

NKRTL

Vol. 36, No. 3
1822 MADISON AVE., P.O. BOX 1202, COVINGTON, KY 41012
Web Page Address: www.nkrytl.org

June 2007
(859) 431-6380
Email Address: postmaster@nkrytl.org

2007 CELEBRATION OF LIFE: SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 23

How many people know which are the most important three days of their life?

1. On the date of your conception, you are born into human life.
2. On the date of your Baptism, you are born into the life of God.
3. On the date of your death, you are born into eternal life — either salvation or damnation.

For most of us, those first two events have been taken care of, and far too few have given sufficient reflection to the third important date of that trilogy.

Except for those relatively few in number who die sudden deaths, most of us will find that death is a process, and the handling of it (indeed the anticipatory planning for it) is very important. **If we could ask Terri Schiavo, I am certain that she would recommend a Pro-Life living will, which would have prevented her having been subjected to the painful death of starvation and dehydration, by her husband, in a hospice, although she had not approved such denial of personal care.**

NKRTL Guest Speaker

“Hospice is comfort care focused on the patient and family. It gives persons the time to complete life’s works — forgiving, seeking forgiveness, sharing love, and saying goodbye — by freeing the patient from pain, loneliness, and despair. Hospice should neither hasten nor delay death. Hospice is not curative, and will not heal the patient. It is comfort care.” This is the definition by **Greg Patterson**, NKRTL’s speaker at its upcoming **34th Annual Celebration of Life** scheduled for **Sunday, September 23, 2007**, at the **Drawbridge Estates, London Hall, in Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky.**

Greg is a Certified Public Accountant and a Certified Hospice Administrator and has worked in the healthcare field industry for more than 20 years. He is the founder and President of Covenant Hospice Services based in Lexington, Kentucky, and lives on a small farm in Paris, Kentucky, with his wife and five daughters.



History of Hospice

An early pioneer in the hospice movement (founded originally in the middle of the nineteenth century by the **Irish Sisters of Charity**) was English physician, **Richard Lamerton, M.D.**, who writes: “Deep in our common mind and heart, as old as our civilization itself, is the knowledge that hospitality is a duty owed to the weary traveler and to the sick.”

Dr. Lamerton also demonstrates the lack of need for euthanasia, assisted suicide, etc., stating:

“ . . . once a patient feels welcome, and not a burden to others, once his pain is controlled and other symptoms have been at least reduced to manageable proportions, then the cry for euthanasia disappears. . . . It is our duty so to care for these patients that they never ask for euthanasia. A patient who is longing to die is not being treated properly.”

A modern expert on the subject, **Dr. Ira Byock**, president of the **American Academy of Palliative Medicine**, points out that the control of pain “. . . can always be done.”

And, of course, individual, intentional termination of innocent human life is always prohibited. (“One may not do evil, even to accomplish good.” **Romans 3:8**; cf *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Sections 2280-2283.

Intriguing But Tortuous History of Terminal Care

The modern genesis of euthanasia were the writings in the medical and legal professions in Germany in the 1920’s, even prior to **Adolf Hitler**. After World War II, the world saw the sickening results of that mentality and reverted again to the traditional Judeo-Christian principle of the sanctity of innocent human life. In light of today’s materialism and

| | |
|---|---|
| In this issue... | |
| 2007 CELEBRATION OF LIFE: SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 23 | 1 |
| U.S. SUPREME COURT PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION DECISION: A NEW COURT MAJORITY? | 2 |
| MORE ADULT STEM-CELL SUCCESS | 3 |
| LETTERS, PRAYERS, AND DONATIONS OF SUPPORT | 4 |
| THE POPE SPEAKS! ARE THE BISHOPS LISTENING? | 4 |
| ABORTION AGAIN DOMINATES PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS | 6 |
| “CATHOLIC” PRAYER BREAKFAST FLASHES GREEN LIGHT FOR PRO-ABORTS | 6 |
| “THE PELOSI PROBLEM” | 7 |
| HOW THE GRASSROOTS LOBBYING BILLS WOULD AFFECT CHURCHES AND OTHER NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS | 8 |

secularism, there has been a significant turning away from that principle, begun with the concept of “meaningful life,” which was the basis for the abortion decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade*, and has proceeded now to the point where we are starving and dehydrating to death patients, including in religious institutions, even without their express consent.

Mr. Patterson traces this tragic history from the German impetus through the more recent acceptance of legal euthanasia in the Netherlands, and including in the United States.

The Devil is in the Details

“Hospices have gotten a bad name for a lot of good reasons,” said **Chris Ice**, a consultant with Patterson.

Their organization emphasizes the governance of absolute and uncompromising Pro-Life principles, and careful selection of staff, as well as a prayerful atmosphere.

Mr. Patterson points out that there are approximately 4,000 separate organizations in the hospice business today. Many of them are affiliated with hospitals, including religious institutions, which are advocating and distributing documents authorizing the withdrawal of food and water from non-dying patients — specifically directly contrary to the specific teaching of **Pope John Paul II**, that food and water are ordinary care, and are required to be furnished to every patient, including comatose patients, and that the deprivation of those essential means of life constitutes euthanasia.

The Issues Are Unavoidable

With the exception of a few notable Biblical persons, the ticket out of this world for each of us is death. The securing of that exit in a moral manner, and in a manner as comfortable as possible, should be a matter of major concern to us all, regardless of age or present condition of health, and a concern as well for our loved ones and those to whom we have responsibility.

We all go. It is important how we go — and more important where we go!

Celebration Program

The doors of the Drawbridge will open at 1:15 p.m., followed by the showing of a Pro-Life film at 1:30 p.m. Refreshments and exhibits will be available at 2 p.m., with the program commencing at 2:30 p.m. (Free babysitting is provided.) Tickets (\$10.00 each) can be obtained by sending your check, payable to NKRTL, to Northern Kentucky Right to Life, 1822 Madison, P.O. Box 1202, Covington, Kentucky, 41012, (859) 431-6380.

We hope for a large crowd of NKRTL members who will bring their friends, relatives, pastors, healthcare providers, etc., to give the appropriate study and consideration to these crucial issues, and to be advised by an experienced observer/ participant who has been in the field for many years.

Please come so that you can inform yourself how to meet your moral obligations to your loved ones and to yourself.

U.S. SUPREME COURT PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION DECISION: A NEW COURT MAJORITY?

In April, in the case of *Gonzales v. Carhart*, the U.S. Supreme Court, by a 5 to 4 vote, upheld a statute which criminalized the procedure known as partial-birth abortion. A similar law had been held unconstitutional by the Court just seven years earlier, likewise by a 5 to 4 vote — the difference being the change in personnel on the Court.

The five Pro-Life majority votes in the current case were given by **Justice Kennedy** (who authored the Opinion for the majority), **Chief Justice Roberts** (who had replaced deceased **Chief Justice Rehnquist**, after the earlier decision; Rehnquist had also voted Pro-Life), **Justice Scalia**, **Justice Thomas**, and **Justice Alito** (who had replaced the retired **Justice O'Connor**, who had cast a pro-abort vote in the earlier case, consistent with her pro-abort voting record during her 20-plus years on the Court).

The hardcore pro-abort minority remained the same deadly four — **Ginsburg**, **Stevens**, **Souter**, and **Breyer**.

Justice Kennedy's Majority Opinion opens with the statement that this statute “proscribes a particular manner of ending fetal life,” which is described as intact D & E (dilatation and evacuation). The Opinion goes ahead to describe this procedure as one in which “the doctor extracts the fetus in a way conducive to pulling out its entire body, instead of ripping it apart...The surgeon then forces the scissors into the base of the skull...He spreads the scissors to enlarge the opening...and introduces a suction catheter into this hole and evacuates the skull contents.”

The Court pointed out that this approach “is not the only method of killing the fetus once its head lodges in the cervix... Another doctor, for example, squeezes the skull after it has been pierced so that enough brain tissue exudes to allow the head to pass through. Still other physicians reach into the cervix with their forceps and crush the fetus' skull. Others continue to pull the fetus out of the woman until it disarticulates at the neck, in effect decapitating it.”

The Impact of the Gonzales Case is Extremely Limited.

It must be clearly noted that the Majority Opinion clearly followed and upheld the previous pro-abortion decisions of the Court in *Roe v. Wade* and *Casey v. Planned Parenthood*. It emphasized that the statute “would be unconstitutional if its purpose or effect is to place a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion before the fetus attains viability” (citing *Casey*), and noted that the statute “does not impose an undue burden...Alternatives are available to the prohibited procedure” (i.e., there are other permitted methods of killing the unborn child still available to the abortionist, so that in effect this decision will not save one innocent human life,

and does not address in any way the critical underlying issue — the personhood of the unborn child).

Even **Justice Blackmun**, author of the infamous evil opinion in *Roe*, conceded that: “If this suggestion of personhood [of the unborn child] is established, ...the fetus’ right to life is then guaranteed specifically by the [Fourteenth] Amendment.

As noted by one of NKRTL’s correspondents: “This decision is equivalent to the Nazis saying you can no longer gas the Jews, but you can still shoot them in the head.”

Justice Thomas filed a Concurring Opinion: “I join the Court’s opinion because it accurately applies current jurisprudence...I write separately to reiterate my view that the Court’s abortion jurisprudence, including *Casey* and *Roe v. Wade*, has no basis in the Constitution.” Justice Scalia joined in this Concurring Opinion. Unfortunately, Chief Justice Roberts did not, so that the reader is left wondering if he agrees with his predecessor, Chief Justice Rehnquist, that indeed the earlier pro-abortion decisions of the Court are without constitutional foundation. Additionally, newly appointed Justice Alito did not join the Concurring Opinion.

Net Effect of the Decision

Simply put, Justice Kennedy held that abortions of late-term babies can continue up to the moment of birth, and even the partial-birth abortion technique can be used, as long as the child is killed in utero.

“This ruling,” said Notre Dame’s professor emeritus of constitutional law, **Dr. Charles E. Rice**, “is 1984 and it is grotesque. The decision does nothing to disturb the current rule that the unborn child is a non-person with no right to life under the U.S. Constitution. All that was at stake here was a statutory restriction as to how that non-person may be legally executed.

“The campaign to restrict partial-birth abortion did enhance public awareness of abortion, but that campaign was and is a reflection of the bankruptcy of the pro-life movement.

“In any civilized society, the only coherent question is whether an innocent human being can be legally executed. The answer obviously is ‘no.’ The establishment pro-life movement, by advocating a states’ rights approach and by advocating exceptions, has itself framed the issue not in terms of whether but in terms of which innocent human beings may be executed. The effort to restrict partial-birth abortions frames the issues in terms of how these innocents may be legally executed.”

The comments of **Judie Brown, President of American Life League**, were likewise pointed: “The decision rendered today simply outlaws *most* of a particular type of abortion; it does not limit when an abortion can be done, nor does it limit abortions by other methods up through the moment of birth. The pro-abortion crowd will scream bloody murder, of course. And the Republicans will use today’s decision to distance themselves from ‘radical’ pro-life positions, but in point of fact, what was really won

today? If pro-lifers consider this a victory, then somebody better check what they’re putting in their coffee.”

The Future

It must be remembered also that Justice Kennedy has a long and strong pro-abortion voting record on the Court, so that his adding his vote to tip the scales now slightly in favor of the Pro-Life majority does not augur anything other than his agreement that the legislature had the authority to outlaw this particularly grotesque method of baby killing.

It is apparent that the horrendous precedents of *Roe* and *Casey* are in no danger unless and until there is at least one more appointment to the Court, replacing one of the four hardcore pro-abortionists — Stevens is 87, and Ginsburg is ill with cancer — with a hardcore Pro-Life vote. And so the election of a Pro-Life president remains absolutely critical.

MORE ADULT STEM-CELL SUCCESS

A recent study published by the **American Medical Association** demonstrates another dramatic success in the use of adult stem cells, wherein diabetes was successfully treated in patients ranging in age from 14 to 31 by stem cells produced by their own bodies, with the result that they have been able to discontinue the taking of insulin.

Yet another example of the reality that the only successful therapy achieved in addressing human disease has been with the use of adult stem cells, versus the use of the controversial embryonic stem cells, which require the killing of the newly created unborn child.

Why the Perverse Ignoring of the Overwhelming Medical Evidence?

Committed pro-abortionists, their representatives in the U.S. Congress, their public relations parrots in the public media, and some scientists continue to ignore scientific reality, and push for public funding of embryonic stem-cell research — even though it has been proven uniformly unsuccessful and also involves the destruction of innocent human life. Why?

There are two answers apparent:

(1) If the use of embryonic stem cells were found to be effective in treating disease, then there would be an argument added to the arsenal of the pro-death mentality for the continuation of permissive abortion (and indeed for cloning) to provide a source of babies for cannibalization.

(2) Legislative approval of the use of public funds would give these modern-day Dr. Franksteins direct access to the public pocket for funding their ghoulish experiments.

State of the Public Debate

Pro-Lifers, armed with both morality and scientific truth, have thus far prevailed. Senate Bill 5, which would provide for the funding of these ghoulish practices by the taxpayers, just passed the U.S. Senate, but by a majority less than the

veto-proof margin necessary, since **President Bush** has promised to veto the bill. It would be only the second veto in his six-year term as president, the first being on an identical earlier bill.

Many conscientious senators have supported a separate bill which would publicly fund adult stem-cell research, totally moral and proven scientifically effective.

LETTERS, PRAYERS, AND DONATIONS OF SUPPORT

We are pleased to report that we continue to receive letters of prayer, support, and donations (over and above the 26 we published in our last newsletter). These letters have in fact increased following the **recent public denunciation (unspecified and undocumented) by the Catholic Diocese of Covington**. We publish herewith a few of the encouraging and heartwarming messages received:

“Dear Members, NKRTL: Thank you for continuing to send me your newsletter. I am the vice president of a local Right to Life. I always read your letter cover to cover. We also struggle here to get the message out in our parish and county. Only 3-1/2 years old and always needing to bypass our priest, who gives us little or no support. I was shocked at the goings on in your diocese. The Open Letter to Bishop Foys will be sent around to our Catholic friends. Know that the youth of today are becoming very active. I missed D.C. this year, but the youth continue to see the abomination of abortion. As an OB nurse and mother of six and grandparent of 17, it has troubled my conscience for 30 years. Do not give up. We pray for work to continue.”

** ** *

“Keep up the good work you are doing.”

** ** *

“Enclosed check is in memory of my uncle. Keep up the good work.”

** ** *

“NKRTL - God bless you for all you do to defend Life.”

** ** *

“Enclosed with this letter is a check for \$200 intended as a donation to Northern Kentucky Right to Life. I am especially grateful for all the work you do defending life and keeping our Bishop and local politicians accountable for their actions. In fact, this money I’m giving was originally intended for the Bishop’s Diocesan campaign, and in protest of his anti-life actions, I am giving this money to your organization.

“I pray for the success of your organization and that many hearts and minds will be converted to the pro-life cause. Do not relent or compromise the principles on which

you stand, as your fervent defense of the same principles is what makes your organization relevant in our culture.

“God Bless all of your efforts. My prayers are with you.”

** ** *

“Enclosed is my check for \$25.00 for my membership to NKRTL. I’m sorry for the troubles with Bishop Foys. Please keep up the good work you do.”

** ** *

“Our prayers are with the N. Ky. Right to Life division within our diocese. The NKRTL has labored and fought against the horrors of abortion for too long to have to be treated as they have been.”

** ** *

Two additional families made generous contributions to NKRTL, which they explained were monies that they would have given to the Covington Diocesan fund drive, but chose instead to contribute to NKRTL.

** ** *

“I’m glad that you are doing the work that the Bishop should be doing. I love the newsletter and the candidate questionnaire. Thank you for all you do to inform us and to protect the unborn. God bless.”

** ** *

“I was very offended by the action the Bishop has taken against Northern Kentucky Right to Life’s policy and support of the lives of the unborn children. My support of the Diocesan Parish Annual Appeal Donation will be less this year with 50% going to NKRTL, also in future years until the Diocese is in good standing with NKRTL.”

THE POPE SPEAKS! ARE THE BISHOPS LISTENING?

Catholic Pro-Lifers are encouraged at the recent strong statement by **Pope Benedict XVI**, wherein he reaffirmed, during a recent Mexico City trip, that legislators who vote to permit the killing of unborn children have excommunicated themselves and should be refused Communion.

The Holy Father was asked by a reporter, “Do you agree with the excommunications given to legislators in Mexico City on this question?”, and he replied, “Yes, the excommunication was not something arbitrary. It is part of the Canon Law Code [Canon 915]. It is based simply on the principle that the killing of an innocent human child is incompatible with going in communion with the body of Christ. Legislative action in favor of abortion is incompatible with participation in the Eucharist. Politicians exclude themselves from Communion.”

The particular bishop in question, **Archbishop Norberto Cardinal Rivera Carrera of Mexico City**, is being honored for his action by **Human Life International** with its

Clemens Von Galen Award. This award is named after the German Catholic Bishop of Munster, who spoke out in 1941 against the Nazi euthanasia program, offending the National Socialist dictatorship and putting his own safety on the line, explained **HLI President Fr. Thomas Euteneur**.

Implication for Pro-Abort Politicians in the United States

Pro-abort "Catholic politicians in the United States immediately saw this threat to the public exposure of their patent hypocrisy in their efforts to call themselves believers in the Catholic Church, and on the other hand their pandering to some of their secular constituents by voting to kill unborn babies. They reacted immediately, vociferously, and deceptively. They again sought cover by a distortion of the principle of "separation of church and state," arguing that this religious pronouncement by the Pope "clashes with freedoms guaranteed in our Constitution."

One wonders where in the Constitution politicians are guaranteed membership in any particular church, or the right to dictate to that church its own right to apply its own rules to all of its claimed members.

The Proper Constitutional Relationship Between Church and State

We read routinely that our Constitution mandates a separation of church and state. Wrong! We refer the reader to a marvelous book, *Christianity and the Constitution*, by **John Eidsmoe**, a Protestant who holds university degrees in political science and law, and a doctor of theology, and currently teaches at the Tulsa Seminary of Biblical Languages.

In fact, the phrase was used by **Thomas Jefferson**, in 1802, in a speech he gave to a group of Baptists, and was borrowed from an earlier Baptist leader, **Roger Williams**, who wrote: "when they have opened a gap in the hedge or wall of separation between the garden of the church and the wilderness of the world, God hath ever broke down the wall itself, removed the candlestick, and made His garden a wilderness, as at this day."

According to Williams, the "wall of separation" was to protect the "garden of the church" from the "wilderness of the world." Today, the metaphor has been stood on its head, and the wall is argued to protect the state from the church. Eidsmoe at page 242-243.

The perversion of the true teaching began with a series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions 150 years after the Constitution's ratification, which cases constructed the government as the enemy of religion. The court was dominated by anti-Christian Masons. We refer the reader to the book, *Behind the Lodge Door*, by **Paul A. Fisher**, p. 266.

Their reliance on an extra-constitutional metaphor as a substitute for the text of the First Amendment inevitably distorts constitutional principles governing church-state relationships. There was in fact a consensus among the founders of this nation that religion was indispensable to a system of republican self-government. The clear accuracy of this statement

was verified more than 200 years ago by the statement of President George Washington in his Farewell Address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who would labour to subvert these Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens And let us with caution indulge the

supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion [R]eason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Simple logic and historic reality demonstrate quite clearly that the First Amendment imposes restrictions on civil government only and was not intended to be a restriction upon churches.

For example, the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press was not written to protect the civil state from the press, but to protect a free and independent press from control by government. Similarly, the religious provisions were added to the Constitution to protect religion and religious institutions from the corrupting interference by government, not to protect the state from influence by religion.

The proper question should be: "Should a church enjoy the same rights as any other non-governmental organization to determine its own beliefs, and its own criteria for membership?" Most non-biased listeners would immediately see that that is eminently fair. They would also see that this "church-state separation principle" is not being used, as it was designed, as a shield against governmental interference, but in fact as a sword by which government can not propose to tell the Church how to run its internal affairs. This is precisely contrary to the Constitution, and indeed to a long line of judicial decisions which have uniformly held that in matters of internal discipline and internal rules of the Church itself, secular courts will not even entertain lawsuits, much less make decisions.

This secular effort to deceive the public and to dictate the internal affairs of the Church would be ludicrous, based upon history and law and logic, were it not such a frightening threat to true freedom of religion, guaranteed by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Current Count of Catholic Bishops in the U.S.

Thus far, only 12 out of 183 Catholic bishops in the United States have chosen to give effect to the clear mandate of the canon law of their Church, and deny Communion to those who publicly and continuously sin by their active support of the killing of the most innocent member of the human family. We already know that these pro-abortion politicians don't believe what they say. The real test is now going to be whether these Catholic bishops actually believe the mandatory and fundamental teachings of their own Church!

ABORTION AGAIN DOMINATES PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

A bortion — the little man who wasn't there, the unimportant issue according to the majority of the media — continues to be the two-ton pink elephant in the center of the room which everyone is trying to ignore, unsuccessfully.

The issue has dominated the debates of the Republican presidential candidates. All of the candidates, in varying degrees, adopt Pro-Life stances, except **Rudi Giuliani**, who continues his mind-boggling and intellect-offending posture of "personally hating abortion," but stating, "I ultimately do believe in a woman's right of choice, but I think that there are ways in which we can reduce abortions."

The pro-abort media fail to follow up with the logical questions: "Why would one 'personally hate abort'?" The obvious answer, that we know that it kills innocent unborn babies, is "politically incorrect." Why would we want to reduce them if the promised merits (solving the alleged population problem, protecting women's health, solving poverty problems, etc.) were not lies — and now conclusively proven so after 34 years and 44 million dead babies, dead and injured women, etc.?

Giuliani and Arizona Senator **John McCain** are the only two Republicans on stage who supported **increased federal funding for embryonic stem-cell research** (which of course involves the intentional destruction of a newly conceived child for the purpose of cannibalizing his parts, and which has been uniformly unsuccessful in the private sphere), as opposed to the moral practice of adult stem-cell research, which does not involve the destruction of innocent human life, and in fact has had remarkable successful therapeutic uses in treating a whole variety of diseases.

U.S. Sen. Sam Brownback, U.S. Rep. Ron Paul, Governor Mitt Romney, U.S. Rep. Tom Tancredo, U.S. Rep. Duncan Hunter, and Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee all opposed abortion and argued that *Roe v. Wade* was wrongly decided and should be reversed. Former **Virginia Governor James Gilmore**, who calls himself Pro-Life, nonetheless supports abortion for the first 12 weeks and so of course is himself internally and inexplicably inconsistent.

McCain and Romney also split with the others on the case of **Terri Schiavo**, who was starved and dehydrated to death by her husband. All of the other candidates except McCain and Romney opposed her **ethanasia**, but McCain and Romney insisted that it was wrong for the U.S. Congress to attempt to intervene to save her life (the same Pharisical argument advanced in the abortion issue, which enshrines procedure over substance, and argues that the real issue is "who should decide," rather than the true issue being the fundamental basic right to life of every individual

human being which must be in fact protected by every level of government, at all times).

Meanwhile, the **Democratic candidates** are slavishly following their party line supporting abortion for everyone, federal funding by all of us taxpayers, etc., etc.

"CATHOLIC" PRAYER BREAKFAST FLASHES GREEN LIGHT FOR PRO-ABORTS

The National Catholic Prayer Breakfast conducted its annual affair in the capital in April. Unfortunately, its keynote speaker was **Washington, D.C., Archbishop Donald Wuerl**.

Wuerl was appointed last year to succeed **Cardinal Archbishop Theodore McCarrick**, who was known for his embrace of strident pro-abortion **U.S. Senator Ted Kennedy**, whom he famously embraced and included in the Recessional of the Memorial Mass for **Pope John Paul II** at St. Mathews Cathedral in Washington in April of 2005.

Earlier this year, Archbishop Wuerl was confronted with an important decision of his new tenure in Washington when **Nancy Pelosi**, the just-elected Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and a notorious pro-abortion supporter, announced that she would have an inaugural Mass at Trinity College, a nominally Catholic institution across the road from Catholic University. Thousands of Catholics in Washington, D.C., begged their shepherd, Wuerl, to intervene, but he did nothing. His message to pro-abort "Catholic" politicians could not have been clearer: "You have nothing to fear. Continue with business as usual."

What A Difference A Decade Makes

One could not help but be reminded of the searing image of **Mother Teresa**, addressing **Bill and Hillary Clinton** at the 1994 Prayer Breakfast in Washington. "Any country that accepts abortion is not teaching the people to love," she said, as the Clintons sat stone-faced, "but to use any violence to get what they want. That is why the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion. If a woman murders her own child in her womb, what is it to kill each other?"

The Clintons, and their fellow travelers, the **Gores**, were the only four people in the room who sat silent and grim, as the rest of the crowd erupted in a lengthy standing ovation.

The Clintons and the Gores were profoundly uncomfortable at the non-Catholic Prayer Breakfast in 1994. Unfortunately, at this one in 2007, they might have felt right at home.

Who's Minding the Store?


This increasing dereliction of duty by many Shepherds has caused many Catholics to remember the famous dictum of **Pope St. Gregory the Great**: "It's a dumb dog that doesn't bark when the wolf is among the flock!"

Serious Catholics are becoming increasingly unaccepting of such failed leadership by so many of their bishops. A brief documentary of these recent failures is

contained in the April 2007 Editorial of *The Catholic World Report*, "The Pelosi Problem: When will those in authority use it?", which we republish here (see following page):

(*The World Catholic Report*, Pelosi story on this page)

HOW THE GRASSROOTS LOBBYING BILLS WOULD AFFECT CHURCHES AND OTHER NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

 **American Center for Law & Justice (ACLJ)** urges all to write their congressmen and oppose the so-called “grassroots lobbying bills,” and to write President Bush urging him to veto any such legislation. ACLJ explains:

“By greatly expanding the scope of lobbying regulation, the grassroots lobbying bills (H.R. 4682 and S.1) would affect many churches, public interest organizations, civil organizations, nonprofit and for-profit organizations, and private individuals that voluntarily choose to pay for any medium to distribute their message to the general public.

“*Amendment 20 to S. 1* — proposed by Senator Bennett on January 10, 2007, and co-sponsored by Senator McConnell -- would eliminate the provisions of the Senate bill dealing with ‘grassroots lobbying firms’ and *ensure that churches and many other public interest organizations and individuals would not be subject to lobbying regulations.*

“Many churches, public interest organizations, and other groups and individuals that encourage members of the public to get involved with federal legal issues would be classified as ‘grassroots lobbying firms’ under these bills. These groups and individuals would be required to register with Congress and make certain initial and quarterly disclosures about their activities that would be made available to the public on an easily searchable government website. The bills also include financial and criminal penalties for failure to comply with the registration and reporting requirements.

“For example, if [organizations or individuals] received or spent an aggregate of \$25,000 on salaries, materials, advertisements, etc. within a three-month period to encourage people to support the Federal Marriage Amendment or support the confirmation of a federal judicial nominee, and [their] message reached over 500 people including some that are not members of [their organization], the [organization or individual] would be considered a ‘grassroots lobbying firm’ under S.1.”

The Democratic-controlled Senate and House can effectively, through this legislation, limit Pro-Life organizations from urging others to contact congressmen to support or oppose legislation or appointments to the judiciary or other offices. This is another example of how the pro-death leadership of the Democratic party, which demands tolerance for a number of intrinsic evils (abortion, euthanasia, homosexuality, embryonic stem-cell research, cloning, etc.) will not tolerate anyone they deem intolerant, i.e., anyone who disagrees.

For more information, see ACLJ’s website, www.aclj.org, and search “4682.” Contact your United States representative to protest this bill.