the abortion clinic, exited about ten people in yellow t-shirts, identified as "pro-choice escorts."

I stared at the prayer warriors lining the street, wondering, "Why do they come here and pray? Why don't they just pray in the chapel, in front of the Eucharist, where it's nice and comfortable and free of the noise from the traffic?" As the student leaders of the Rosary announced the Fifth Joyful Mystery, "Don't you know, I must be about my Father's business?" pushed its way into my thoughts. The students kept on praying.

I moved into the street to make way for a man who looked angry and frustrated, and a woman who found the sidewalk the only thing of interest at which to look. Following a footstep behind, was a young girl who obviously had been crying. They walked past the abortion clinic, traveling farther down the street.

As the students had finished a long litany of other prayers, before starting the Sorrowful Mysteries, I noticed again on the other side of the street the man, the woman, and the young girl, this time with some of the student sidewalk counselors offering them a brochure picturing the development of an unborn child. The father took the literature but kept walking, as the threesome were then greeted by the yellow shirt escorts who tried to block and separate the students from talking any further to this family. They disappeared through the front doors of the yellow brick abortion mill.

The Fifth Sorrowful Mystery was announced, as I thought, "This is Calvary. This is where innocent blood is shed." The group of students kept on praying, with no signs of wanting to break up or go elsewhere. They remained, as 2000 years ago did Mary, the women who accompanied her, and St. John. "It was the other ten who always regretted that even though their presence would not have changed the outcome, they had failed Him by not being there," I reminded myself.

Reinforcements arrived. About ten seminarians from St. Vincent Seminary in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, along with a priest, filled out the ranks of the prayer warriors.

A young couple came from the opposite direction. Both were greeted by the students, who again offered them the literature, speaking with them as they walked toward the abortion mill. The escorts wasted no time in pushing and blocking the way of the students, in order to "protect" those coming in from receiving the truth.

As the threesome who had arrived earlier now walked out, the escorts quickly surrounded them to "protect" them from the students, who persistently tried to touch their hearts. The man and the woman were in too much of a hurry to talk. The young lady was too busy crying.

"How many little babies were going to die here today?" saddened my thoughts, depressed my emotions. "How many young girls will leave today, soon to be grieved by the

death of their child, a regret that will simply not go away?”

After about an hour and a half, my legs and back, now tired of standing, told the rest of me that it was time to go. “What good will be accomplished here anyway?” Looking around, it was obvious that I would find no weakening among these students, who were now just starting the Glorious Mysteries. They didn’t want to rush off to do other things on this Saturday morning. Nobody was ready to leave; the students kept on praying.

Looking up, I noticed the couple again coming out of the clinic, heavily guarded by the yellow shirts, but taking time to

exchange remarks with a male student, who was the counselor closest to the entrance.

The students continued with their prayers, as I watched the clock approach 10 a.m. After a few minutes, my daughter grabbed my arm, and announced gleefully that there was a “turn around.”

“A what? What is a turn around?” I questioned.

“That couple, didn’t you see that couple? They came out of the clinic. Dave said that they had changed their minds,” explained Monica. “The counselors are trying to get them to go to one of the pro-life pregnancy centers.”

The students kept on in their prayers, finishing the Rosary, which they followed with other prayers and silent reflection.

Crossing the street, I approached Dave, a Texan, and inquired about what happened.

“I asked them if they had an abortion before, and she said she had four other abortions. I told her about Christ’s mercy, and all three of us started crying. She said she would change her life,” related Dave.

Returning back to the other side of the street, joining the prayer warriors, I noticed a few more students arriving, which I assumed was the “second shift.” It was now 10:30, and a number of the escorts had left.

The students were concluding their prayer and were now offering praise for the “turn around,” for the life saved. “Each day, 4,000 American babies die by abortion,” I thought. “Today it could have been 4,001, but someone was here, someone cared. Soon, this child will bless this couple.”

As the original group headed back to the cars, from the seminarians and the new arrivals came the words, “the First Joyful Mystery.”

With Monica and Jessica, I drove the 50 minutes back to Steubenville. Still excited about the baby saved, they discussed previous Saturdays, on which some days there were “turn arounds.” They were already making plans for next Saturday.

A number of students expressed their intent on now getting something to eat before they caught a nap. I looked around at the students, and my heart filled with hope. They had given up their Saturday morning; they were as tired as I was; and they were filled with joy.

Next year when the University again has Parent Weekend, I am going to get up and make that 6 a.m. Mass, and join those students praying in front of the abortion clinic so I can once again experience the joy of their sacrifice to Jesus for His “unwanted” children, whom these students greatly loved.

To the baby who was “turned around,” Merry Christmas!

Fred H. Summe, Esq.
Vice President, NKRTL

(Photo collage)

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS - “PLACE NOT YOUR TRUST IN PRINCES” (PSALM 145:3)

President **George W. Bush** ran on a platform that he would appoint Supreme Court justices like **Antonin Scalia** and **Clarence Thomas** (both avowed Pro-Lifers!). He appointed several judges to the U.S. Courts of Appeals who had such staunch previous Pro-Life records, but has nominated candidates for the first two U.S. Supreme Court vacancies whose past records are ambiguous.

John G. Roberts, whom Bush nominated to replace deceased Pro-Life **Chief Justice William Rehnquist**, has already been confirmed as the new Chief Justice of the United States. He has never made an expression of his views on the issue in his 50 years of life (32 years *post-Roe v. Wade*). His background as a lawyer is a mixed bag, at best, having volunteered his services to defend Playboy Foundation’s advocacy of the publication of pornography in prime time on television, and the homosexuals’ attack upon the voters of Colorado who decided to defend the average citizen against special rights claimed by the homosexuals in terms of employment and tenancy. (See details in our September 2005 newsletter.)

Activists in the Pro-Life movement were deeply divided over Roberts’ nomination, some enthusiastically welcoming it, and others expressing serious reservations and in some instances outright opposition.

We publish for the reflection of our readers a thoughtful editorial in the October 2005 *New Oxford Review*:

“When President Bush announced the nomination of John G. Roberts for the Supreme Court on July 19, the next day’s newspapers gave us everything we needed to know about Roberts. As we noted in our New Oxford Note (Sept., pp. 15-16, 18): ‘When Roberts was asked by the Senate Judiciary Committee for his appointment to the Court of Appeals on April 30, 2003, about his views on *Roe*, he said: ‘*Roe vs. Wade* is an interpretation of the Court’s prior precedents. You can read the opinion beginning not just with *Griswold*, which is the case everybody begins with, but going even further back in other areas involving the right to privacy.... And what the Court explained in that case was the basis for the recognition of that right [to privacy].... *Roe vs. Wade* is the settled law of the land.... There’s nothing in my personal views that would prevent me from fully and faithfully applying that precedent.’” We also noted: ‘On the night Roberts was appointed by Bush (July 19), MSNBC ran a banner saying, ‘ROBERTS: OVERTURN ROE V. WADE.’ White House aide Steve Schmidt called MSNBC to complain. A correction followed the next evening (July 20): ‘According to the White House, Judge Roberts does not oppose *Roe v. Wade*.’

“President Bush promised to appoint Supreme Court

As the White House continued its efforts to shore up the shaky nomination of Harriet Miers, under vigorous attack from many strong voices in the right to life movement,

justices ‘like Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas.’ Scalia and Thomas voted to overturn *Roe*. But Roberts won’t vote to overturn *Roe*.

“As **Patrick Buchanan** writes in *The Wanderer* (Aug. 4): ‘With his nomination of John Roberts to the Supreme Court, the president consciously chose to avoid battle with the left. ... There were any number of potential nominees — Edith Jones of the Fifth Circuit, Michael Luttig of the Fourth (whose judicial records were stronger than Roberts’ and whose battle scars as warrior-conservatives were immensely more impressive) — who were passed over.... Their nomination would have ignited a battle — one the president would win.... One wonders, why did the president not choose one of them? Why did he decide not to fight?’ The answer is easy: Because Bush doesn’t care about abortion (e.g., see our New Oxford Note, June 2005, pp. 21-22).

“For pro-lifers, the Democrats are by and large the enemy, and the Republicans are by and large false friends. Either way we lose.”

The editorial also had a very insightful quote from **Robert Bork**, a former federal judge whose U.S. Supreme Court nomination was defeated by pro-abortion Democrats who then controlled the Senate. Judge Bork noted: “A moderate is a judge who is unpredictable on many issues but who on major cultural issues — abortion, homosexual sodomy, pornography, religion, affirmation action, etc. — invariably votes with the cultural Left.”

Bush’s Second Supreme Court Nominee

Next President Bush nominated to replace the retiring pro-abortion justice, **Sandra Day O’Connor**, his personal lawyer, **Harriet Miers** — yet another candidate with a record which, at best, ambiguous.

Miss Miers, who has served as personal counsel to President Bush for several years, is a former President of the Texas Bar Association, and a member of a prestigious Dallas law firm. At one point, she pushed an effort (unsuccessfully) to have the American Bar Association rescind its “pro-choice” policy, and take a referendum of its membership on the issue.

A social friend of hers, **Nathan Hecht**, a former member of the Texas Supreme Court and a co-parishioner with Miss Miers at a Dallas evangelical church says that he has heard her say, “I am convinced that life begins at conception,” and he believes that “she is Pro-Life.”

On the other hand, she has made political donations to a pro-abortion U.S. senator from Texas, and to the stridently pro-abortion presidential candidate **Al Gore**, who openly campaigned upon the premise that he would never appoint a judge unless that candidate was committed to the defense of *Roe v. Wade*!

including Gary Bauer, Pat Buchanan, and others, unfortunately the signals continued to be mixed. For example, on the same day that the White House released a

statement showing that Miss Miers had, as a candidate for Dallas, Texas city council some years ago, signed a right to life questionnaire there confirming her support for a constitutional amendment to reverse *Roe v. Wade*, Miss Miers on the same date issued her own statement that no one knows where she stands on *Roe v. Wade* and no one speaks for her on that issue.???

Division in the Pro-Life Movement

Again, Pro-Life activists are deeply divided over this nomination. **Dr. James Dobson**, head of Focus on the Family, supports the nominee, while his close friend **Gary Bauer**, who formerly headed up Focus on the Family, and was himself a Pro-Life candidate for the presidency in the Republican primaries of 2000, describes himself as deeply disappointed over this nomination. Also highly critical of the nomination is **William Kristol**, Editor of the Washington, D.C. conservative magazine, *Weekly Standard*, and **Patrick Buchanan**, long-time Pro-Life activist and twice a candidate for the presidency, once in the Republican primaries and later, after being excoriated by his own party, a candidate of a third party.

Perhaps the most insightful analysis was made by Bauer on an interview by **Al Kresta** on Ave Maria Radio, carried locally on 740 AM. Bauer began by pointing out that Miers' nomination certainly did not comply with the President's commitment to appoint justices like Scalia and Thomas, and constituted a breach of fidelity with the Pro-Life movement, which had clearly had provided the margin of his victory in his last presidential race — specifically on this issue of judicial appointments.

Bauer said he found it very difficult to understand why the President would have overlooked a significant field of eminently qualified candidates, including sitting judges on the U.S. Courts of Appeals, who have Pro-Life records — other than the conclusion that Bush decided to avoid a fight with the militant pro-abortion members of the U.S. Senate, which constitutes nearly all of the Democratic senators, and indeed some of the Republican senators as well. On the other hand, another commentator noted that no president of the United States since 1937 has suffered a rejection of a Supreme Court nominee, when his party was in the majority in the Senate. In 1937, **President Franklin D. Roosevelt** failed in his effort to "pack the court," i.e., promoting legislation that would expand its numbers and give him more appointments so as to change their decisions.

Bauer pointed out that every time there is a "stealth" candidate, i.e., one about whom little or nothing is known on these issues, the only side that is fooled is the Pro-Life side.

He pointed out, for example, the nomination of **David Souter** by the previous President Bush (**George H.W. Bush**), who of course has turned out to be a militant pro-abortion vote on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Bauer's most persuasive advocacy came in the form of his response to a question as to how he would handle a nomination to the Supreme Court. He responded that he would send down the name of his nominee to the U.S. Senate with a message that said:

"I'm nominating _____ to the U.S. Supreme Court. The candidate is extremely well qualified professionally, and holds the Judeo-Christian principles of the sanctity of all innocent human life — a principle in which I believe and upon which I was elected. The confirmation is up to you, and we will let the American public decide."

Bauer explained that the nomination of candidates who in 50 or 60 years of living have not taken positions on the most crucial moral issue of our time, i.e., the destruction in the womb of 4,000 innocent babies daily in the United States, hardly inspires us to believe that suddenly if they become members of the U.S. Supreme Court that they are going to recognize and act upon that priority value, i.e., the sanctity of all innocent human life.

Bauer then stated what a bad message is being sent by the President's nomination of such people, to lawyers and others who might aspire to such high office. It is saying that it is perfectly all right for people in public life to publicly declare that they defend this current slaughter of the innocents, but that if you hold the contrary view, you'd better keep it to yourself if you desire to advance in public life.

President Bush Withdraws Miers Nomination, At Her Request

On October 27, President Bush withdrew the nomination of Harriet Miers, at her request made to him the evening before, October 26. The "explanation" for the withdrawal was the fact that the Senate was insisting upon receiving documents regarding Miss Miers' service as White House counsel to President Bush, which the Bush administration maintained would compromise the "executive privilege," and since this would remain an ongoing dispute and impair the likelihood of her successful confirmation, the President was withdrawing her nomination, at her request.

Swept under the rug by this "spin" is the reality of the ongoing "conservative revolt," nationwide, against President Bush's nominee, whose record on the clear crucial issue in this nomination, i.e., the destruction of unborn babies, is at best ambiguous.

It is not coincidental that Miss Miers' nomination was withdrawn the very evening that the most recent damaging evidence was disclosed, i.e., certain speeches she had made in 1993, to women's groups, wherein she praised "self-determination" on abortion (echoing the radical language in the Supreme Court decision of *Casey*, which had affirmed *Roe v. Wade* with the immoral and indeed insane language: "At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning of the universe and the mystery of life." — authored by another Supreme Court Republican appointee, Justice Anthony Kennedy).

Miss Miers' speech in 1993 also praised such radical pro-abortionists as **Barbara Streisand** and then-Texas Governor **Ann Richards**.

Principled Criteria for Selection of a Supreme Court Nominee.

U.S. Senator Sam Brownback (R., Kan.), a committed and uncompromising Pro-Life activist, dared to advance the candid position: Why is a candidate's pro-abortion stance a valid litmus test for the liberals, and a candidate's pro-life stance an invalid litmus test for traditionalists? He pointed out that **U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg**, appointed by our past pro-abort **President Bill Clinton**, had served as general counsel for the pro-abortion **American Civil Liberties Union**. Her nomination was not challenged. Indeed, unfortunately, she was confirmed with only three dissenting votes, thereby gathering obviously the votes of the majority of the Republican senators in addition to the pro-abort Democrats.

Sen. Brownback advocated a truly revolutionary — and morally defensible — approach to this question of selection of Supreme Court justices. He suggested a candid disclosure of the nominee's position on the profound issues of the day, including of course abortion. He suggested that the American public is ready for a public debate in the Senate on these issues.

This is the same position that had earlier been articulated by **Gary Bauer**, a Newport, Kentucky native, on Catholic Radio, *supra*.

Amazingly simple! Amazingly straightforward. It is time to draw the line in the sand!

President Bush Nominates Judge Samuel Alito

President Bush has now nominated **Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr.** to the seat on the Supreme Court to be vacated by Justice O'Connor. Judge Alito is a 15-year member of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, a very liberal circuit in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His record seems to suggest cause for optimism to the Pro-Life movement.

In the famous case of *Casey v. Planned Parenthood*, which ultimately went to the Supreme Court, there was involved a Pennsylvania state statute which, among other things, required a woman who was considering an abortion to notify her husband of her intention. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit held that that restriction was unconstitutional, as constituting "an unreasonable burden upon the woman's right to choose," established in *Roe v. Wade*. Judge Alito was the sole dissenting judge from that court, and would have upheld the policy decision of the Pennsylvania legislature as a reasonable measure.

The "Demologues," Senators Kennedy (D., Mass.), Schumer (D., New York), etc., consider it radical that the Pennsylvania legislature would suggest, or a court uphold, the concept that a father has a right to at least have a voice in trying to persuade his wife not to kill their unborn child — and they have so weighed in already in this nomination process.

Serious Pro-Lifers have welcomed the President's nomination of Alito as an appropriate (if late) nomination, setting before the U.S. Senate, and therefore the American people, this long-delayed debate concerning the Judeo-

The question then arises as to how *Roe v. Wade* would be reversed. Unfortunately, many, such as **Life Issues**

Christian underpinnings of this nation. Conservative activist **Gary Bauer** of Newport, Kentucky, has enthusiastically endorsed the nomination of Judge Alito: "At least now the President is having a battle with his political opponents and not with his friends. I will help him in any way I can."

An "Ideologue"?

A darling word of the "irreligious left," used against the "religious right," is "ideologue." The media employs this phrase with particular contempt, but never applies it against the left. "Ideologue" is defined in *Webster's Dictionary* as "an advocate or adherent of a particular ideology." (Notice that this is not limited to traditional, or radical, left or right.)

"Ideology" is defined as "a systematic body of concepts, especially about human life or culture...the integrated assertions, theories and aims that constitute a socio-political program."

Obviously, Webster did not have "a political agenda."

Today, it is suggested (covertly, and sometimes overtly) by the media, and the irreligious left, that those who hold the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic of the respect of the sanctity of all innocent human life are "ideologues," while that phrase with its modern pejorative implication is never ascribed to the atheist left.

For all of the power and indeed media monopolizing influence of the atheist left, this Judeo-Christian "ideology" has not been effectively erased from the collective conscience of the American people. They elected this president, clearly by all of the polls, upon this sole crucial question of his guarantees of selection of Supreme Court justices who held their views on these crucial issues. The indescribably huge importance of Supreme Court appointments was brought into clear focus by the statement of **Ann Coulter**, national syndicated columnist who has been a long time supporter of President George W. Bush. When asked on national TV as to whether, if faced with the alternative, would she jettison President Bush, or a Pro-Life appointment to the Supreme Court, answered unhesitatingly, in that context, the choice is clear. George Bush is not worth one Supreme Court Pro-Life justice.

Such rare candor in public life brings to mind the courageous and principled statement of **St. Thomas More**, who, when he was about to be beheaded by his former friend, **King Henry VIII**, for his refusal to abandon the teachings of his faith for the pragmatic demands of the king, stated: "I die the king's good servant, but God's first."

Absolute Crucial Nature of Supreme Court Appointments

To reverse *Roe v. Wade*, there would need to be replaced three pro-abort votes on the Court with three strong Pro-Life votes. One essential would be the replacement of the pro-abort **Sandra Day O'Connor** (retiring) with a Pro-Life candidate, the current nomination for which is Judge Samuel Alito.

Institute in their recent article, argued that a reversal of *Roe v. Wade* would simply mean returning the matter to the

states, and we know that the legislatures of many states would not pass 100 percent Pro-Life laws. However, this concession is again, unfortunately, a compromise concession which has been going on, as pointed out in a recent article by Notre Dame Constitutional Law Professor **Charles Rice**, “with the establishment pro-life movement and Catholic bishops’ apparatus since the early 1980s.”

See the following article as to the principled method of *Roe*-reversal, applying the clear constitutional principle that the unborn child is protected by the U.S. Constitution, with respect to his/her right to life.

AFTER ROE?: A COUNTER OPINION

A “Guest Commentary” in the 10/21/05 *Messenger* (the newspaper of the Catholic Diocese of Covington, Kentucky) opened with the assumption that if *Roe v. Wade* were overturned, this would not mean the end of abortion on demand, but instead the referral of the issue back to state legislatures for their individual decisions, which will most likely result in some states continuing abortion on demand.

Many, unfortunately, have accepted the core principle of *Roe v. Wade*, which depersonalized the unborn child.

Notre Dame Constitutional Law Professor Charles Rice points out that that is the principle that underlay the *Dred Scott* decision: “slaves were property rather than persons. It is also the principle involved in the Nazi depersonalization and extermination of the Jews and other target classes. To ‘overrule’ *Roe*, in the correct meaning of that term, would be to hold that every human being, from fertilization, is a ‘person’ entitled to the constitutional right to life. That would forbid the states and the federal government to withhold the protection of the homicide laws from the youngest persons, i.e., those in the womb.”

In fact, such a position is not novel, and was the holding of a federal court in Ohio, prior to *Roe v. Wade*, in 1970, in the case of *Steinberg v. Brown*: **“Once human life has commenced, the constitutional protections found in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments impose upon the state the duty of safeguarding it.”**

In fact, that opinion is consonant with the true intention of the Fourteenth Amendment, as stated by its prime sponsor, Ohio Congressman **John A. Bingham**, who noted that the amendment was “universal” and applied to “any human being,” and consistent also with this nation’s foundational document, the Declaration of Independence, which guarantees our prime right, the right to life, and points out that that right comes not from government but from “the Creator.”

Even the *Roe v. Wade* court cited (and then ignored) evidence discovered by the **American Medical Association** of the process of fertilization, which then became the motivation for the passage of anti-abortion statutes throughout the United States, from 1857 to 1871. The AMA passed resolutions condemning abortion as “unwarrantable destruction of human life” and described “the independence

and actual existence of the child before birth as a living being. ...We had to deal with human life. In a matter of less importance, we could entertain no compromise. An honest judge on the bench would call things by their proper names. We could do no less.”

It is undeniable that in the years following this new and dramatic medical discovery of the existence of an individual human being from conception on, 36 states had passed anti-abortion statutes, protecting the life of the unborn child prior to the date of the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (1868), which guaranteed the right to life of all persons.

A study of two of the most complete and authoritative dictionaries in the English language, the *Oxford English Dictionary of 1970* and *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*, as well as the 1828 and 1865 editions of Daniel Webster’s *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, are illuminating. All relevant definitions define “person” in terms of humanness, and the state of being a human being. “Human” is then defined in these dictionaries in terms of “man,” and “man” is defined in terms of “humanness” or in terms of individual membership in the human race. Thus the circle of definitions is complete. Neither the word “birth” nor anything related thereto is mentioned, in any of the numerous and varying definitions of “person,” “human,” “human being,” or “man.”

In the intervening 100 years before *Roe*, the courts were expanding other rights of the unborn child, in terms of the right to inherit from a father who predeceased the birth of the unborn child, property rights, and rights for injuries sustained in the womb resulting in the death of the unborn child before birth. He/she was still deemed a “person” for all of these purposes. I have myself handled such cases to successful jury verdicts, and affirmed by the highest courts in Kentucky, prior to *Roe v. Wade*. The courts indeed continue the schizophrenic and hypocritical dichotomy of upholding all of these other rights of the unborn child, post-*Roe*, while denying his most fundamental right protected by the Constitution, the right to life.

This same principle has long been acknowledged in American law, long before the decision of *Roe v. Wade*, as shown in the most widely-used legal encyclopedia in the United States: “Biologically speaking, the life of a human being begins at the moment of conception in the mother’s womb, and as a general rule of construction in the law, a legal personality is imputed to an unborn child for all purposes which would be beneficial to the infant after its birth.” 42 Am Jur 2d Infants, Sec. 2.

The matter is medically indisputable as well: “It is scientifically correct to say that an individual human life begins at conception, when the egg and sperm join to form the zygote, and that this developing human always is a member of our species in all stages of its life. There is not one medical text in use in one medical school in this country that teaches to the contrary.” Dr. Micheline Matthews-Roth, M.D., Principal Research Associate of the Harvard University Medical School.

“An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun.” Planned Parenthood World Population, 1963 (before it got

into the lucrative abortion business).

An honest Supreme Court would call things by their "proper names" and acknowledge the irrefutable truth that the child in the womb is a human being, and a "person" within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment, and entitled to the constitutional protection of its right to life, based upon the compelling authorities cited above.

The severance of "human being" from "personhood," attempted by the Roe court, is arbitrary, artificial, unscientific, and contrary to history and traditional constitutional interpretation, and ludicrous when we consider that the same Supreme Court has determined fleshless corporations to be "persons" within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The application, of course, of this patently clear constitutional principle depends upon the personnel at the U.S. Supreme Court, which of course depends upon the political process of presidential selection.

Truth remains truth, regardless of its acceptance or nonacceptance at any given time. Serious pro-lifers recognize the necessity of rejecting sham, or its sister, compromise.

(This Guest Commentary has been submitted by Robert C. Cetrulo, J.D. Mr. Cetrulo is President of Northern Kentucky Right to Life Committee, a licensed attorney for 47 years including 15 years a U.S. Magistrate Judge, Past President of the Local Bar Association and the State Bar Association, and a Professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law at the university level, and author of *That Reminds Me of a Story...Reflections of a Pro-Life Warrior*, available at www.nkyrtl.org or 1822 Madison Avenue, Covington, Kentucky 41012.)

"POLITICAL CORRECTNESS" PRODUCES BAD POLICY AND MAKES FOR BAD MEDICINE

Three articles published in *The Challenger* (Amanda Van Benschoten, 10/16/05, Ann Holstein, 10/9/05, and Patricia Scheyer, 10/30/05) dealt with the subject of breast cancer, particularly appropriate since October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. The articles, however, are more noteworthy by what they don't say, as opposed to what they do say.

Each of the authors talks about multiple causes of breast cancer, including "alcohol consumption...smoking...obesity...family history, age of menses...never having a pregnancy...failure of regular exercise," but neither mentions prominent medically identified causes of breast cancer: *induced abortion and hormonal birth control pills*: the pink elephants in the center of the living room that no one wants to recognize.

The authors do identify estrogen as a known carcinogen, as has been recognized by the National Cancer

Institute. The authors also condemn long-term hormone replacement therapy (HRT), obviously because of its estrogen content, but they fail to point out that the same estrogen is contained in the hormonal birth control pill, routinely delivered to young women on a long-term basis even though they have no disease or pathological condition justifying the use of this carcinogenic medication. One of the articles states that "genetic factors play the strongest role..." In fact, genetic factors constitute, according to epidemiological studies, only 5 to 10 percent of all of the breast cancer cases. **Angela Lanfranchi, M.D., *Breast Cancer: Risks and Prevention*, www.bcpinstitute.org.**

"Abortion causes breast cancer just like cigarette smoking causes lung cancer," says Dr. Lanfranchi, who specializes in breast surgery.

Dr. Lanfranchi explains in her lectures that the estrogen level in a woman's body shoots up by 2,000 percent by the end of the first trimester of pregnancy, that the lobules (milk vessels) in the breast are increased in number, but remain Type 1 and 2 (the known primary locus of breast cancer). The lobules do not mature to Type 3 (those which biologically protect against breast cancer) until after 32 weeks, so that when there is an induced abortion, before 32 weeks of gestation, the woman is denied the protection of breast lobule differentiation and is left with an increased number of immature and cancer-vulnerable Type 1 and 2 lobules. This, however, is not what occurs with a miscarriage, since the estrogen levels are not as high.

This biological explanation of the increase in breast cancer by abortion finds statistical support in the epidemiological studies. In 28 out of 37 international studies done since 1957 (a meta-analysis of which was done by nationally recognized epidemiological expert Dr. Joel Brind), there has been demonstrated a relationship of induced abortion with breast cancer. Dr. Brind's meta-analysis, which was published in October 1996 by the *British Medical Association Journal of Epidemiology*, found a "remarkably consistent, significant positive association between induced abortion and breast cancer incidences. ...the increased risk is seen both in prospective and retrospective studies from around the world, in populations with the widest imaginable differences in ethnicity, diet, and socio-economic and lifestyle factors." Many of these studies were done by the National Cancer Institute, which continues to decline to educate the public concerning this known risk.

One of these NCI studies was done by Dr. Janet Daling, who is herself pro-abortion, and who admits that the scientific information has been corrupted by political agendas. She found that an induced abortion before age 45 increased the risk of breast cancer by 50 percent. If the abortion was done before age 18, the breast cancer risk was increased by 150 percent.

The *British Journal of Cancer* just published the results of a British cancer research meeting in 2004, which found that "the best predictor of breast cancer among British women is legal induced abortion." Patrick Carroll, Director of Research for the Pension and Population Institute in London, a participant in that meeting, called nulli parous

(childless women) abortions “highly carcinogenic.”

Dr. Lanfranchi points out that in 1975, 1 in 12 women could anticipate experiencing breast cancer, whereas that number had increased by 2004 to 1 in 7. Thus we have a 40 percent increase in breast cancer in the past 30 years – curiously the years immediately following the legalization of abortion in the United States by *Roe v. Wade*, and the development of the hormonal birth control pill. Dr. Lanfranchi points out also that it is “not your grandma anymore – it’s 30 year olds,” experiencing this disease which historically was a disease of aged women.

A clear exposition of the biological mechanism explaining the abortion and birth control breast cancer connection may be seen by the reader in an interview conducted during Dr. Lanfranchi’s recent visit to Northern Kentucky, which was taped and will be shown on **Insight Cable, Channel 17, throughout the months of December and January on Monday at 10:00 p.m. and Friday at 10:30 p.m.**

Someone once said that in war, the first casualty is truth. In the pro-death community’s relentless war on the unborn (and on women), regrettably this is being proven again to be true. Isn’t it curious that several of these breast cancer organizations conducting marches and collecting charitable funds (such as the **Komen Foundation**) themselves make donations to Planned Parenthood – the largest propagator of abortion and hormonal birth control pills – known major contributors of these medical tragedies which they profess to regret!

“Political correctness” produces bad policy and makes for bad medicine!

“CAN YOU NOT WATCH ONE HOUR WITH ME?” - MONTHLY LITURGY FOR LIFE

NKRTL was one of the initiators, nine years ago, of the prayer witness for life at the abortuary on Auburn Avenue in Cincinnati, Ohio. It began on one Saturday a month, and progressed to two Saturdays a month (the second and the fourth) and has resulted in the closing of the abortuary there on those two days.

Helpers card

The grace of God has now sent us another faithful Priest who is willing to undertake the third Saturday of each month (the inaugural of which is **January 21, 2006** – the day before the 33rd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, and the 10th anniversary of our Helpers ministry locally), **Fr. Philip DeVous** of the Diocese of Covington, Chaplain at Thomas More College.

Covington Diocesan priest, **Fr. John Schulte**, pointed out to the congregation at the Annual Diocesan Pro-Life Mass in October of 2005 that if there were indeed wider participation in this peaceful, prayerful witness for life, that we would indeed be successful in closing down the abortuary.

Will you participate?

ABORTION CENTER SIDEWALK COUNSELING MINISTRY

Peaceful, prayerful, and effective abortion sidewalk counseling methods and techniques will be taught at the **Holy Spirit Center**, Room 116, 5440 Moeller Avenue, Norwood, Ohio, on **Thursday, December 8** (Feast of the Immaculate Conception) **from 9 a.m. until noon**. **Mr. Paul Robertson** will be the facilitator (**513-791-0295**).

Mr. Robertson explained that the most important aspects of successful sidewalk counseling involved personal prayer, prayer support, showing non-judgmental love and respect to the mothers, and just showing up and being used as God’s instruments at the abortion centers.

Reservations are not necessary. Please come and learn from the seven-year valuable sidewalk counseling experience of Mr. Robertson how you can help in what **Pope John Paul II** has called “the most important work in the world.”

THE RIGHT TO LIFE ACT (HR 552)

One of the true heroes of the Pro-Life movement, former Congressman **Robert K. Dornan**, has joined the team of that truly committed and uncompromising national right to life organization, **American Life League**, to dedicate his time to refocusing attention upon the **Right to Life Act (HR 552)**, which has again been introduced this year into the U.S. House of Representatives, under the prime sponsorship of **Rep. Duncan Hunter (R., Calif.)**.

This bill makes findings that the unborn child is truly a human being and a person within the meaning of the U.S. Constitution, and thus entitled to constitutional protection of his/her right to life, in every instance. Those who insist that the Congress cannot trump the Supreme Court decision of *Roe v. Wade* have not taken into account the fact that the

Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which establishes the right to life, also contains a section that grants to the Congress the "...power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

HR 552 currently has 60 co-sponsors in the U.S. House. All Pro-Lifers are encouraged to write to members of the

Kentucky delegation to the House, to inquire if they have signed on as co-sponsors to this monumental piece of legislation — and if not, when we may expect their doing so. The members are:

U.S. Representative Geoff Davis
1541 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-3465 phone
(202) 225.0003 fax
Email by first clicking on geoffdavis.house.gov

U.S. Representative Anne Northup
2459 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-5401 phone
(202) 225-5776 fax
Email by first clicking on northup.house.gov

U.S. Representative Ben Chandler
1504 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-4706 phone
Email by first clicking on chandler.house.gov

U.S. Representative Harold (Hal) Rogers
2406 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-4601 phone
Email via www.house.gov/rogers

U.S. Representative Ron Lewis
2418 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-3501 phone
Email by first clicking on www.house.gov/ronlewis

U.S. Representative Ed Whitfield
301 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-3115 phone
(202) 225-3547 fax
Email by first clicking on whitfield.house.gov

YOUR ONE-STOP SHOP -- NKRTL OFFICE, 1822 MADISON AVE., COVINGTON, KY

Give a Gift of Life This Christmas

Fill out your Christmas gift list with a gift of life -- a gift that will be of incalculable value to the receiver, the giver, and the unborn babies. Office hours are from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday through Friday or by special appointment by calling **431-6380**.

In addition to Christmas cards, there are all occasion cards and thank you cards in packs of 10 (\$4 each picked up at the office or \$5 each mailed to your home), bumper stickers (both magnetic and stick-on), precious feet and hands, buttons, license plates, static cling for the windows, and a variety of Pro-Life books and tapes and materials, inspirational and teaching.

In addition, we now have available the marvelous inspirational and teaching book by our President Robert C. Cetrulo, *That Reminds Me of a Story...Reflections of a Pro-Life Warrior* — an enthralling account of 32 years of Pro-Life activism, presenting an accurate snapshot of life at the end of the 20th century, and including a treasure trove of citations, references, and documents.

A complimentary inscribed copy of Mr. Cetrulo's book will be sent to anyone who donates \$50.00 or more to NKRTL Educational Fund, Inc., a charitable corporation and therefore a tax deduction.

(NKRTL Christmas card story)

NKRTL MARCH FOR LIFE NEWSPAPER AD

IF VICTIMS COULD SIGN!!

PRO-LIFE NEWSPAPER AD NEEDS YOUR NAME!

Although only some are able to go to Washington, D.C. for the magnificent **March for Life, Monday, January 23, 2006, we all can make a **public statement against abortion by placing our name in the NKRTL newspaper ad, on this 33rd anniversary of the infamous Supreme Court decision legalizing the killing of unborn children.****

This ad will urge the passage of a Human Life Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, an amendment which will declare that all human beings, from the moment of fertilization, are persons entitled to legal protection of their right to life.

Copies of this ad are sent to the President, all members of the U.S. Supreme Court, and the entire Kentucky delegation to the U.S. Congress, constituting your statement that abortion must be stopped and that your efforts will persist in that respect.

Although the Supreme Court has wrongfully created a definition denying personhood to the unborn child, that cannot change the reality that these babies are human persons, unique and special.

NKRTL is again providing you your opportunity to meet your obligation to "stand up for life," as pointed out by **Pope John Paul II.**

We are enclosing an envelope for your use to list your name and those of your family, in memory of the 40+ million American babies who have destroyed by surgical abortion in the past 33 years.

For your convenience, feel free to print your name(s) below and enclose this newsletter page, or print your name(s) on a separate sheet of paper, and mail, along with your donation, in the enclosed envelope.

A \$3.00 per name donation is suggested, or if you would like to list all the names of your children, a \$10.00 per family donation is requested to cover the cost of this ad.

Larger donations are needed and greatly appreciated. Thank you!

Deadline for names: January 10, 2006.

NAMES:
