

Los Pequeños Pepper

Newsletter of Los Pequeños de Cristo

February 2010

Volume 12, Number 2

Seventy-Five Million Reasons to Just Say No to Health Care Reform

By Judie Brown

The 2010 New Mexico State Winter Legislative Session

By Jose Vasquez

Evolution

Part 1: Back to the Future

By Marie P. Loehr

Excerpt from...

The Shame of Rembert Weakland and the Diocese of Milwaukee:

Disgraced archbishop portrayed in bronze plate as a protector of children?

By Charles J. Sykes

Personhood Blindness

Where the Culture of Death prevails, even "pro-lifers" can be blinded.

By Stephanie Block

Update on New Mexico Abortion Providers

These people need your prayers.

An Anniversary to Mourn: Assessing 40 Years of No-Fault Divorce

By Jim Tonkowich

Seventy-Five Million Reasons to Just Say No to Health Care Reform

By Judie Brown

One of the least reported, but most blatantly repugnant expenditures contained in the Senate version of the health care reform bill is the allocation of \$75,000,000 to *Planned Parenthood* and its cohorts for the express purpose of initiating the “Personal Responsibility Education for Adulthood Training” programs.

What could such a program be about, you might ask? Well, let’s examine the facts according to the *Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States*, better known as SIECUS. They are reporting the following:

[T]he Senate Finance Committee approved an amendment offered by Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) to fund a comprehensive sex education funding stream, *The Personal Responsibility Education for Adulthood Training*. The amendment provides **\$75 million for states**; \$50 million of which would be geared to evidence-based, medically accurate, age-appropriate programs to educate adolescents about both abstinence **and contraception** in order to prevent unintended teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS. The remaining funds would be for innovative programs as well as research and evaluation...

SIECUS continues: “We would like to thank Chairman Baucus and his staff for their strong support of a comprehensive approach to **sex education**, ensuring that all young people have access to information so that they can make responsible decisions and lead healthy and safe lives,” said William Smith, vice president for public policy at SIECUS. “The Baucus Amendment creates a new comprehensive sex education program for the states and can be easily reconciled with a similar measure, the Healthy Teen Initiative, on the House side. **This is a huge step in putting evidence and common sense over hyper-morality** and will get states the money they need to support good programming.”

For those who are uncertain about what “**hyper-morality**” might be, it is a word created by the proponents of **fornication** to segregate into a highly specialized segment of society those who do not approve of what Planned Parenthood, SIECUS and others would like to do by way of **brainwashing youngsters**.

Proof of this is contained in the same SIECUS press release, wherein they denounce any funding for abstinence-only education as being a “**giant step backward**.” The agenda of these conniving educators is obvious. So one has to wonder why this contemptible program is not mentioned by nearly all of those organizations that consider themselves to be part of the pro-life, pro-family movement.

Let me be clear before moving ahead that *American Life League* **does not favor any sort of sexuality education** in the classroom, regardless of what it is called. Whether it is “Personal Responsibility Education for Adulthood Training” or a “Healthy Teen Initiative” or “Abstinence Only,” the problem that is inherent in such programs remains the same: A usurpation of parental rights to teach children about matters of human sexuality within the context of the parent/child relationship. **Parents are the primary educators of their children**, not school teachers, not *Planned Parenthood* videos and not any other component of the culture that leads children down the path to debauchery.

As *American Life League*’s Michael Hichborn pointed out in his analysis of the Senate Healthcare Reform Bill, in Section 1803, pages 491-508, the bill stipulates grants of at least \$250,000 for each state.

In order for states to receive money for such programs, they must provide the following: current statistics on the pregnancy and birth rates of **children age 10–19**; goals for reducing pregnancy and birth rates for said children; and a description of how such funds will be used to reach these goals, especially for “youth populations that are the most high-risk or vulnerable for pregnancies or otherwise have special circumstances, including youth in foster care, homeless youth, youth with HIV/AIDS, pregnant youth who are under 21 years of age, mothers who are under 21 years of age, and youth residing in areas with high birth rates for youth.”

Further, Hichborn and others make it perfectly clear that the “most dangerous aspect of this entire section is the creation of a ‘*National Teen Pregnancy Prevention Resource Center*’ through Subsection (C) on page 503”:

The Secretary shall award a grant to a **nationally recognized, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that meets the requirements described in clause (ii)** to establish and operate a national teen pregnancy prevention resource center (in this subparagraph referred to as the ‘*Resource Center*’) to carry out the purpose and activities described in clause (iii). (emphasis added)

According to the requirements set forth in clause (ii),

The organization has demonstrated experience working with and providing assistance to a broad range of individuals and entities to reduce teen pregnancy. The organization is research-based and has comprehensive knowledge and data about teen pregnancy prevention strategies.

Hichborn accurately explains,

[T]here is no organization that better fits this description than *Planned Parenthood*. The language in this clause even includes PP's preferred adjective for its explicit, promiscuity-promoting sex education: "comprehensive." If this provision is allowed to remain in *America's Healthy Future Act*, PP will assume the position of a quasi-government agency with quasi-governmental powers to engage the nation's youth on matters of sex, birth control and abortion.

So, I am forced to ask why so few of our allies in this battle have made note of this draconian aspect of the Senate and House health care reform proposals. Since organizations of a Catholic bent such as the *Knights of Columbus* and the *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops* know all too well, based on the empirical data, that **sex education provides a springboard for adolescent promiscuity**, which leads to all manner of sexually transmitted diseases and to abortion, shouldn't they be exposing this dreadful aspect of the health care reform proposals? Why is it that they insist on keeping the focus **exclusively** on the question of taxpayer support for some abortions? **Why is taxpayer-mandated sex education as part of alleged health care reform moving ahead unchallenged by these respectable Catholic organizations?**

What are the *Knights of Columbus* and the Catholic bishops thinking?

None other than esteemed academic, *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars* board member and former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education Kenneth Whitehead has connected the dots in a most convincing way. Whitehead questions why sex education continues to be so popular, in view of what the results teach us about its failures.

Our teenage pregnancy and out-of-wedlock birth rates are at unprecedented levels. In 1940 only 4 percent of births in the United States were to unmarried women, compared with 11 percent in 1970, and 31 percent in 1993—that amounts to nearly a third of all births out of wedlock at the present time. By 1988 52 percent of teenage women in the United States were having premarital intercourse, compared with 29 percent in 1970.

The teenage abortion rates have gone up proportionately; around **40 percent of teenage pregnancies currently end in abortion**, compared to about 25 percent, or 1 in 4, of all pregnancies. All of these high rates have come about during exactly the same time period that sex education too was being institutionalized in the schools. Of course the contemporary increase in sexual permissiveness and the decline in traditional sexual morality must surely be attributed to a multiplicity of causes; but it has certainly not helped much to have presented under the authority of the school indoctrination in the acceptability of today's various deviant "lifestyles" as well as in the use of the supposed modern means of avoiding pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases while in fact engaging in a kind of permissive sexual activity that is now too often taken for granted.

And Whitehead is not the only one who has exposed the flawed philosophy of classroom sex education. When Pope Benedict XVI addressed Catholic educators at the *Catholic University of America* in April of last year, he made it a point to discuss why American education was failing: "We witness an assumption that every experience is of equal worth and a reluctance to admit imperfection and mistakes. And particularly disturbing, is the reduction of the precious and delicate area of education in sexuality to management of 'risk,' bereft of any reference to the beauty of conjugal love."

Colin Mason of *Population Research Institute*, who covered Pope Benedict XVI's address for LifeSiteNews.com, opined, "While these words were primarily intended for Catholic educators across the country, they hold a special meaning for the pro-life movement. They describe, in a beautifully succinct way, what we fight against every day: a sexual culture of lies, misrepresentations and illusions that results in an epidemic of contraception, sterilization, and abortion."

Clearly there is cause for concern. There is no defense for incorporating failed sex-instruction courses in so-called health care reform. The two terms are in fact contradictory when used in the same sentence.

So why are so many organizations and leaders remaining silent?

It is not my place to answer for the K of C or the USCCB, or any of the other groups that have thus far ignored this subject, but it is my place to remind the reader that this example of how our tax dollars might be used, along with the other life-threatening, life-altering aspects of so-called health care reform legislation, provide each of us with reasons aplenty to just say no to health care reform. ☞

Judie Brown is president of American Life League and a member of the Pontifical Academy for Life.

The 2010 New Mexico State Winter Legislative Session

By Jose Vasquez,
The New Mexico Watchman

The people of New Mexico deserve an opportunity to express their views on same-sex “marriage.” Governor Bill Richardson announced on September 29 that Domestic Partnerships will again be considered this legislative session which begins on Tuesday, January 19.

At no time have the people of this nation said “yes” to same-sex marriage.

Thirty-one states have voted on homosexual marriage including the larger states of California and New York. Each time the American people have been allowed a say at the ballot box, the enactment has been voted down.

Currently five states, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and Iowa and now the District of Columbia allow same-sex marriage. All have been accomplished by fiat - either by court order, as in the case of Iowa, or as recently noted, by the City Council in the District of Columbia.

In New Mexico, the homosexual community has made repeated attempts to pass same-sex marriage. The legislation has been cloaked as domestic partnerships. Domestic Partnerships are touted as being a desperate need of the elderly and the disabled. Heads of Governor Richardson’s governmental agencies are sent to testify before legislative committees to plead the case.

You rarely see the aged or the disabled at these meetings, however. You see mostly young gay activists populating the halls of the legislature.

Senator William Sharer of Farmington has introduced legislation that would allow New Mexicans an opportunity to decide on the same-sex marriage issue. SJR 1, a one-page Senate Joint Resolution, calls for a constitutional amendment to be voted on by the citizens of New Mexico. It would define marriage as being between one man and one woman.

The political reality is that the Governor dictates what legislation is allowed on even legislative years, during the 30-day “budget” sessions. By keeping silent, the Governor can wall off this legislation.

If the legislation were allowed, it would be assigned to the “Senate Rules Committee.” The Chair of the Rules Committee would then have to allow it to be presented and voted on. (Committee chairs have a great deal of power.) The Chair of the Senate Rules Committee is none other than Senator Linda Chavez. Senator Chavez last session proposed what might be considered a 15-minute-a-day homosexual indoctrination program for all New Mexico schools in an “anti-bullying” bill. She managed to get passed a “Senate Memorial” requiring our schools to develop and incorporate a “Tolerance Curriculum.”

If the citizens of New Mexico are allowed to only play defense against the gay agenda, we can stand only in opposition to same-sex marriage. The citizens of New Mexico should be afforded an opportunity to address this issue in a straight forward way.

Governor Richardson, tear down this wall. ☞

Evolution

Part I: Back to the Future

By Marie P. Loehr

*For in him were created all things in the heavens and on the earth,
things visible and things invisible... - Paul, Colossians 1:16-17*

Creation is the beginning. Why is Creation so important, beyond its reality as the source of all being and life, as we know it? All peoples and cultures have a Creation story to explain the origins of the world, and their own culture. Even individuals have their own family and personal creation story—how the family came to be, how “I” came to be—who, where, when, what, why, and how. The need to know roots of all sorts appears to be hard-wired in humans. Even animals, especially birds and fish, return to the place of their conception and hatching, over great distances in time and space, in order to spawn or mate, and bear their young.

The Catechism of the Catholic Church [279-282] notes that Creation is the “foundation” of all else—including God’s plans for salvation. We start there in order to find the answers to the perennial human questions: where did I come from? who am I? where am I going?

Creation is so important that Aquinas warns that a mistake about Creation ends in a mistake about God. Bonaventure finds it so important that he speaks of Creation as the second book of Scripture. Creation, and our understanding of it, are crucial to our knowledge and perception of God, and ourselves. Thus the ongoing, often totally confusing and confused, debates about Creation that we experience in our modern age are all the more confounding—and vital to sort out!

The Catechism also notes the vital work of science in elucidating the mysteries of Creation, the universe, inorganic and organic being. As Cardinal Schönborn reminds us in *Chance or Purpose?*, if we posit a God who is a Person with intellect and will, who thinks and loves, then Creation is no accident. A God who is one in three, and three in one, lives not only as a thinking being, but as a loving being. Love can never be contained or constrained. It’s always going beyond itself, out of itself, exploding into new life, new children, new friends, new experiences, new creative artworks, new scientific discoveries. This is the nature of loving intelligence and intelligent love. If this is true in man, made in the image and likeness of God, how much more so in God himself?!

In any discussion of evolution, this is where we must start. As Catholics we do believe in precisely this sort of God. Genesis is the Scriptural foundation of the Judeo-Christian Creation story. It is not a scientific text. It is not intended to be—it presents the why of Creation, and its order according to God’s plan. Science explores and explicates the where, when, how . . . Because science is human, and thus subject to man’s Fall and sin, science does not immediately discern truth in its fullness. It discovers by slow, halting steps, one at a time, testing, verifying, duplicating whenever possible its initial findings.

Part of the problem for Catholics and other Christians dealing with evolution—the scientific explication of the where, when, how of organic Creation and its development—is untangling the mess created by both malicious and foolish ideologues and media, with secular axes to grind.

What then is evolution, and how does it square with Genesis? Must it square in all points with Genesis?

In his *Pocket Catholic Dictionary*, Fr. John Hardon, S.J. defines evolution as “the theory that something was or is in a state of necessary development.” In short, evolution is a process of development, a process of growth and change. There is no growth without necessary change, however infinitesimal or invisible.

If we read Genesis 1, and its account of the order of Creation, we can in fact see that it presents a pattern of origin, change, growth, development. In its most basic presentation, the Genesis account of God’s Creation does not conflict with this most basic definition of evolution.

To some extent, as we read the particular creation within each “day”, we can see it loosely follows the actual scientific order of the beginning of the universe, the development of the heavens and earth, the coalescence into solar systems, stars and planets, the geological development of earth, and the necessary steps through paleontological and bio-chemical growth that earth sciences and biology have mapped. It is not point by point, but it reveals remarkable correlations to those who pursue these things, both theologically and scientifically.

There is not now, and never has been, any real conflict between Scripture and science in this particular study. But it requires more than a pop or media knowledge of science and its latest discoveries to appreciate this. It also requires more than a superficial reading of Genesis. The Church has always interpreted Scripture as having four

levels of meaning: the literal or factual, the allegorical or religious, the tropological or moral, and the anagogical or mystical. Both the Fathers and Doctors read Scripture accordingly. Henri de Lubac's *Medieval Exegesis* is an excellent scholarly presentation of this interpretive method.

All interpretation is founded on the initial and literal level of meaning. French *explication du texte* is the best presentation of this method. Literal meaning is more than presenting mere denotation, *i.e.*, surface dictionary definition. It involves denotation, connotation, and context. "*The Two Minute Apologist*" website defines it this way.

"The 'literal' meaning of a passage of Scripture is the meaning that the author of that passage of Scripture intended to convey." This presupposes a context, both cultural and creative. This recognizes one word may have many meanings as in denotation, and many nuances, as in connotation, *aka* emotional, personal, literary allusion and subliminal reference.

Many of our current problems re Creation/Genesis/evolution result from literalist interpretations. "*The Two Minute Apologist*" defines literalist as "the 'literalist' interpretation of a passage of Scripture is: 'that's what it says, that's what it means.'" "There is only a grasp of flat denotation, with no concern for the many different meanings one word may have, depending on context, nuance, idiom or connotation.

The literalist interpreter is tone-deaf where language is concerned.

Like the computer that interpreted "black" in the financial or accounting sense to mean "we need to go from the red into the African-American", the literalist ignores all but the most superficial meanings of any given word.

A Scriptural example of this is a translator's note found in the *Book of Job* in the *Confraternity of Christian Doctrine* edition of the *Bible*. The translation of the Hebrew reads "Job escaped with his flesh between his teeth." The note puzzles over what this might actually mean, calling it some obscure Hebrew idiom. A reasonably intelligent reader, fond of words and word play, will say, with a certain amount of astonishment, "Job escaped by the skin of his teeth." Duh.

We need to be very careful in our reading of both Scripture and science to adhere to legitimate literal meanings, and avoid literalist howlers, the painful equivalent of nails on a chalkboard.

We are faced with two opposing literalist interpretations of Scripture and science when we deal with evolution in discussion, or simply reading. The creationists, on the one hand, are religious literalists. What Scripture says, it says, and that's that. If Genesis says God created the universe, and all in it, in six days, that's what we are obliged to swallow. Now it's true that with God all things are possible. He could create that way, if he so desired. The question is, did He? Is this how He normally proceeds?

The other extreme of literalism is materialistic evolution. Hardon says, it "assumes the eternal existence of uncreated matter and then explains the emergence of all living creatures, of plants, animals, and human beings, both body and soul, through a natural evolutionary process." He adds that this is contrary to Christian revelation and Church teaching.

Within both extremes of philosophical or pious belief there are strict and loose constructionists. Some fundamentalist factions insist on six ordinary 24 hour days in which God created all things. Some believe with Bp. Ussher, the Anglican primate of all Ireland in the 1600s, that Creation is only 4000-6000 years old. Some believe the Devil put fossils in geological strata to tempt us, others that God put them there to test us. Some claim to be scientists and to use scientific method against Darwinian or atheistic evolution. Some consider the stance of the Catholic Church hypocritical or schizophrenic, an end run around another Galileo snafu.

Among evolutionists, there are strict Darwinians, gradualists, punctuated equilibrists, natural selection adherents, ordinary materialists, and proselytizing atheists.

Intelligent Design is in a class of "irreducible complexity" all by itself.

In other words, before we discuss creation and evolution with anyone, we need to know which form of evolution they're talking or writing about. We need to know the Church's teaching, as well.

Catholics confronting this issue have a few problems of their own. In the forty-five some odd years since the end of Vatican II, Catholics have been so badly educated in their own cultural, historical, artistic and scientific heritage that they are as liable to be as literalist at either extreme as anyone else. But we need to understand that we can be neither fundamentalist creationists nor atheistic Darwinians.

Hardon adds, "Theistic evolution is compatible with Christianity provided it postulates the special divine providence as regards the human body and the separate creation of each human soul." [Hardon, *Dictionary*, Doubleday Image, p. 136] In this he follows Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani Generis*. ☞

Excerpt from...

The Shame of Rembert Weakland and the Diocese of Milwaukee:

Disgraced archbishop portrayed in bronze plate as a protector of children?

By Charles J. Sykes

It is hard to image a less appropriate image than Archbishop Weakland depicted as a protector of children.

Leaders of SNAP, the *Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests* (SNAPnetwork.org) will hold a sidewalk news conference on the steps of Milwaukee's Catholic Cathedral urging newly installed Archbishop Jerome Lis-tecki to explain:

- Why disgraced former Archbishop Rembert Weakland is being honored next Tuesday, January 12th, with giving the keynote address at the Cathedral on the renovation of St. John's...
- Why, as part of that renovation, Weakland commissioned charitable money to be used to create a bronze relief of himself pictured in the biblical scene of Jesus protecting the little children[In the Weakland bronze relief, which serves as a pedestal to the Mary, Mother of the Church Shrine and is the Cathedral's east side altar, Weakland is flanked by St. John the Evangelist and St. Anne, the mother of Mary. Also in the background of the relief, according to Chicago artists Jeffrey and Anna Koh-Varilla, is a portrait of the Cathedral's current rector, Fr. Carl Last. A recent email by Anna and Jeffery Koh-Varilla, confirms that the relief was meant to bring the biblical scene into the contemporary world of the Milwaukee church by placing Weakland in it [as protector of children]...
- Why, for the first time since the 2002 revelations of paying half a million dollars in hush money to a man who says Weakland sexually abused him, is Weakland being allowed to ascend the Cathedral pulpit, but not in order to explain his covering up of child sex abuse crimes...
- How these actions are going to help bring about the desperately needed healing and resolution of the ongoing clergy sex abuse and cover up crisis in the Milwaukee archdiocese...

Here is a recent email message from the artists confirming it is Weakland in the bronze plate and why. On Thu, Dec 10, 2009 at 9:56 AM, Anna Koh-Varilla wrote:

The relief bronze panel below Mother Mary depicts the diversity of the Milwaukee Catholic community. It is, indeed, the tower of St. John the Evangelist Cathedral in the background and St. John is on the right with Archbishop Weakland on the left. The young mother in the foreground represents Mother Mary with today's children and Christ Child. The elderly woman praying represents St. Anne. The portrait of Father Last is also depicted in the background. You are correct that our intention was to merge the biblical message with contemporary reality.☞

Charles J. Sykes is the author of six books, including *Dumbing Down Our Kids: Why American Children Feel Good about Themselves, But Can't Read, Write, or Add* and is the host of a Milwaukee talk radio show, www.620wtmj.com.

Personhood Blindness

Where the Culture of Death prevails, even “pro-lifers” can be blinded.

By Stephanie Block

*“[R]acial bigotry is not merely a product of intentional interactions between individuals but racialized social relationships developed over generations and manifested in all of society’s major institutions.” [Johnny Eric Williams, “Unveiling Systemic Racism: ‘Barack the Magic Negro’” Revisited,” *Racism Review*, 1-13-09]*

The above statement has been a difficult one for dominant cultures to grasp. *Sin*, after all, isn’t systemic – it’s personal, that is, it’s the deliberate act of a person. A *person* lynches another human being; a *person* withholds an employee’s wages; a *person* throws toxins into drinking water ...these are acts over which a *person* has personal control and therefore personal responsibility.

However, despite the fact that many individuals know better than to lynch another human being and are personally revolted at the thought of lynching, even despite the fact that lynching is illegal, doesn’t entirely eliminate a culture of bigotry. Subtle expressions of racial prejudices may linger even in individuals whose personal values eschew such bigotry...ask anyone “of color.” The very term “racial” in such a context is a good example since, in reality, for all the variations of humanity’s skin tones and hair textures, we are a single, genetic “race.”

Difficult as it is for us, as a society, to embrace the full personhood of people from differing backgrounds and appearances – particularly when such a realization seems to interfere with our own self-interests – we are further along that path than the one that recognizes, as a society, the personhood of human beings who are not yet emancipated from the womb. Our legal institutions, for now, have put the problem into the lap of the woman who carries an *in utero* person, treating him or her as property rather than as a distinct and individual creature.

In such a society as ours, where the dominant culture infects not only legal institutions but social institutions such as the media and schools, as well, even people who would describe themselves as “pro-life” are trapped by norms of abortion-supportive expressions and behaviors. The Catholic Church in the United States finds itself in this position.

A glaring example of this problem is its *Catholic Campaign for Human Development* (CCHD) collection that, as an organization, argues exists to “help the poor.”

When critics have pointed out that a disproportionate number of CCHD grants support organizations – many of them Alinskyian organizing efforts – that are in some way related to Culture of Death policies, CCHD defenders are apoplectic. *Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good* writes, for instance:

In recent months, the campaign has been attacked by right-wing bloggers and partisan ideologues. While they have successfully pressured CCHD to de-fund groups that have taken some positions opposed to church teaching, these critics have also launched a concerted effort to exploit the ACORN scandal to get CCHD to stop ALL funding for community organizing efforts. At least five dioceses have cancelled this year’s collection. Several bishops have threatened to raise the issue next month at the U.S. bishops’ annual meeting in Baltimore.

The assumption in this response is that CCHD not only doesn’t need to concern itself with the social injustice of abortion but that where “solutions” to poverty – healthcare legislation, for example – include fellowship with pro-abortion forces, they may morally be pursued. Healthcare for some, according to this culture-of-death infused thought, trumps abortion for others.

That deadly consequence of funding organizations with one foot in the culture-of-death political camp never crosses the collective CCHD mind and fails to horrify it is the equivalent (by analogy...it’s actually more serious) of a racist policy never crossing the mind of a 1950s white legislator. The racism isn’t overt - it’s part of the subconscious fabric of the times. Similarly, today the pro-abortion position may not be overt...heck, the good folks at CCHD are surely good, pro-life Catholics...but the subconscious behavior betrays a participation in the culture of death. The issue of pro-abortion consequences simply doesn’t enter the equation.

That’s a big problem - *Reform CCHD Now* [www.reformcchdnow.com]. ↪

Update on New Mexico Abortion Providers

**NM ABORTION PRACTITIONER, CURTIS BOYD, ADMITS
“YES I AM” KILLING UNBORN CHILDREN DURING ABORTIONS**

By Steven Ertelt
LifeNews.com Editor
November 5, 2009

Dallas, TX (LifeNews.com) -- The late-term abortion practitioner at the new abortion center in Dallas has admitted in a shocking interview that he kills unborn children during abortions. Curtis Boyd is one of the few abortion practitioners to admit what he is doing, but he has no qualms with his job.

Boyd opened the first abortion center in Dallas in 1973 after the Supreme Court handed down the Roe v. Wade decision allowing virtually unlimited abortions.

In an interview with WFAA yesterday after news surfaced that he re-opened his late-term abortion center, Southwestern Women's Surgery Center, in the huge metro area last week after more than a year following the closure of the Aaron's abortion facility, he makes a startling admission.

“Am I killing?” Boyd said. “Yes, I am. I know that.”

He told WFAA that he is a former Baptist ordained minister who is now a part of the pro-abortion Unitarian Universalist church who says he prays often about the abortions he does.

“I'll ask that the spirit of this pregnancy be returned to God with love and understanding,” he said.

Boyd must operate an ambulatory surgical center in order to qualify under state law to do abortions after 16 weeks of pregnancy and he says women from across the south central United States come to him for late-term abortions.

“We see patients from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana and across Texas,” he said.

“The hardest ones are the young girls,” he added, saying that girls as young as 9 and 10 years of age have been to his center for abortions.

Boyd says he was a close friend of George Tiller, the late-term abortion practitioner who was shot and killed at his church earlier this year—allegedly by militia activist Scott Roeder, who is not affiliated with any pro-life groups.

He says he takes precautions such as keeping his address and phone number private but isn't afraid of doing abortions.

“I don't want the fate that befell Dr. Tiller, but I'm not going to be deterred because what I'm doing is important,” he said.

Curtis Boyd MD PC manages *Abortion Acceptance of New Mexico*, a private clinic specializing in *abortion* services.

NM ABORTIONIST PERFORMS UNWANTED ABORTION

By Christina Dunigan

June 2, 2006
realchoice.blogspot.com

Shari Russell [not her real name] had an ultrasound by Dr. Gary DeBaakey on *June 16, 1992*. DeBaakey informed Mr. and Mrs. Russell “that their child was a little girl,” and that she had anencephaly. The Russells wanted the infant delivered by C-section “to give the child a chance to live if she could,” but reported that DeBaakey pressured them to choose abortion. DeBaakey told them that Shari's medical condition necessitated immediate abortion and “that any delay in the abortion could cost [Shari] her life and that would leave her 7-year-old daughter, [Meghan], without a mother.” Under this pressure, the Russells relented, and DeBaakey referred them to **Robert P. Kaminsky** for an abortion.

Kaminsky failed to verify that Shari had any life-threatening condition. Only after the abortion of the baby, whom the family had named Rebecca, did the family learn that Shari had no medical indications for abortion, “that anencephalic children are not necessarily stillborn, and that the abortion was not necessary for the safety of [Shari.]” Mr.

and Mrs. Russell sued Kaminsky for fraudulent concealment, failure “to disclose the emotional and psychological risks and hazards to the family members,” “mental anguish, emotional distress and torment, emotional trauma, loss of affection, loss of solace, loss of comfort, loss of assistance, loss of love, loss of companionship and society, and harm to their family relationships.” Suit was also filed on behalf of Meghan for the loss of her baby sister.

Robert Kaminsky is currently an abortionist for Planned Parenthood of New Mexico, San Mateo Blvd. NE, Albuquerque

IS TIME RUNNING OUT ON WOMEN’S REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM?

Santa Fe Reporter
May 9, 2007

...**Like many in the nation’s rapidly graying pool of abortion** providers, Santa Fe doctor Lucia Cies is a veteran of the gender wars. She sees the conservative ideology behind anti-abortion groups as a throwback to what young women today might consider ancient history.

“The idea is that the proper role for women in society is to have children and to do that in marriage,” Cies says. “And if you do not choose to be married, to be open to having as many children as that marriage provides, then you’re not fulfilling your role as a woman.” For Cies, attacks on reproductive rights threaten the hard-earned gains women have made: “The ability to control when and whether one will have a child is about the most basic aspiration of women. To be able to control that aspect of our lives is fundamental to women’s rights—and if you don’t look at the big picture, you miss that.”

Dr. Lucia Cies is an abortionist at 435 Saint Michaels Dr., Santa Fe.

NEW MEXICO ABORTIONISTS, DR. BRUCE FERGUSON AND DR. CURTIS BOYD were presented ACLU-NM’s Guardian of Liberty Award on September 26, 2009 for a Bill of Rights Benefit Celebration

“I started providing abortions in 1971. I took two years off from my residency to do a fellowship in family planning at the University of New Mexico. At that time New Mexico law permitted abortion in a hospital with the approval of a committee who “certified” that the abortion was medically necessary for the life or health of the mother. I learned to perform abortions under the supervision of several pro-choice ob-gyn faculty. During the second year of the fellowship I

started my own abortion practice. After the fellowship I went back into a family practice residency, which had just been established at the University of New Mexico. After finishing the residency I joined the practice of an older family physician. We did not do abortions as part of that practice, but I worked two afternoons per week at an outpatient abortion facility that one of my mentors had established in 1973 after the Roe decision. Whenever I had a patient in my practice who requested an abortion, I referred her to the abortion clinic where I worked. It seemed dumb to refer patients out when I could do it myself in my own office. So I bought the equipment and instruments I needed and started doing the abortions in my own office, in between other typical family-practice patients (patients with issues like high blood pressure, diabetes, and depression). Abortion became an important part of my practice and eventually I just did contraception and abortion care.

I stayed connected with the University of New Mexico. Its Department of Family Medicine, which started training both ob-gyns and family physicians in abortion care, started sending residents to my office for two to three half days per week for a month or two as part of a reproductive health rotation to see how abortion could be integrated into a family practice, and to learn by doing. Over the years I have probably trained 20 or 30 residents in my office.” (Quoting Bruce Ferguson, “Focus on a Provider: Bruce Ferguson,” *The Reproductive Health Access Project Newsletter*, Spring 2009) ↪

An Anniversary to Mourn: Assessing 40 Years of No-Fault Divorce

By Jim Tonkowich

At the first annual men's retreat at our church, I was asked to speak about prayer. One of the topics we discussed was trust. I led a discussion after the men read Habbakuk and the article "Can God be Trusted" by Thomas D. Williams, a Catholic priest and professor of ethics. In the article, Williams comments: "Perhaps never before in history has the experience of betrayal personally affected so many people. To take one obvious example, a 50 percent divorce rate means that half the people who have dared to give their lives to someone (not to mention the millions of children affected) have experienced the brutal effects of misplaced trust."

In passing, I mentioned Elizabeth Marquardt's book, *Between Two Worlds: The Inner Lives of Children of Divorce*, in which Marquardt documents the long-term effects of divorce on children well into adulthood. The response was immediate ("How do you spell that name?" "What's that title again?" "Can I get that on Amazon?") and formed the conversation after the session and at lunch.

I have rarely been confronted by such a visceral response to the ravages of divorce, which recently celebrated a sad anniversary.

In the inaugural edition of *National Affairs*, W. Bradford Wilcox, director of the National Marriage Project at the University of Virginia, pointed out: "In [September] 1969, Governor Ronald Reagan of California made what he later admitted was one of the biggest mistakes of his political life. Seeking to eliminate the strife and deception often associated with the legal regime of fault-based divorce, Reagan signed the nation's first no-fault divorce bill."

After California, every state followed suit.

No-fault divorce answers the Pharisee's question to Jesus, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any and every reason?" with a resounding, "Yes!" Then it adds that it is also lawful for a woman to divorce her husband for any and every reason. In the U.S., wives initiate approximately two thirds of divorces.

It permits unilateral divorce, that is, one spouse can decide "for any and every reason" that the marriage is over giving the other spouse no recourse.

The result, says Wilcox, was that, when added to the sexual and psychological revolutions of the '60s and '70s, the number of divorces doubled between 1960 and 1980.

Divorce became acceptable even among Christians, easier to rationalize, and far easier to obtain. People who were unhappy and found their marriages unfulfilling, says Wilcox, "felt obligated to divorce in order to honor the newly widespread ethic of expressive individualism." Children, everyone felt certain, were resilient and would do just fine.

But children of divorce, says Wilcox, are "two to three times more likely than their peers in intact marriages to suffer from serious social or psychological pathologies."

Beyond children, divorce often has devastating social, psychological, spiritual, and financial consequences for at least one spouse. And others' divorces effect all of us by calling every marriage into question. "[W]idespread divorce," writes Wilcox, "undermined ordinary couples' faith in marital permanency and their ability to invest financially and emotionally in their marriages—ultimately casting clouds of doubt over their relationship."

Children of divorce lose their faith in marriage and are less likely to marry themselves. As a result, cohabitation rates have skyrocketed, which is bad news for adults, children, and marriage since, as Michael and Harriett McManus report in *Living Together*, cohabitation carries a whopping 80 percent failure rate.

Wilcox is not, however, simply a bearer of bad news. "The good news," he writes, "is that, on the whole, divorce has declined since 1980 and marital happiness has largely stabilized" as a result of three factors.

First, he says, "the views of academic and professional experts about divorce and family breakdown have changed significantly in recent decades." Scholars across the political spectrum are rediscovering the importance of stable marriage for adult wellbeing and the priority of intact families for the wellbeing of children.

As Kristin Anderson Moore, Susan M. Jekielek, and Carol Emig write in the article "Marriage from a Child's Perspective: How Does Family Structure Affect Children, and What Can We Do about It?": "The majority of children who are not raised by both biological parents manage to grow up without serious problems, especially after a period of adjustment for children whose parents divorce. Yet, on average, children in single-parent families are more likely to have problems than are children who live in intact families headed by two biological parents."

There is a need for pastoral care for people to live chaste lives in our sex-obsessed culture, beginning with explaining why that is important.

While myths about the resiliency of children and the extraneous nature of fathers persist, the conclusions reached by scholars are trickling down to the general population and marriages are being saved.

A second positive, says Wilcox, is that people are waiting longer to marry for the first time. "This means," he writes, "that

fewer Americans are marrying when they are too immature to forge successful marriages.”

This good news comes with a hidden problem. As the age of marriage has increased, the onset of puberty has decreased. That is, sexually able people are spending a longer time single. The result is a need for pastoral care for people seeking to live chaste lives in our sex-obsessed culture beginning with explaining why that is important.

The final factor in divorce declining is troubling. “Put simply,” writes Wilcox, “marriage is increasingly the preserve of the highly educated and the middle and upper classes.” He goes on: “When it comes to divorce *and* marriage, America is increasingly divided along class and educational lines. Even as divorce in general has declined since the 1970s, what sociologist Steven Martin calls a “divorce divide” has also been growing between those with college degrees and those without (a distinction that also often translates to differences in income).”

College graduates are half as likely to divorce as their less educated peers. He also cites a Child Trends study showing that only seven percent of mothers with a college degree had a child out of wedlock compared to 50 percent (!) of mothers who do not have a degree.

So while the divorce rate has stabilized, the stabilization is uneven—it is down for college graduates, up for everyone else. This means that a stable, lasting marriage has become a luxury good enjoyed by the affluent and educated and by their children. Wilcox sums up the findings: “Thus, the fallout of America’s retreat from marriage has hit poor and working-class communities especially hard, with children on the lower end of the economic spectrum doubly disadvantaged by the material and marital circumstances of their parents.”

While he suggests public policy measures, he admits that they are not a solution. Cultural change is necessary: “Parents, churches, schools, public officials, and the entertainment industry will have to do a better job of stressing the merits of a more institutional model of marriage. This will be particularly important for poor and working-class young adults, who are drifting away from marriage the fastest.”

I have little confidence in public schools, most public officials, or the entertainment industry. And my confidence in parents is contingent on what the Church does.

In order to break the divorce culture of America, we need to break the divorce culture in the Church.

If God hates divorce (Malachi 2:13-16), so should we. Yet as George Barna of Barna Research observed, “Americans have grown comfortable with divorce as a natural part of life.”

Having been a pastor, I understand the fear and trembling over teaching or preaching about divorce. Statistically, 26 percent of our hearers in evangelical churches have been divorced. That represents a lot of wounded people, some of whom will respond with fury and others who will respond with tears. Either way, the pastor can expect “feedback.”

It needs to be done anyway, because shaping the culture of our churches is vital to shaping the culture of our communities and nation. In order to break the divorce culture of America, we need to break the divorce culture in the Church.

Love for neighbor should inspire us. As I spoke on the retreat with men haunted by their parents’ divorce, their children’s divorce, their own divorce, or their spouse’s prior divorce, their pain and sadness impressed me in a new way. A culture that feeds such unhappiness should be fought.

The good news is that while God hates divorce, He dearly loves His children. If we ask, He will send us the help we need. That is, while every man and woman may be a liar (Psalm 116:11), God can be trusted. ☞

The following article originally appeared on the byFaith Magazine website, and is reproduced with permission. Jim Tonkowich can be reached at www.theird.org or www.jimtonkowich.com.