

Lifeline

*A Legal Network
in Support of Life*

A P U B L I C A T I O N O F T H E L I F E L E G A L D E F E N S E F O U N D A T I O N

I N T H I S I S S U E

- 2** Cloning Reality
- 3** Interview with Gary Keep
- 5** UPDATE: Rocklin and F.A.C.E.
- 6** Pro-Life Family Lives Beliefs
- 11** STUDENT ESSAYS:
 - “Hope for a Pro-Life Future”
 - “The Real Women’s Movement”

Anne Starr

Choose Life License Plates for California

California could have a pro-adoption license plate soon if state lawmakers listen to a grassroots appeal in favor of a mother’s right to choose life. The idea for a new category of vanity plates faces fierce opposition, however, from the abortion industry.

If passed, Senate Bill 251 by Sen. Ray Haynes (R-Riverside) would raise money through the sale of special “Choose Life” license plates. The funds would go to non-profits that counsel and aid expectant mothers who carry their child to term and then allow the child to be adopted. Agencies that include abortion among their services would receive no money from the license plate sales. The bill is modeled on a successful “Choose Life” vehicle tag program in Florida.

California’s powerful pro-abortion forces are determined to block the license proposal from getting to the Senate floor. For example, the Transportation Committee will be having a special hearing to attempt to ban specialty plates in California. These are the lengths pro-abortion forces will go to in order to ensure there is no choice when it comes to abortion and adoption.

Supporters of the “Choose Life” idea want lawmakers to know that thousands of California motorists would buy the bright yellow plates. To get the message across, promoters of the idea want potential buyers to send postcards, write letters and make phone calls to lawmakers.

If logic prevailed, the so-called pro-choice movement would tolerate the proposed

*“Allow us the choice,” she
said in challenge to those
to preach that a woman
has a right to choose.*

“Be truly pro-choice.”

license plate, according to Dana Serrano, director of the Women’s Resource Network. “Allow us the choice,” she said in challenge to those to preach that a woman has a right to choose. “Be truly pro-choice.” In reality, abortion supporters fear any movement that might hurt business, Serrano indicated. She holds no false expectations for the license’s chances of success. “There’s not much hope of getting it passed in the Legislature we have now or by the governor we have now,” she said. “However, I’m receiving e-mails from supporters that are so moving. I am praying for a miracle.”

(LICENSE PLATES CONT. ON PAGE 10)

GENERAL RECAP & UPDATE

MAJOR VICTORY!

Planned Parenthood v. ACLA et al. (Oregon)— On March 29, the Ninth Circuit reversed the trial court decision imposing \$107 million dollars in damages against pro-life activists and directed the court to enter judgment IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANTS ON ALL COUNTS. The court ruled that the defendants’ posters and website publicizing the names and addresses of abortionists were not threats but constitutionally protected political speech.

Conservatorship of Wendland (Stockton)— After arguments before the Third District Court of Appeal, the Court’s decision was to remand the case for trial. They upheld the standard of proof used during the first trial, (clear and convincing evidence, but held that Rose Wendland, (Robert Wendland’s wife and conservator), must only prove she acted

(RECAP CONT. ON PAGE 3)

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

After our last issue of *Lifeline*, we received a number of letters from supporters who disapproved of Katie Short's use of the term "new McCarthyism" to describe the pro-abortion tactic of asserting guilt by association. (See "Are You Now or Have You Ever Been A Member..." *Lifeline*, Vol. X, No. 3.) Ironically, shortly after receiving these letters, we saw a news release in which another pro-life spokeswoman used the expression "pro-abortion McCarthyism." Mrs. Short wishes to assure our readers that she was referring not to what Senator McCarthy actually did or said, but to the liberal caricature of his actions which is now in common parlance as "McCarthyism." She was attempting to highlight the irony that those who readily and regularly trot out accusations of witch hunting and guilt by association are either silent about or actively involved in the use of these tactics against pro-lifers. So-called "civil rights" groups such as the ACLU are all for free speech when it means, e.g., access to pornography on the internet, but are rarely to be found when the right to speak out against abortion is under attack. Similarly, these groups are all for the freedom of association when the association is the Communist Party, but not when it is, e.g., Operation Rescue. It is this hypocrisy which she intended to expose in using the term "new McCarthyism."

We apologize for the misunderstanding the title of the article caused.

CLONING REALITY

Brave New World here we come.

Brave New World has arrived at last, as we always knew it would. On January 22, 2001, Britain's House of Lords voted overwhelmingly to permit the cloning and maintenance of human embryos up to 14 days old for the purposes of medical experimentation, thereby taking the first terrible step toward the legalization of full-blown human cloning.

Meanwhile, an international group of human-reproduction experts announced their plans—current legal prohibitions be damned—to bring cloned humans to birth in order to provide biological children to infertile couples. They expect to deliver their first clone within 18 months. The ripple effect on human history of these and the events that will inevitably follow may well make a tsunami seem like a mere splash in a playground puddle.

Human cloning is moving slowly but surely toward reality despite intense and widespread opposition throughout the world. Many resistors worry that permitting human cloning would remove us from the natural order. As the venerable Leon R. Kass has so eloquently put it, cloning brings conception and gestation "into the bright light of the laboratory, beneath which the child-to-be can be fertilized, nourished, pruned, weeded, watched, inspected, prodded, pinched, cajoled, injected, tested, rated, graded, approved, stamped, wrapped, sealed, and delivered."

Kass's point is that once human life is special-ordered rather than conceived, life will never be the same. No longer will each of us be a life that is unique from all others who have ever lived. Instead our genetic selves will be molded and chiseled in a petri dish to comply with the social norms of the day. And if something goes wrong, the new life will be thrown away like some defective widget or other fungible product. So long, diversity. Hello homogeneity.

Princeton's Silver hopes to create a "special group of mental beings" who "will be as different from humans as humans are from the primitive worms . . . that first crawled along the earth's surface."

Perhaps even worse, widespread acceptance of cloning would be a deathblow to the sanctity/equality of life ethic—the cornerstone of Western liberty from which sprang our still unrealized dream of universal human rights.

The premise of the sanctity of life ethic is that each and every one of us is of equal, incalculable, moral worth.

Whatever our race, sex, ethnicity, stature, health, disability, age, beauty, or cognitive capacity, we are all full moral equals within the human community—there is no "them," only "us."

Cloning stands in stark opposition to this equalitarian dream. It is—and always has been—the quintessential eugenic enterprise.

(CLONING CONT. ON PAGE 8)

ASK THE ATTORNEY

Rose Grimm

An Interview with Gary Kreep

Gary, could you tell me a little about your background, and particularly your education?

I graduated from Miramonte High School in Orinda, California and went to the University of California San Diego in La Jolla. We used to call it Tinker Toy Tech—it was a science school. Originally I was seeking a degree in mathematics, but I ended up with a degree in economics and a minor in mathematics. I was two classes short of being able to have a minor in Black Studies. I took all the Black Studies courses I could because that's where a lot of the radicals were and I wanted to get an understanding. I was very active in politics in college; those were the days of radicalism—Kent State, Vietnam, the Cambodian incursion. We had student strikes led by the left for three years in a row, and the fourth year we managed to take it over and stop it, because we learned from the left their tactics, and turned their tactics against them.

**When you say “we”—was it a group?**

Yes. There was a gentleman by the name of Karl Keating, who is now a well known Catholic author and does a lot of Catholic apologetics; Karl and I went to college and law school together. There were others—one is now an estate planning attorney, another is a doctor, another, Jim Sills, was very active in the pro-life movement and is a political consultant in San Diego county. We set up our own conservative group called the Associated Moderate Students. We learned from the left that every time there is a new issue you set up a new front group with a new name; most people were not smart enough to realize that it was all the same people. We called ourselves by a variety of names at different times. We set up a Young Americans for Freedom chapter on our campus; that way we could publish excerpts from Campus News Service, which was a conservative publication that you could just take articles out of and print. We set up a conservative newspaper to combat the radical newspaper.

I didn't do so well in college because I was so busy combatting the left, but when I took the Law School Admissions test I got the highest score in the history of the college, so I didn't have a lot of trouble getting into law school. I went to the University of San Diego School of Law, and graduated in 1975. As soon as I passed the Bar I got involved in pro-life legal issues.

What kind of law do you do in addition to your conservative and pro-life work?

I have been a family law attorney for twenty-five years. I do child custody, child visitation, divorces, things like that.

I understand that you are the founder of the U.S. Justice Foundation.

Yes, I started that back in 1979 with a former national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom. We do lawsuits. We represent pro-life picketers in civil and criminal cases, we represent parents in suing schools when they object to things going on in the school system. We do taxpayer related suits—not the IRS but local taxes. The type of things we do can be found on our website—www.usjf.net. If it's conservative we do it.

(INTERVIEW CONT. ON PAGE 4)

(RECAP CONT. FROM PAGE 1)

in good faith based on medical advice. The court characterized her decision to end Robert's life as one of privacy and choice, stating that, of course, Rose has every right to discontinue Robert's life-sustaining treatment. On June 21, the California Supreme Court voted unanimously to grant Robert's mother's request that it review the appellate court's decision. Briefs have been filed; the date for oral argument has not yet been announced.

Conservatorship of the Person of Robert Wendland (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 517; 93 Cal.Rptr.2d 550. Supr. Ct. No. S087265.

Foti v. Planned Parenthood/Planned Parenthood v. Foti (Menlo Park)—

This action and cross-action between sidewalk counselors and PP and its escorts is now stayed, pending the outcome of a new lawsuit filed by PP in which it seeks a declaration from the court that a speech-free zone injunction it obtained six years ago against completely different parties actually applies against these sidewalk counselors *and* anyone else PP serves it on.

Reeves v. Rocklin United School District—

Pro-lifers leafletting and holding signs were detained after high school administrators involved the local police; during a second visit to the same school, pro-lifers were forced to move off the campus after being refused visitor registration. They were also told that the public street adjacent to the school was off-limits. Despite clear California case and statutory authority allowing free speech on and near public school campuses, the trial court ruled that the administrators could permissibly exclude the pro-lifers in order to prevent “disruption” of school activities. Case on appeal.

Kelly v. County of Orange— Nurse Karen Kelly, who was fired for not violating her pro-life convictions, sued the County of Orange for wrongful termination and religious discrimination. Trial set for April 17, 2001.

North Dakota v. Family Life Services—

State Attorney General took over pro-life ministry, with trial court placing Family Life Services, a pro-life ministry, in permanent receivership. The North Dakota Supreme Court reversed and sent the case back to the

(RECAP CONT. ON PAGE 4)

(RECAP CONT. FROM PAGE 3)

trial court. In an unusual move, the Court also ordered that the case *not* be returned to the same trial court judge. The case is now before a new trial court judge and the case appears headed for a satisfactory resolution.

U.S. v. Alaw (Wash., D.C.)— Department of Justice suing rescuers civilly for “blocking” a clinic where no abortions were taking place and doors were locked. Judge issued injunction in spite of lack of evidence. Case on appeal. Oral arguments heard February 2001. Decision pending.

Spingola v. U.C. Regents (Berkeley)— Street preacher of pro-life message harassed. Summary judgment granted in part and the remainder transferred to State Court. Case pending.

Wilkerson [PP] v. Scott et al. (San Diego)— Injunction and \$2,500,000 damages suit against multiple sidewalk counselors. Counselors appealed preliminary injunction; court of appeal very grudgingly reversed the most outrageous provisions, while indulging every conceivable presumption to affirm the remainder, including a 25-foot speech-free zone and a requirement that pro-lifers stand single-file on the sidewalk. Clinic is appealing the dismissal of two of the defendants and the award of \$15,000 in attorneys fees against it.

Amy Jo Mattson v. MKB Management Corporation dba Red River Women’s Clinic (North Dakota)— False Advertising suit. Abortion mill claimed in writing that there was no link between breast cancer and abortion. In response to the suit, the clinic stopped distributing one brochure, but is now distributing a different misleading brochure. Trial court denied preliminary injunction against distributing the second brochure, and the case is now set for trial.

DeParrie v. Hanzo et al. (Oregon)— Civil rights suit against abortion clinic director for defamation and civil rights violations. Dismissal upheld by Ninth Circuit. Plaintiff intends to file a petition for certiorari.

Crone v. Resurrection Health Care Corp. (Illinois)— Psychiatric Nurse suing for wrongful termination; rights as a conscientious objector were violated for refusing to dispense “day-after” pill. Case in discovery phase.

(RECAP CONT. ON PAGE 6)

(INTERVIEW CONT. FROM PAGE 3)

And you are also on the advisory board of the Life Legal Defense Foundation. What made you willing to do that, when you have your own organization which is doing many similar things?

I believe that organizations such as ours should work together. Before Life Legal obtained its 501(c)(3) status we served as a funding organization for them, where grants would be made to the U.S. Justice Foundation and we would pay Life Legal’s attorneys directly. We were there to assist in Life Legal Defense Foundation’s projects, by administering grants. Life Legal has also provided financial assistance in some of our cases, where they would pick up deposition costs, for example.

Has your organization worked together on any cases with Life Legal Defense Foundation?

Yes, we recently filed a brief together, along with California Public Policy Foundation, in the case of Catholic Charities in Sacramento; they are opposing the statute which would require Catholic and other church-based groups to provide abortion and related medical coverage to their employees, and would require an intrusive investigation into the beliefs of the employees in a church-related entity. The state appellate court accepted our brief and we are awaiting a decision.

We also appealed a restraining order which we thought was unconstitutional, on behalf of two defendants in the Wilkerson case. We divided up the clients; we’re representing two of them, Katie Short is representing one, and other attorneys are representing others. The court of appeals just overturned the parts of the injunction that we considered unconstitutional—parts pertaining to the content of the signs and their distance from the location. That was a nice victory for us.

We have had three straight appellate victories on pro-life cases, two on criminal and one on civil. We also give a lot of advice. We are going to do an opinion letter on two new pieces of proposed legislation. One would be a state F.A.C.E. law and one is a state bubble law; we are going to submit testimony to the state senate discussing the unconstitutional aspects of these laws. The bubble law means that they are proposing an eight-foot bubble around each high school student—that no one should come and try to hand them literature or try to talk to them unless the student gives permission. That flies in the face of recent court decisions as well as the U.S. constitution. The F.A.C.E. statute means that they are trying to create state penalties in addition to federal penalties for those found blocking access or egress to abortion clinics.

We are also in litigation with several school districts over the violation of teacher or student rights—we do this on a regular basis. We are starting on a brief in a case of internet pornography. We do litigation!

L

...the fourth year we managed to take it over and stop it, because we learned from the left their tactics, and turned their tactics against them.

UPDATE

Dana Cody

Update on Rocklin School Case and F.A.C.E Legislation for California

In June of 1998, LLDF filed a complaint against the Rocklin Unified School District in the Placer County Superior Court on behalf of four individuals who belong to the Sanctity of Human Life Network (SOHLNET). In summary, the complaint alleges that the district and its employees violated the civil rights of the four individual plaintiffs, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Reeves, John Ficker, and Murray Lewis, by denying them the opportunity to register to come on campus to leaflet.

Plaintiffs contend that established California case and statutory law (Penal Code sections 626 et seq.) have been interpreted by the courts to have created the right of access of nonstudents to come onto campuses to leaflet and/or engage in other peaceful expressive activity. The complaint alleges that by refusing these individuals the right to register, or to even stand on the public street adjacent to the school entrance to engage in expressive activity, their rights to free speech and freedom of association were impinged.

The case has already gone to trial. It was a bench trial before Superior Court Judge John L. Cosgrove. His decision strongly favored the defendant district based on the collective years of experience of their administrators as related to the registration of visitors on public school campuses. However, testimony at trial indicated none of the administrators, including the District Superintendent, had intimate knowledge of the cases or statutes involved. The case is now on appeal.


Interestingly, Senator Mike Machado, a pro-death Democrat from the Stockton area, has now introduced a bill, SB 862, that adds section 32214 to the Education Code. It reads as follows:

No person shall knowingly approach a pupil within eight feet of that pupil, unless the pupil consents, for the purpose of passing a leaflet or handbill to, displaying a sign to, or engaging in oral protest, or counseling with

the pupil in the public way or sidewalk area within a radius of 100 feet from any entrance door to a public school.

The legislation is a predictable consequence of holding Educrats accountable for their dictatorial conduct. Some call it fascism.

Unrelated to the school issue, but related to yet another assault on the right of pro-life speech, Senator Debra Ortiz of SB 1945 fame (SB 1945 was the hate crimes reporting bill was covered in *Lifeline*, Vol. X, No. 2) has introduced California's version of the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act. This bill is similar to SB 1945 in that any reporting requirements related to incidents of blocking at medical facilities would only be reported if pro-death advocates are the so-called victims.

Because the two bills will directly impact LLDF clients if signed into law, we are watching them closely. SB 862 may become an issue on appeal in the Rocklin case. Those interested in reading the bills, or in contacting their state representatives about them, can visit the State's Legislative website at www.leginfo.ca.gov. 

100+ PRO-LIFE THINGS YOU CAN DO

- pray regularly for pro-life concerns
- join a pro-life organization
- participate in a pro-life rally or event
- support pro-life ministries financially
- visit the elderly, sick, or lonely
- volunteer at a pregnancy care center
- serve as foster parents
- subscribe to pro-life publications
- write a letter to your local newspaper
- educate yourself on pro-life issues
- adopt a child with special needs
- VOTE for only 100% pro-life candidates
- support organizations that care for the dying
- peacefully picket or pray at an abortion mill
- talk to your doctor about abortion
- talk to your doctor about euthanasia
- sign and promote the pro-life "Loving Will"
- start a pro-life group in your community
- invite a pro-life speaker to your church
- give your pastor pro-life resources
- contact your legislators on pro-life concerns
- participate in the annual "March for Life"
- sidewalk counsel women at abortion mills
- participate in and help organize "Life Chains"
- distribute pro-life information in public places
- put pro-life bumper stickers on your car
- present the chastity message to youth
- place pro-life literature at the back of your church
- invite friends to watch pro-life videos
- offer positive support to expectant moms
- evaluate local "sex education" programs
- wear pro-life buttons and T-shirts
- give a pro-life presentation at your church
- sponsor a pro-life billboard in your area
- call in to talk radio shows to speak for life
- establish a pro-life phone tree
- lobby for life at your state capitol
- picket pro-abortion events and speakers
- place pro-life ads in newspapers
- donate pro-life books to local libraries
- support pro-life businesses
- support pro-life teens and college students
- challenge candidates to be 100% pro-life
- boycott pro-abortion businesses
- sponsor a baby shower for a local pregnancy center
- help a single mom through labor
- offer to babysit for moms in need
- monitor Planned Parenthood activities
- volunteer at a local pro-life office
- organize a candidate forum on life issues
- sell roses on Mother's day to raise funds
- put a pro-life sign in your home's window

(100+ THINGS CONT. ON PAGE 7)

(RECAP CONT. FROM PAGE 4)

Dym v. White (San Diego)— First Amendment /Due Process case, involving a judgment against ORC (Operation Rescue of Calif.) after a kangaroo court judge/trial, without the right to cross-examine witnesses. Case is on appeal.

Villarroel v. Brennan et al.— Family sues because mother euthanized against expressed wishes. Lost at trial court.

Spingola v. Village of Granville Ohio— City passed vague ordinance to apply as needed against pro-lifers at public events. On appeal in Sixth Circuit.

Planned Parenthood of Central Penn. v. Snell et al.— Five sidewalk counselors sued by abortion clinic seeking injunction. Counselors have filed cross-complaint against clinic escorts' unlawful interference.

Veneklase v. Fargo North Dakota— Pro-lifers, arrested for praying on sidewalk in abortionist's neighborhood, sued for damages and ultimately won, and won again on appeal—but lost by one vote on en banc rehearing. The deciding vote was cast by a judge who had been a lawyer in the firm representing the abortionist; he refused to recuse himself. Plaintiffs intend to file a petition for certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Catholic Charities v. Sacramento Superior Court— LLDf has joined in an amicus curiae ("friend of the court") brief on behalf of Catholic Charities in its suit challenging the 1999 Women's Contraceptive Equity Act. The Act requires health care insurance packages to provide coverage of Food and Drug Administration-approved prescription contraceptive methods. The list of FDA-approved drugs includes both contraceptive and abortifacient drugs such as Preven.

L

DUPLICATES

Please help us conserve! If you are receiving duplicate newsletters, let us know.

ON THE WEB

www.ildf.org

FAMILY

Debra J. Saunders

Pro-Life Family Lives Its Beliefs

Over dinner, the middle-class, suburban family of activists discusses the time each of them has spent behind bars.



*The Riley Family
Michelle, Ben, Tom, Mary and Greg
Below: Teresa and TJ*

Ron, the 64-year-old patriarch, is a gruff, much-decorated Vietnam vet who likes a Rusty Nail at cocktail hour. "I think I feared more than anything else that I might be sexually abused. It was a crazy thing to fear, but that's what I feared," he later explains.

Instead, inmates often respected that he put himself behind bars for a cause, and some toughs took it on themselves to protect him.

I disagree with the cause, but admire how this family has lived its beliefs.

Ron estimates that he has cumulatively spent between 18 months and two years behind bars, including time in prison (not just jail, where the inmates are petty criminals or those awaiting sentencing).

Wife Nancy, 63, discovered that being arrested was "really scary. I found out for the first time

that I get claustrophobic." She gave up getting arrested nearly a decade ago, she said, because the state of California threatened to revoke her day-care license. "I found the people in jail on the whole very nice. They're really sad cases and they've had hard lives, but they have heart," she sighed.

Daughter Mary Riley, 43, and her husband Tom, 42, live with Ron and Nancy. Tom now teaches at a Catholic school. He went to jail in New York and New Jersey before he met Mary.

"The people I encountered were far more afraid than I was," Tom recalled. It didn't hurt that he could lift more weight than anyone else in his cell block.

Like her two sisters, Mary also has done time. She tells of the time she impressed her cellmates by facing the highest bail of anyone

in the jail. Most of her stints were for short periods, but she once spent three months in a Contra Costa County jail.

There would come a time during each incarceration, she remembers, when hard-as-nails fellow cellmates would take a look at her—a motherly white woman who could pass for Auntie Em—and ask: What are you in for?

That's the family's story: They are pro-life activists and they are willing to go to jail for their beliefs.

"I'd tell them that I'm in here for saving babies," she explains. "I was arrested, technically for trespass, at an abortion clinic. And I sort of brace myself, because most of these women know what I'm talking about. They know someone who had an abortion, or they had an abortion themselves."

The Rileys don't get arrested anymore, although they remain committed to their cause. When they married in 1995, Mary—now administrative director of the nonprofit Life Legal Defense Foundation—thought they would be entering a more comfortable time in their lives. (Alone, she had raised two children

from a previous marriage. Now her son is at West Point and her daughter attends college in Northern California.)

Then, the Rileys learned about a substance-abusing pregnant single mother. When her son was born, they took him in. A couple of years later, the Rileys added a daughter to their family. Then came a bright-eyed baby boy, now 1 year old. In December, the last adoption became final.

The moms of all three children were "abortion bound" during their pregnancies, according to Mary Riley. All the children have "special needs" because of their mothers' drug or alcohol abuse.

The household's most recent addition is a 5-year-old Belgian shepherd whose owner, in the hospital for pancreatic cancer, was afraid he would have to put the sweet dog to sleep.

"We're so blessed. I can't tell you," Mary explained. "People look at us and say what a good thing you're doing. I can tell you, it's the exact reverse. These kids are the most beautiful children."

That's the family's story: They are pro-life activists and they are willing to go to jail for their beliefs.

L

[Debra J. Saunders writes a column for the San Francisco *Chronicle* which has national syndication. This article originally appeared in the *Chronicle* (Feb. 7, 2001) and is here reprinted with permission.]

- volunteer for a 100% pro-life candidate
- invite your local legislator to a gathering
- defend and accommodate the disabled
- sponsor a program at a local nursing home
- encourage and promote adoption
- establish a hotline for women in crisis
- get pro-life voter's guides into churches
- participate at rescue at an abortion mill
- pray regularly for a local abortionist
- distribute pro-life literature door-to-door
- always carry pro-life literature with you
- set up pro-life booths at fairs, conventions, etc.
- get a pro-life show on Christian radio
- set up pro-life prayer groups
- send roses to legislators each January 22nd
- offer to bury babies found in disposal systems
- set up pro-life prayer groups
- get pro-life videos on local cable stations
- challenge media to be fair and accurate
- educate others on abortifacient birth control
- boycott hospitals that perform abortions
- speak up for life at all times, in all situations
- distribute pro-life literature at public events
- run for political office and be proudly pro-life
- expose pro-abortion civic groups like YWCA
- distribute pro-life petitions
- pass on pro-life literature to friends and family
- counsel women and men after abortion
- organize a "walk-a-thon" for pro-life groups
- sponsor a pro-life prayer vigil/service
- always speak the truth in LOVE
- build a strong family and live by example
- defend every preborn baby, without exception
- educate others on the dangers of "living wills"
- order pro-life checks
- send pro-life Christmas cards
- educate and activate youth to advocate for life
- bring a national pro-life speaker to your area
- pray regularly for all pro-lifers
- ask your pastor to defend life from the pulpit
- encourage and pray for pastors who speak up
- put a pro-life insert into local newspapers
- offer help to women injured by abortion
- offer financial help to moms in crisis
- take pregnant moms in need into your home
- do "get out the vote" calls before elections
- distribute pro-life prayer cards
- attend public hearings on bills affecting life
- hold a yard sale to raise funds for a pregnancy center

Greg Chesmore, *American Life League*

[Originally appeared in *Celebrate Life* (Sept.-Oct. 1998), published by American Life League.]

EDUCATION

LLDF, on an ongoing basis, provides referrals to attorneys for assistance in ensuring care for medically dependent relatives and for adoption and guardianship matters; obtains legal assistance for women injured by abortion; advises employees in regards to free speech rights in the workplace; instructs pro-lifers in how to defend themselves in court; advises attorneys and citizens on working with legislative bodies re proposed legislation; advises numerous sidewalk counselors, picketers, and prayer supporters of their free speech rights and rights to peaceful assembly when speaking out for the unborn in their communities; provides spokespersons for television, radio, and print media, and speakers for training workshops and debates.

WANTED

LLDF is receiving calls from people whose loved ones are being denied necessary medical treatment. We need local attorneys to assist us in these matters. LLDF is currently compiling model briefs, petitions and other forms for use in these cases.

Please consider making a tax-deductible contribution today. Your generosity allows LLDF to fulfill its mission to provide a trained and committed voice in the courtroom so that pro-lifers can continue their life-saving work.

If you have stock that gives you more tax trouble than earnings, please consider donating it to LLDF. You can deduct the full value of the stock at the time of donation (no need to determine the basis). Thus, what may be a burden to you can be turned directly into support for the defenders of the defenders of life.

Any article, except those which are reprinted from other sources, may be reproduced without permission, provided LLDF is credited as the source and provided with a copy of the item.

(CLONING CONT. FROM PAGE 2)

Eugenics, meaning “good in birth,” directly contradicts the self-evident truth enunciated by Thomas Jefferson that all people are created equal. Eugenicians believe that the moral value of people is relative, or to put it another way, that some of us are better than others of us. Eugenicians seek to “improve” humanity by breeding out the “undesirable” traits of those deemed less worthy. Indeed, the pioneers of the eugenics movement worked for more than 50 years during the late 1800s and into the middle of the twentieth century to eliminate the genes of the “unfit” from the human genome, first by encouraging proper eugenic marriages (positive eugenics) and more perniciously, by involuntarily sterilizing those deemed to have undesirable physical and personal traits (negative eugenics).

Anyone with even a modicum of historical knowledge—alas, a scarce commodity in these post-modernistic times—knows where that led. In this country alone, 60,000-plus people were involuntary sterilized. In Western Europe, eugenics belief systems combusted with social Darwinism and anti-Semitism to produce the Nazis and thence to the Holocaust.

Today’s eugenicians are not racist or anti-Semites but they exhibit every bit as much hubris as their predecessors by assuming that they—that we—have the right to direct the future evolution of humanity, only now rather than having to rely on clunky procreative planning they literally grasp the human genome in their hands. Cloning plays a big part in these plans as the patriarch of the modern bioethics movement, Joseph Fletcher, a wild eugenicist, well knew when he wrote nearly 30 years ago that cloning would “permit the preservation and perpetuation of the finest genotypes that arise in our species.”

What are these supposedly “finest” genotypes? Most neo-eugenicist cloning advocates worship at the altar of the frontal lobe, valuing high intelligence and logical thinking in much the

same way that founding practitioners of eugenics valued the blue eyes and blond hair they saw each morning in their own mirrors. Thus, Princeton University’s Lee Silver hopes through cloning to create a “special group of mental beings” who “will be as different from humans as humans are from the primitive worms ...that first crawled along the earth’s surface.”

“As it is now, low grade work is shoved off on moronic and retarded individuals, the victims of uncontrolled reproduction. Should we not program such workers ‘thoughtfully’ instead of accidentally, by means of hybridization?”

— Joseph Fletcher

Yet Fletcher, Silver, and most others of their ilk almost always miss the point that smart people are not necessarily good people. And they rarely discuss designing people with the most important human capacities of all: the ability to love unconditionally, gentleness, empathy, the deep desire to be helpful and productive.

Ironically, these highest, best human characteristics are often found in people with Down syndrome or other developmental disabilities—the very people who the neo-eugenicians believe should be evolved intentionally out of existence whether through genetic manipulation or if necessary, selective abortion, and infanticide.

Eugenics, as awful as it is, is only the beginning of the threat posed to the natural order by human cloning. Some cloners have decided

that if they are going to “play God”; they might as well do it all the way by creating altogether new life forms. Indeed, scientists have already used cloning techniques to add jellyfish genetic material to a cloned monkey embryo, manufacturing a monkey that glows in the dark. Nor is human life itself immune from such “Dr. Meraux” forms of manipulation. For example, some in bioethics and bioscience support the creation of chimeras—part human and part animal— beings Joseph Fletcher called “parahumans” who he hoped would “be fashioned to do dangerous and demeaning jobs.” In other words, Fletcher advocated the creation of a slave race of mostly-humans designed by us and for our use. “As it is now,” the bioethics patriarch wrote in his typically snobbish fashion, “low grade work is shoved off on moronic and retarded individuals, the victims of uncontrolled reproduction. Should we not program such workers ‘thoughtfully’ instead of accidentally, by means of hybridization?”

Fletcher’s dark dream of human/animal chimeras is well on its way to reality. Not too long ago Australian scientists announced they had created a “pig-man” through cloning techniques, and allowed the hybrid to develop for more than two weeks before destroying it. Last year, a biotech company took out a Europe-wide patent on embryos containing cells both from humans and from mice, sheep, pigs, cattle, goats, or fish. Where such manipulations will lead may be beyond comprehension.

Cloning presents humankind with the post-modernist version of the Faustian bargain. Through cloning, we are told, our greatest dreams can be realized: the barren can give birth, genetic anomalies and disabilities can be eliminated at the embryonic level, near immortality will be within our grasp as replacements, for worn out organs can be grown in the lab for transplantation without fear of bodily rejection. But the devil always

demands his due—the higher the “value” of the bargain, the greater the price.

In cloning technologies we may face the highest price of all: the end of the perception of human life as “sacred” and the concomitant increase in the nihilistic belief that humans are mere biological life; an increasing willingness to use and exploit human life as if

*Cloning presents
humankind with
the postmodernist
version of the
Faustian bargain.*

it were a mere natural resource; eventually, the loss of human diversity itself—and these are just the foreseen consequences. The unforeseen consequences of mucking around in the human genome may be worse than we can imagine. As Leon Kass has written, “shallow are the souls that have forgotten how to shudder.”

L

[Wesley J. Smith is the author of *Culture of Death: The Assault on Medical Ethics in America*, recently published by Encounter Books. This article appeared originally as a guest commentary (1/31/2001) on National Review Online (www.nationalreview.com) and is here reprinted kind permission of the author.]

CLE COURSE

Videotapes of LLDLF’s continuing legal education (CLE) course, *Active Killing: What the Law Allows*, presented June 5, 1999, in Sacramento, and March 11, 2000, in Pasadena, are available. Please call our office (707/224-6675) if you would like to place an order, or use the order form below. Each of the four tapes is available at cost, \$25.00 each, which includes shipping and handling. You can order the entire CLE on videotape, or select one of the six separate segments listed below. The text is available for \$30.00, which includes shipping and handling.

- **Active Killing: What the Law Allows** Introduction (Dana Cody), and **History of Euthanasia, Assisted Suicide, and Active Killing** (Wesley J. Smith)
- **Case Law on Assisted Suicide and Active Killing** (Catherine Short)
- **California Law on Assisted Suicide and Active Killing: Case Strategy and the Wendland Appeal** (Janie Hickok Siess)
- **Bioethics and Bias Against the Disabled** (D. Cody on ADA law; W. Smith on managed healthcare’s impact on the law)

Each tape is available for \$25.00, which covers production, shipping and handling.

TOTAL \$ _____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP _____

TEL. _____

CREDIT CARD _____

EXP. DATE _____

MEMBERS OF THE RULES COMMITTEE:

Sen. Kevin Murray, Democrat, District 26
Ph 916-445-8800

Sen. James Brulte, R-31
Ph 916-445-3688

Sen. Jim Costa, D-16
Ph 916-445-4641

Sen. Joe Dunn, D-34
Ph 916-445-5831

Sen. Betty Karnette, D-27
Ph 916-445-6447

Sen. Liz Figueroa, D-10
Ph 916-445-6671

Sen. Dick Monteith, R-12
Ph 916-445-1392

Sen. Bill Morrow, R-38
Ph 916-445-3731,

Sen. Don Perata, D-09
Ph 916-445-6577

Sen. Jack Scott, D-21
Ph 916-445-5976

Sen. Neil Soto, D-32
Ph 916-445-6868)

Sen. Jackie Speier, D-08
Ph 916-445-0503

Sen. Tom Torlakson, D-07
Ph 916-445-6083

[It should be noted that the committee members need to be contacted but please check with your state representative's office first. The nature of the legislative process is such that just to be well-informed, you must know the status of the bill. The bill's status will be also be available at

www.WomensResourceNetwork.org.

On Tuesday, March 20, 2001, the Senate Transportation Committee met and passed a rule disallowing any specialty license plates. Senators Monteith, Costa, and McClintock argued that the committee shouldn't be making blanket prohibitions but should hear each bill on a case by case basis.

However, Chairman of the committee, Senator Kevin Murray, admonished committee members that President Pro Tem of the Senate, John Burton, "doesn't like these plates," and a vote for them was a vote contrary to the Senator's leadership policy. Translated, vote against the President of the Senate and you may find yourself in a small office with virtually no staff.

The vote was 8-3 to adopt the rule. Senator Jim Brulte left the committee during the vote. Senator Morrow was not present. They may have added their votes later in the day.

Senator Ray Haynes, the bill author, plans to submit a request for a rule waiver to the committee.]

(LICENSE PLATES CONT. FROM PAGE 1)

Serrano, whose organization is leading the grassroots effort in favor of the plates, repeated some of the personal stories. "One woman said, 'My son is adopted and I would be proud to have the plate on my car.' Another person said he found out at age 36 that he was adopted. Friends asked if he was upset, and he said no, that he was thrilled to find out that he had been given the chance to live. He wants to buy two plates. I heard from parents who have adopted six children and would love to have the plate on their van."

Lifeline readers in California should receive a postcard along with this issue of the newsletter. Readers with Internet access may sign an electronic postcard at

www.WomensResourceNetwork.org

Anyone who wants to help is urged to take the following actions:

1. Sign a postcard to demonstrate that support exists for the tags. *Lifeline* readers in California should receive a postcard along with this issue of the newsletter. Readers with internet access may sign an electronic postcard at: www.WomensResourceNetwork.org.
2. Telephone (California) Rules Committee members and tell them you support SB251, the bill for "Choose Life" plates, and that you respectfully request that the bill at least have the opportunity to be heard. (See the list of committee members in the sidebar.)

3. Send a letter to your state representative or to the Women's Resource Network on letterhead from your business or organization stating your support for SB251. The Women's Resource Network will forward the letters it receives to lawmakers.
4. Write a letter to the editor of your local paper to let others know how they can help. Encourage people to write to their local Assembly and Senate representatives in favor of SB251.

"Specialty plates have been used to raise money for environmental causes and the California Arts Council," says bill sponsor Haynes, a member of Life Legal's Board of Advisors. "If the state can sanction license plates to save whales and picture whale tails, then certainly the state can sanction a license plate to save human lives."

Any specialty, or "vanity," license plate needs to sell 7,500 copies in the first year it is offered. Given the Florida track record and the positive responses her organization has received via e-mail and telephone, Serrano is confident that more than enough support exists among Californians.

The license idea received a boost in mid-March from radio talk show host Dr. Laura Schlessinger, who twice urged listeners to contact California lawmakers and the Women's Resource Network. An hour after the first mention, "there were 100 e-mails in my inbox," said a delighted Serrano.

A network of pro-life organizations also is helping to generate support. Among them are Concerned Women for America, the National Right to Life League, the Capitol Resource Institute and many churches and crisis pregnancy centers.

Although she is not optimistic about the license plate's political chances, Serrano has been encouraged recently by the appearance of her own material in e-mails. "I'm getting e-mails of my own stuff," she said. Not realizing that Serrano was the author, "people are forwarding it to me as something useful to

(LICENSE PLATES CONT. ON PAGE 12)

E S S A Y

Hope for a Pro-Life Future

Caitlin Young and I had the privilege of attending the American Collegians for Life (ACL) Conference in Washington, D.C. We were sponsored by Life Legal Defense Foundation (LLDF) and were sent to represent them at the conference.

I found the ACL Conference to be a fantastic experience because it gave me hope for the future of the pro-life movement. Speakers taught us how to start pro-life groups on college campuses and provided us with inside information on how best to approach secular campuses around the U.S., where large majorities may be presumed to favor abortion just because that's what the dominant culture tells them.

In addition, Patricia Bainbridge spoke on how Planned Parenthood contains the real extremists, Mary Owen spoke on euthanasia, and Serrin Foster, as president of Feminists for Life (FFL), presented a seldom-heard pro-life perspective and told how to get students interested in starting up FFL groups. Plus, there were many additional excellent speakers. I found the talks on Planned Parenthood and Feminists for Life to be real eye-openers, in that people really have no idea how the abortion industry has lied to women about their own empowerment, when in actuality abortion ends in degradation for mother and child.

The true empowerment of women was visible in their active voice in the March for Life, which Caitlin and I attended after the conference was concluded. The March for Life began with a rally at the Washington Monument with a diverse group of speakers, including politicians and pro-life activists. The rally inspired everyone to put his or her energy into marching from the monument to the White House.

It was inspiring to see so many people praying, singing, carrying banners, and chanting in the freezing cold weather, publicly expressing their commitment to life.

—Michelle Smedley

The Real Women's Movement

Those who would champion the “pro-choice” (or rather “pro-abortion”) stance under the guise of being “pro-woman” need to hear what the Feminists for Life have to say. Speaking at the annual Collegians for Life conference in Washington, D.C., FFL spokeswomen called abortion the ultimate degradation of women. And they had quotes from the founders of the feminist movement to prove it.

Feminist Mattie Brinkerhoff said in 1869: “When a man steals to satisfy hunger, we may safely conclude that there is something wrong in society—so when a woman destroys the life of her unborn child, it is evidence that either by education or circumstances one has been greatly wronged.”

Indeed, FFL asserts that by endorsing abortion as an acceptable option, the modern feminist movement strayed from an original feminist ideology that sought equal rights and protection for men, women, and children—including the unborn.

For, as Elizabeth Cady Stanton once noted: “When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit.”

Feminists for Life “recognize abortion as a symptom of, not a solution to, the continuing struggles we face in the workplace, in education institutions, at home and in society,” but believe that when people come together they can find creative solutions to complex problems, especially through the institution of social programs to assist pregnant women.

—Caitlin Young

[Life Legal Defense Foundation sent Michelle Smedley and Caitlin Young to represent LLDF at the American Collegians for Life Conference at Catholic University Law School and the annual March for Life. We asked them to record a few of their reflections. A big thanks to these young women for disseminating LLDF material and for representing LLDF as a co-sponsor of this event. Michelle and Caitlin will both graduate in May of this year from the recently “reorganized” Saint Ignatius Institute at the University of San Francisco. Congratulations, Michelle and Caitlin!—Ed.]

LIFELINE MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of Life Legal Defense Foundation is to give innocent and helpless human beings of any age, and particularly unborn children, a trained and committed defense against the threat of death, and to support their advocates in the courtrooms of our nation.

LIFELINE EDITORIAL POLICY

The purpose of LLDF is set forth in our mission statement above. To that end, *Lifeline* welcomes all ideas, opinions, research and comments, and all religious and political points of view, so long as not seen to be clearly divisive, and so long as fundamentally based upon the twin pillars of truth and charity.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- John Streett**, Chairman — *Novato*
- Dana Cody**, Legal Director — *Sacramento*
- Catherine Short**, Legal Director
- Gregg Cunningham** — *Anaheim*
- David Llewellyn** — *Sacramento*
- Steve Lopez**, Founder — *Lafayette*
- Terry Thompson** — *Alamo*
- Anthony Wynne** — *Palo Alto*
- Mary Riley**, Administrative Director

BOARD OF ADVISORS

- The Hon. Steve Baldwin**
California Assembly
- The Rev. Michael R. Carey, OP, JD**
Colorado / California
- Daniel Cathcart, Esq.**
Los Angeles, California
- The Hon. William P. Clark**
Paso Robles, California
- Raymond Dennehy, PhD.**
San Francisco, California
- The Rev. Joseph D. Fessio, SJ**
San Francisco, California
- The Hon. Ray Haynes**
California Senate
- The Hon. Henry J. Hyde**
*U.S. Congress**
- The Hon. Howard Kaloogian**
California Assembly
- Anne Kindt, Esq.**
California/New Jersey
- Gary Kreep, Esq.**
U.S.J.F. — San Diego, California
- David Llewellyn, Esq.**
Sacramento, California
- Charles E. Rice, Esq.**
South Bend, Indiana
- The Hon. Christopher H. Smith**
*U.S. Congress**
- Ben Stein, Esq.**
Hollywood, California
- Andrew Zepeda, Esq.**
Beverly Hills, California

*Honorary Members

Editor Dana Cody
Production John O'Rourke
Design Kelly Connelly Design+Print
Printing Range Printing

**LIFE LEGAL
DEFENSE FOUNDATION**
P.O. Box 2105
Napa, California 94558

Address Services Requested

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Brainerd, MN
Permit N°472

(INTERVIEW CONT. FROM PAGE 8)

read. That means it has made the rounds. That's a good sign."

The "Choose Life" license plate movement has been successful and popular in Florida, where more than 15,000 of the plates have been purchased, raising more than \$300,000 for crisis pregnancy centers and organizations that promote adoption. "Choose Life" bills also are being considered in Texas, Mississippi, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Not surprisingly, abortion backers have sued in Florida and Louisiana, arguing that "Choose Life" plates violate the constitutions of those states. In Florida, opponents argue that the license message illegally mixes church and state issues. In Louisiana, a judge has

ordered the state to delay its proposed pro-life license plates until free speech issues are examined.

Meanwhile, a proposed pro-life license in Pennsylvania has drawn the ire of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League of Pennsylvania. The pro-abortion group argued that free speech rights would suffer if the state, through an approved license, promoted a particular point of view.

While the legal arguments spiral elsewhere, Serrano is focused on the pro-life message in California. "We don't want to just talk about offering choices; we want to connect women in need with the help that is available," she said. **L**