

BENEATH THE INTRACTABLE POLITICAL SURFACE:
How and Why the Terms of the Abortion Controversy Keep Changing
James R. Kelly, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Fordham University
(delivered at Dorothy Day Catholic Worker House, Washington, DC, June 4, 2010)

The debate about abortion has changed more than even its antagonists realize. The significant question for a Catholic Worker effort at clarification of thought is, When will it be more widely and efficaciously known that the ongoing fates of the peace movements and the prolife movements are intertwined?

1) Though it has been 37 years since *Roe v. Wade* and abortion remains an inconclusively disruptive part of every Supreme Court nomination process and every presidential election, and decades old national surveys show only glacial change in public opinion, the public debate has changed in morally significant ways:

* Abortion opponents now unanimously accept that stopping abortion requires comprehensive help for women who are pregnant and tempted by life circumstances - often of poverty and male irresponsibility - to abortion.

* Abortion proponents increasingly acknowledge that abortion most often is more an unhappy decision than the consciousness enlarging experience intrinsic to the practice of human rights.

These two still evolving acknowledgements can be summarized as the movement of abortion opponents towards more comprehensive thinking and action and abortion protagonists ongoing search for more common ground.

2) While comprehensiveness and common ground make abortion politics more morally promising, these progressions do not yet meet the challenge of a *consistent ethic of life*, the challenge of the 1983 Pastoral *The Challenge of Peace* which taught that the violences of war and the violences of abortion are morally intertwined, so that: There will be no slow but continued evolution away from the violences of war and away from the violences of abortion unless these movements are conjoined. And here lies a special responsibility for the Catholic Worker and those who identify with the Worker's prophetic call to a biblically rooted vocation of nonviolence.

WHAT ABOUT THE VIOLENCE IN THE ANTI-ABORTION MOVEMENT?

Certainly a major aspect of the wariness of peace activists to view the movement opposing abortion as potential allies is the widely publicized murders committed in the name of fetal life against abortion providers. Beginning our clarification with examples of violence committed in the name of stopping abortion must seem at first glance awkward and left-footed. Yet a close examination of the abortion doctor murderers and the cumulative responses of mainstream pro-life leaders and organizations show their implicit awareness not only of the deepest, nonviolent core of their movement but also the moral requisite of distancing themselves from the just war analysis used as justification by abortion doctor killers.

ALREADY INCLUSIVELY NONVIOLENT WHEN DEFENSIVELY ANSWERING CRITICS After each murder of an abortion performing doctor prolife social movement organizations and leaders first note that the killer is a "lone wolf" unattached to any prolife social movement organization and then - and here's the point to think hard about - to unfailingly characterize their movement as inherently nonviolent. For example, after the Eric Rudolph series

of terrorist bombings in the Atlanta area in the mid-1990s,¹ the then chairman of the Bishops' Committee for Pro-Life Activities said, "Such violence is the opposite of everything we stand for." The executive director of the Georgia Right to Life said that violence "is never the solution to social problems". Gary L. Bauer, then president of the Family Research Council, said "Violence is not the answer to violence". David O'Steen, long time executive director of the National Right to Life Committee said "The goal of NRLC is to break the cycle of violence, which includes abortion, not perpetuate it".²

More than a decade later after Scott Roeder murdered Dr. George R. Tiller in the vestibule of his church on the last Sunday of May, 2009, the remarks of leading prolife SMOs simply recycled these earlier avowals of nonviolence. Father Frank Pavone, the founder and director of Priests for Life, a prominent pro-life Catholic group said, "We at Priests for Life continue to insist on a culture in which violence is never seen as the solution to any problem. Every life has to be protected, without regard to their age or views or actions," he said. Thomas Glessner, a pro-life attorney who heads NIFLA, a group that provides legal services to hundreds of pregnancy centers, said "violence is never a solution. The pro-life movement stands against violence and killing and this opposition is in our DNA".

These remarks show that when prolife leaders **must** respond to others in a morally persuasive way they link their opposition to abortion to the perpetually nascent non-violence movement, adumbrated in the gospels and embodied by, among others, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Dorothy Day and countless others. But these leaders and the mainstream movement opposing abortion have yet to personally and organizationally apprehend the deeper meaning and full moral implications of their immediate response to the use of violence to stop abortion. Let's think more carefully about the still unreflexive nonviolence underlying prolife public rhetoric and the evolution of just war reflecting towards a more systemic nonviolence.

PROLIFE AND JUST WAR EVOLUTION TOWARDS NONVIOLENCE When abortion is characterized as the killing of the unborn, the issue inevitably becomes entwined with just war theory. Just war theory can be traced back to St. Augustine who sought to explain how Christians, in their new situation as full fledged citizens of the Roman Empire, could support the state violence that Jesus as portrayed in the gospels called on them to renounce.³ In fact, in his April 13, 2005 statement for prosecutors Eric Rudolph, whose pipe bomb explosion at the Atlanta 1996 Summer Olympics killed a young mother and whose Birmingham, Georgia clinic bombing

¹ See Maryanne Vollers, *LONE WOLF*, HarperCollins, 2006. Eric Rudolph "had never been seen at an anti-abortion demonstration in Birmingham or anywhere else in the country. He had no history with the movement at all" (233). Vollers reports that "When he was identified as the main suspect in the series of bombings, federal investigators profiled him as a 'lone offender,' or 'lone wolf': a self-appointed avenger with no real alliances, no meaningful social ties. He tries to justify his actions by attaching them to a cause: saving babies, defending the white race, striking a blow against technology. The lone wolf believes history will judge him to be a hero. To psychologists, he is an inadequate male who converts his frustrations and longings into a campaign of murder" (11-12). After his plea bargain with the Birmingham, Alabama prosecutors, Rudolph wrote an eleven pages manifesto entitled "Statement of Eric Robert Rudolph April 13, 2005". In it he apologized for the explosives placed on July 27 at Centennial Park across from the Atlanta 1996 Olympic Games that killed Alice Hawthorne and injured 111 others.

² All of the above are cited in *THE TABLET*, "Atlanta Archbishop Decries Bombing of a Clinic" (1/25/97) and "A Truly Horrendous Bombing," (1/16/97).

³ Cf. Ronald G. Musto, *THE CATHOLIC PEACE TRADITION*, (Maryknoll, New York, Orbis Books, 1986; for a succinct summary of just war theory see *COMPENDIUM OF THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH*, Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, Washington, DC, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005: #500, p. 217.

killed an off duty policeman, showed a familiarity with just war theory and even cited one of its Latin phrases: “You so-called ‘Pro-Life,’ ‘good Christian people’ who point your plastic fingers at me saying that I am a “murderer,’ that ‘two wrongs don’t make a right,’ that even though ‘abortion is murder, those who would use force to stop the murder are morally the same,’ I say to you your lies are transparent... are you not the ones waving the flag in support of the coward Bush’s operation in Iraq? Do you not say that Washington’s cause justifies the bombing and shooting of thousands of people? Answer me, is the *causus belli* of promoting democracy in the Middle East more weighty for waging war than the systematic murder of millions of your own citizens?”

The linking of just war theory with violence against abortion providers is not merely found among deranged long wolves. Following Paul Hill’s 1994 killing of Dr. Bayard Brittan and his security escort at a Pensacola, Florida clinic and John Salvi’s 1994 murder of two clinic staff members in Boston - both also characterized as “lone wolves”, the highly regarded⁴ neo-conservative monthly *FIRST THINGS*, founded by the late Richard John Neuhaus, held and then published a December 1994 symposium entitled “Killing Abortionists”. The symposium, no surprise, morally condemned the use of violence by abortion opponents. But, and this was a surprise, the majority of the subsequent letters to the editor (March 1995: pp. 2-4) criticized the symposium participants because they had omitted considerations explored in just war theory that defend the use of violence in defense of the innocent. Rev. Earle Fox writes that Hill’s stated principle was that “Whatever force is legitimate in defending a born child is legitimate in defending an unborn child... It did not appear to me that anyone (in the symposium) successfully disapproved his principle.” Letter writer Eric A. Voellm challenged the moral consistency of the symposium members: “If we truly believe that the child in the womb is every bit as much a person as a child outside the womb, can there really be any legitimate excuse for not employing deadly force? Alas, the pro-life movement is faced with a conundrum. Either we insist upon the unborn child as a person with all the legal rights of an adult, including the right to expect assistance in the defense of its life, or we fold up our tents and concede that the child in the womb cannot expect the same legal and moral considerations as the child already born”. The Rev. E. Michael Womack found that the participants’ “appeals to and applications of Just War theory were convincing”.

ORIGINAL DIRECT ACTIONS ARE EXPLICITLY NONVIOLENT. A great irony is that the origins of the direct protest, civil disobedience wing of abortion opposition had its origin among members committed to a Gandhi-like spirit of active nonviolence. The first direct action in the prolife movement was in August, 1975, a sit in in front of an abortion clinic in Rockville, Maryland.⁵ The woman (the men’s role was as solicitous bystanders) who led the groups was Chris Mooney, who, along with most of other seven, had been involved in the peace movement during the Vietnam War era. All were Catholics. Their explicit intention and plan was to adapt the successful tactics of the peace movement to abortion protest. They viewed their sit-ins as an educational outreach and say they were surprised and shocked that “during sit-ins we found that

⁴ The editorial and editorial advisory board reads like a “who’s who” of American religious conservatives, including such names as Peter Berger, Midge Decter, Stanley Hauerwas (who was forced to resign after 9/11 because of his pacifism), Gertrude Himmelfarb, Michael Novak, Hadley Arkes, Jean Bethke Elshtain, Mary Ann Glendon, Glenn Loury, George Marsden, Gilbert Meilender, and Max Stackhouse.

⁵ Telephone interview with John Cavanaugh-O’Keefe, April, 1982. Cavanaugh-O’Keefe, a Harvard educated, Viet Nam war conscientious objector, is described by Cynthia Gorney as “one of the philosophical guides of the sit-in movement”. (ARTICLES OF FAITH, Simon & Schuster, 1998: 260. She cites (p. 262) Cavanaugh O’Keefe on the TV media disappointment to his presentation on direct action at the 1978 National Right to Life Convention in St. Louis, Missouri: “In the workshop it became clear that we were not going to advocate violence, and at that point all the (TV) lights went out”.

people would leave (the clinic). We found that sit-ins do save lives - that wasn't initially part of the point of it. People were going to talk to them and try to persuade them (not to abort) but nobody believed it would work". The second sit-in was the 4th of July weekend when 12 people were arrested in Washington. For these actions there were preliminary preparatory meetings which included "some spiritual training and people getting up and talking about the need for acting out of love and reading scripture" (Cavanaugh-O'Keefe, see footnote). Terry Sullivan⁶, who worked at Catholic Worker houses in Chicago and New York City and who burned his draft card at a 1960s anti-war rally, presciently warned in his *Pro Life Action* bulletin 1992 (Number Five: p. 14) that although "we have a nonviolent direct action movement which is both larger and more peaceful than the movement of the 1960s ... the nonviolence in the pro life movement arises from an external situation rather than from the inward convictions of most of the people involved. It can change very quickly when that situation changes. That is just what happened in the 1960s, and the potential for a violent showdown growing out of this movement is much greater, because the political base of this movement is much larger". Indeed, the decentralized *Pro-life Nonviolent Action Project* declined and eventually disappeared as the more confrontational groups with no principled attachment to the nonviolence movement became ascendant. By November 2003 Randall Terry apologized for *Operation Rescue's* confrontational tactics, saying "I wish I had not been so strident in some of the things that I said. I'm hoping people will cut me some slack."⁷

THE COMMITMENT TO ACTIVE NONVIOLENCE AMONG KEY MOVEMENT

PIONEERS The moral insight that objections to abortion and objections to war are rooted in the same moral principles appeared at the very beginning of the modern anti-abortion movement. In 1964, almost a decade before *Roe*, Tom Cornell, one of the founders of the Catholic Peace Fellowship, said that it was pacifism that brought him to protest both the Vietnam war and abortion. "Catholic pacifists," he explained, "are opposed to war because it is the planned, mass taking of human life for political purposes (and) we are opposed to abortion, euthanasia, capital punishment, and economically enforced starvation also, on the same basis".⁸ Two years before *Roe* Gordon Zahn, one of the founders of *Pax Christi*, the international Catholic peace organization formed after World War II, linked opposing abortion and opposing war. "It is not just a matter of consistency; in a very real sense it is the choice between integrity and hypocrisy. No one who publicly mourns the senseless burning of a napalmed child should be indifferent to the intentional killing of a living fetus in the womb...."⁹

In 1973, the year the Supreme Court in its 7 - 2 *Roe vs. Wade* decision struck down all state laws prohibiting or restricting abortion, the first college social movement organization formed in the abortion controversy, *The National Youth Pro-Life Coalition* at the University of Minnesota, morally intertwined its opposition to abortion and to the Vietnam War: "The Coalition is deeply concerned that our contemporary society is not consistent in its respect for human life" and it challenged those who were "antiabortion, pro-war and pro-capital punishment" to moral consistency because "true conservatism should involve a willingness to 'conserve' all human life".

⁶ Sullivan was one of the founders of Pro Life Nonviolent Network of Denver, founded in August 1989 to coordinate a 5 day a week pro life witness and sidewalk counseling effort at the Planned Parenthood clinic at 20th and Vine in Denver, which still persists.

⁷ *Lifenews.com*, Nov. 30, 2003.

⁸ Cited in Patricia McNeal, *Harder Than War: Catholic Peacemaking in Twentieth-Century America* (Rutgers Univ. Press, 1992: 169).

⁹ "The Unborn Life and the Protection of Life," *Commonweal*, May 28, 1971: 337-339.

The year following *Roe* the *Catholic Peace Fellowship* published its *Statement on Abortion* (June 28, 1974) saying that “For many years we have urged upon our spiritual leaders the inter-relatedness of the life issues, war, capital punishment, abortion, euthanasia and economic exploitation”. It was signed by Dorothy Day, Eileen Egan, Hermene Evens, Joseph Evans, M.D., Thomas C. Cornell, James H. Forest, and Gordon Zahn.

Six years after *Roe*, in 1979, Juli Loesch began *Pro-lifers for Survival* which linked the oppositions to war and abortion. In 1980, the Evangelical Christian journal *Sojourners* explicitly joined opposition to abortion to its long-standing opposition to the arms race and to capital punishment.

While *the consistent ethic of life* had originally emerged among groups of religiously committed pacifists who intuitively saw a connection between their moral abhorrence of war and abortion, the phrase entered more mainstream discourse in the aftermath of the late Joseph Cardinal Bernardin’s Gannon lecture at Fordham University on December 6, 1983, entitled *A Consistent Ethic of Life: An American Catholic Dialogue*. Bernardin was invited to speak on the American Bishop’s recently published and widely commented on pastoral letter on the morality of nuclear weapons, *The Challenge of Peace*. His audience and the reporters present expected a discussion of the letter’s severe moral critiques of the Reagan administration’s expansionist military policies and of its doctrine of *Mutually Assured Destruction*. But Bernardin surprised everybody when he told them he was going to talk about abortion in the context of the Church’s evolving teaching about war and peace. He was, like the earlier Catholic opponents of the Vietnam war, going to intertwine the moral arguments against abortion and against war. For three reasons the surprise of the audience and the reporters about this unexpected intertwining revealed how far the protest movement against abortion had strayed from one of its core moral intuitions, and how closely it had become publicly associated with political conservatism.

An implicit consistent ethic of life can be traced back to the decade before *Roe*. First, in 1964 in its “The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World” (section #27) the Second Vatican Council included abortion not as a single issue but as the third item in a list of sixteen examples of violence against human life: “Furthermore, whatever is opposed to life itself, such as any type of murder, genocide, abortion, euthanasia, or willful self destruction, whatever violates the integrity of the human person, such as mutilation, torments inflicted on body or mind, attempts to coerce the will itself; whatever insults human dignity, such as subhuman living conditions, arbitrary imprisonment, deportation, slavery, prostitution, the selling of women and children; as well as disgraceful working conditions, where men are treated as mere tools for profit, rather than as free and responsible persons; all these things and others of their like are infamies indeed.” Second, in 1972, the year before *Roe*, in accord with Vatican II teaching, the bishops inaugurated their “Respect Life Program” in which they invited Catholics and others to focus on the “sanctity of life and the many threats to life in the modern world, including violence, hunger and poverty.” Even more explicitly, just seven months before his Fordham lecture the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in their pastoral letter *The Challenge of Peace* taught that it was the precise same moral principle that governed both the traditional just war principle of discrimination prohibiting any direct targeting of civilians *and* the traditional prohibition against abortion: “Nothing, the bishops taught, “can justify the direct attack on innocent human life, in or out of warfare. Abortion is precisely such an attack” (paragraphs #286-87). Acknowledging the need for a deeper evolution of the moral linkage of the violences of abortion and war, the bishops acknowledged that the

consistency they found in the traditional teachings linking war and abortion was not widely known and held, even by Catholics.

Because of this two decade old history, in his 1983 Fordham address Bernardin described the linking of opposition to abortion and targeting civilians as “long-standing” and “traditional”. What had evolved was the heightened significance of their linkage in thought and in public policy advocacy¹⁰ which he acknowledged was neither widely known or accepted. Bernardin acknowledged that “We should begin with the honest recognition that the shaping of a consensus among Catholics on the spectrum of life issues is far from finished”.

MORALLY POTENT, PUBLICLY WEAK Though largely ignored by the media and prominent prolife social movement organizations, by the mid-1980s there was a wide and dense network of groups which explicitly linked their non-violence and rejection of modern warfare to a moral critique of abortion. At the last PROLIFERS FOR SURVIVAL gathering in March 1987 the “Seamless Garment Network” was formed. Its mission statement reads: “We the undersigned are committed to the protection of life, which is threatened in today’s world by war, abortion, poverty, racism, the arms race, the death penalty and working on all or some of these issues to maintain a cooperative spirit of peace, reconciliation, and respect euthanasia. We believe that these issues are linked under a consistent ethic of life. We challenge those working on all or some of these issues to maintain a cooperative spirit of peace, reconciliation and respect in protecting the unprotected.” By 2003 the Network had over 120 member organizations, most of them with religious identities, such as Catholic Worker groups and diocesan Peace and Justice Committees, Pax Christi, Evangelicals for Social Action, Sojourners, and the Buddhist Vihara Society. Because the metaphor “seamless garment” (Jn 19: 23-4) required constant explication in a secular society, the network now identifies itself as “Consistent Life – An International Network for Peace, Justice, and Life.” At the end of the year 2009, the *Consistent Ethic - Voices for Peace and Life* web site listed 215 group affiliates. In efforts to overcome media stereotypes of abortion opponents, Consistent Life has taken out ads in publications explaining the consistent ethic of life. Signers have included prominent peace activists such as Daniel and the late Phillip Berrigan, Elizabeth McAlister, Jim and Shelly Douglass, Joan Chittister O.S.B., the late Eileen Egan (the first to apply the *seamless garment* metaphor to abortion opposition), Jean Goss and Hildegard Goss-Mayr of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Bishops Thomas Gumbleton, Walter F. Sullivan, and Raymond J. Hunthausen; Nobel prize recipients Mairead Corrigan Maguire and Adolfo Perez Esquivel, and the high-profile Protestant theologians Harvey Cox and Stanley Hauerwas.

The Consistent Life International Network for Peace, Justice, and Life is mostly invisible to popular opinion largely because the principle of nonviolence itself is mostly unacknowledged in American popular culture. Opposition to specific wars receives some press coverage but there is no media attention paid to the tradition and relevance of active nonviolence. The early and strong biblical traditions showing that Christ taught, and his followers accepted non-violence, have been mostly marginalized in the Christian Churches. But the current unlinking of opposition to abortion from the center of the Republican Party establishment means, among other things, that the prolife movement will become freer to reconnect with its originating moral intuition linking opposition to abortion and war and become more widely recognized, and morally respected, as promoting a

¹⁰ Bernardin was not even the first bishop to explicitly call for pro-life consistency. In 1971 Boston Archbishop Humberto Medeiros entitled an address to lawyers, “A Call for a Consistent Ethic of Life and the Law,” (*The Pilot*, July 10, 1971.)

consistent ethic of life that, in the name of the biblical values of nonviolence and equality, challenges all major and minor streams of American politics.

The *telos* - the driving force, the essence, and the ultimate goal - of the movement opposing abortion is to become fully pro-life and thus re-join the first Christian disciples, and then many others, in a commitment to non-violence.¹¹ Principled nonviolent antiwar activists comprised one of the core early streams of the modern movement to prevent abortion from becoming a normal dimension of human life. To keep its vitality the movement opposing abortion must keep returning to its deepest and more inclusive moral insight: that a resort to violence in any dimension is a negation of the human good. And to keep its deepest vitality, movements opposing war must learn from the early opponents of abortion that at its deepest moral justification abortion is a personalization of just war theory applied to a unique and vulnerable developing human life. Abortion is the individualization and thus the continuation of just war theory. The fates of the moral flourishing of the nonviolence animating both the anti-war and anti-abortion movements are irrevocably linked.

William D. Miller, *ALL IS GRACE: The Spirituality of Dorothy Day*, NY, Doubleday, 1987.

In May 1918 Dorothy Day trained to become a nurse in Kings County Hospital, Brooklyn. While there she met a patient Lionel Moise, described by Miller as “an egotistical, heavy-drinking, and brawling adventurer whose normal occupation was that of womanizing” and a producer of “prodigies of journalistic output” (15). Miller describes Day at this time as “twenty-one years old, virginal, and actually without previous serious romantic adventure in her life” and who “positively disintegrated before Moise.” Always one to move impetuously, even recklessly, Miller continues, “she flung herself at him and then flung herself into his apartment”. Six months later she was pregnant, ten months later, at Mosie’s urging, she had an abortion, and then Mosie left her (15).

Miller writes that Dorothy kept her abortion a secret, “around which she erected an impenetrable silence”. He reports that her abortion deeply bothered her throughout her life. “The consequences of the abortion were near catastrophic. Ill, she took a room with a German family which, as she later said, treated her with extraordinary compassion. Yet she lived with such desolation,” he writes, “that twice she initiated attempts at suicide. Gradually she built a fantasy: it was that she would again become pregnant and that the lost child would be reincarnated in a new birth” (15).

Dorothy’s pain about her own abortion impacted her advice to the young women who, in similar straits, sought her counsel. Miller writes that “even in the closing years of her life only several people knew of it” and one “was a young woman, pregnant, who had gone to the Catholic Worker

¹¹ Roland Bainton concluded from his exhaustive examination (*CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS WAR AND PEACE*, NY, Abingdon, 1960: 67-8) that “From the end of the New Testament period to the decade A.D. 170-180 there is no evidence whatsoever of Christians in the army”. But some sociological context is needed here. The first Christians expected an imminent return of Jesus, the Roman Army required emperor worship, and the first Christians were themselves largely marginal to the affairs of state. But when Constantine unifies the Roman Empire and makes Christianity the state religion, the Church shifted from pacifism towards (under St. Ambrose and St. Augustine) what has crystallized as just war theory. Thomas A. Shannon (*WHAT ARE THEY SAYING ABOUT PEACE AND WAR*, NY, Paulist Press, 1983: 11) points out that the first Christian soldiering took place on the edges of the empire where there the need to protect the population from the hit and run tactics of the barbarian forces seemed close to policing and “the more the army took on the function of a police force, the less problematic service in that army became (for Christians)”.

house and was thinking of having an abortion. Dorothy wrote her a letter, telling of her own experience and begging her not to subject herself to the suffering that she, Dorothy, had undergone” (15).

After an ill-fated marriage to Barkeley Tobey and during her long attachment to Foster Batterham, Dorothy again became pregnant and again her companion urged an abortion. Miller describes it this way. Dorothy clung “to the desperate hope that she might get pregnant” by Batterham whom, though not her legal husband, she loved dearly. But Batterham could make no final commitment. “He had not wanted her to have Tamar” and when Dorothy had begun her deeper exploration of Catholicism, he did not want Tamar baptized, which she was two years later on December 27, 1927, at the church of Our Lady Help of Christians in Tottenville, Staten Island. Years later at a Worker House of Hospitality, Miller writes that “When a pregnant woman came to the community to have her baby, Dorothy’s terms for accepting her were that she not place the baby for adoption after its birth but that the mother keep it”. In her diary she wrote, “I am so glad to see the great happiness of the girls with their babies and they are to be congratulated for keeping them when priests, social workers, and all are opposed” (169). Inexplicably, Day’s biographers makes no mention of her participation in the 1974 **Catholic Peace Fellowship’s** *Statement on Abortion* which explicitly proposes a consistent ethic almost a decade before Bernardin.

LESSONS LEARNED

- 1) The first national abortion social movement organizations formed were not politically or legally oriented but service groups providing help to pregnant women to help them decide against abortion.
- 2) The number of Pregnancy Resource Centers in 2009 approach 3,500. The average center sees between 300 and 350 women per year. Twenty-nine out of thirty Pregnancy Center personnel are volunteers. Fewer than 20 percent nationally participate in any government grants or any other assistance program, and thus are completely reliant on donations and gifts. Fifty percent operate with total revenues at or below \$125,000.
- 3) The first organizations favoring abortion had strong links to eugenic and then population control groups.
- 4) The first feminists of the 19th century opposed abortion and described it as an evasion of what women needed for equality and dignity.
- 5) The identification of legal abortion with rights for women occurred in the end of the 1960s when the National Organization For Women, without an organization vote, included it in their platform.
- 6) The moral insight that objections to abortion and objections to war are rooted in the same moral principles appeared at the very beginning of the modern anti-abortion movement. The first national social movement organizations to oppose abortion were members of the Catholic Peace Movement in opposition to the Vietnam War.
- 7) The first direct action clinic sit-in protests were former anti-Vietnam War activists.

8) When leaders of prolife organizations respond to the murders of abortion providers they characterize their movement as inclusively and inherently nonviolent.

9) Abortion provider killers employ just war theory as their defense.

10) While *the consistent ethic of life* had originally emerged among groups of religiously committed pacifists who intuitively saw a connection between their moral abhorrence of war and abortion, the phrase entered more mainstream discourse after the late Joseph Cardinal Bernardin's Gannon lecture at Fordham University on December 6, 1983, entitled *A Consistent Ethic of Life: An American Catholic Dialogue*.

11) An implicit consistent ethic of life can be traced back to the decade before *Roe*. In 1964 in its "The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World" (section #27) the Second Vatican Council included abortion not as a single issue but as the third item in a list of sixteen examples of violence against human life.

12) Just seven months before Bernardin's Fordham lecture the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in their 1983 pastoral letter *The Challenge of Peace* taught that it was the precise same moral principle that governed both the traditional just war principle of discrimination prohibiting any direct targeting of civilians *and* the traditional prohibition against abortion: "Nothing, the bishops taught, "can justify the direct attack on innocent human life, in or out of warfare. Abortion is precisely such an attack" (paragraphs #286-87).

13) Though largely ignored by the media and prominent prolife social movement organizations, by the mid-1980s there was a wide and dense network of groups which explicitly linked their opposition to war and to abortion in a wider non-violence.

14) At the end of the year 2009, the *Consistent Ethic - Voices for Peace and Life* web site listed 215 group affiliates. In their outreach they have taken out ads in publications explaining the consistent ethic of life. Signers have included prominent peace activists such as Daniel and the late Phillip Berrigan, Elizabeth McAlister, Jim and Shelly Douglass, Joan Chittister O.S.B., the late Eileen Egan (the first to apply the *seamless garment* metaphor to abortion opposition¹²), Jean Goss and Hildegard Goss-Mayr of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Bishops Thomas Gumbleton, Walter F. Sullivan, and Raymond J. Hunthausen; Nobel prize recipients Mairead Corrigan Maguire and Adolfo Perez Esquivel, and the high-profile Protestant theologians Harvey Cox and Stanley Hauerwas.

15) No term and no principle is more alien to the nation state, especially in its foreign affairs, than non-violence.

16) The first abortion opponents entering politics were democrats and their first political supporters were democrats, such as Ted Kennedy and Jessie Jackson. They expected and received very little Republican Party support. By 1976 Republican insiders understood that without a constitutional revocation of *Roe* they could co-opt anti-abortion social movement organizations.

¹² Egan recalled that in exasperation "the word popped out" in a heated conversation with the late English journalist Malcolm Muggeridge, who agreed with her about abortion while disagreeing with her about nuclear disarmament (Marvin L. Krier Mich, *CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING AND MOVEMENTS*, Twenty-Third Publications, Ct.: 2009 (1998): 211-212.

- 17) The current unlinking of opposition to abortion from the center of the Republican Party establishment means, among other things, that the prolife movement will become freer to reconnect with its originating moral intuition linking opposition to abortion and war and become more widely recognized, and morally respected, as promoting a *consistent ethic of life*.
- 18) In their justification, abortion opponents who kill doctors who do abortions cite just war theory explicitly or its tenets.
- 19) The absoluteness of opposing all abortions makes no final sense save in the context of the absoluteness of nonviolence.
- 20) The absoluteness of nonviolent pacifism makes no final sense if abortion is characterized as a neutral choice.
- 21) Although few know it, Catholic Church authorities link anti-abortion and anti-war sentiments.
- 22) The *telos* - the driving force, the essence, and the ultimate goal - of the movement opposing abortion is to become fully pro-life and thus re-join the first Christian disciples, and then many others, in a commitment to non-violence.
- 23) To keep its deepest vitality, movements opposing war must learn from the early opponents of abortion that at its deepest moral justification abortion is a personalization of just war theory applied to the unborn.
- 24) The fates of the moral flourishing of the nonviolence animating the anti-war and anti-abortion movements are irrevocably linked.
- 25) “Although we tell them (social movements) forward, their logics run backward” for “they involve a subtle teleology ... they impute a kind of coherence”, Charles Tilly.