

"Whatever needs to be maintained through force is doomed." - Henry Miller

**Schultheis deliberately misleads the reader by passing off his personal beliefs as an accurate rendering of the law**

Dear Editor,  
Rep. Dave Schultheis' (R-Colorado Springs) July 26 Colorado Statesman comments in response to my challenge of the Catholic Church's moral authority to any longer speak or take action against legal abortion, including questioning where Life and Liberty for Women's (LLW) moral authority is based, doesn't seem to reflect an understanding of the definition of moral authority. Moral authority is based on the principle of right conduct and involves the right to speak and take action on a moral issue because one's right in conduct, principles, and standards. Priests preach the sacredness of all human life from church doctrine, denouncing legal abortion while sexually abusing born children. Church hierarchy enables molesting priests and foregoes a zero-tolerance doctrine against the sexual molestation of born children. One cannot preach the sacredness of all human life, be a child molester and co-conspirator of child molestation and command any right to denounce legal abortion.

Schultheis questions our motivation suggesting we're acting opportunistically and attacking a vocal opponent of legal abortion rather than expressing genuine concern for born children. But it's our genuine concern for born children, which obligated us to publicly, loudly and vigorously criticize and denounce Catholic

priests and hierarchy. Secrecy has been an enabler of the crime and cover-up. There's nothing vindictive about ending such enabling secrecy by publicly holding Church priests and hierarchy accountable, in no uncertain terms, for their criminal behavior and hypocrisy. Schultheis' attempt to shoot the messenger because he doesn't like the message is all too transparent and does nothing to facilitate justice for the victims, or repentance and criminal accountability from priests and bishops, something our "sensational morally indignant language" may go along way toward accomplishing. The fact that the Catholic Church is one of the most vocal consistent opponents to abortion surely makes what they've done to born children even more abhorrent.

Though not surprising, but certainly most notably missing from Schultheis' comments, is outrage at the crime and the hypocrisy. In fact Schultheis defends the hypocrisy and minimizes the abuse by characterizing priest's criminal behavior as, "the moral problems of a small minority of Catholic priests." But these aren't just "moral problems" - they're crimes and according to the evidence I cited they involve more than a "minority" of priests.

Schultheis deliberately misleads



the reader by passing off his personal beliefs as an accurate rendering of the law. The law says abortion under the guidelines of Roe vs. Wade isn't murder or a criminal act. It's not a criminal act precisely because pre-viable human life has absolutely no right to life over a born woman, and God doesn't disagree ([www.lifeandlibertyforwomen.org](http://www.lifeandlibertyforwomen.org) <<http://www.lifeandlibertyforwomen.org> first issue article/>

Rep. Schultheis, if a priest, who's also an abortion provider, commits the criminal act of sexually abusing children, he should lose his medical license, be defrocked, tried in the criminal courts and once convicted, jailed for the crime of sexual abuse.

Deliberately misrepresenting LLW's positions calls into question Schultheis' integrity. First, regarding the article in our Spring 2002 newsletter on our web site about President Bush's decision to extend health coverage under the CHIP program to "unborn children." It's Schultheis' position that's degrading to women because it uses low-income pregnant women to further the anti-abortion agenda. What Schultheis conveniently leaves out is the admittance of HHS Secretary Tommy Thompson that "states can already cover pregnant women under their CHIP Programs by getting a waiver from the federal government

to existing rules." Julie Bosman, The New Republic said, "If Bush were simply interested in giving more low income women prenatal care, he could've expanded the program's eligibility to pregnant women without ever mentioning the rights of a fetus." Schultheis knows full well this unprecedented move isn't about the health of women and their unborn fetuses, it's about setting the stage for a legal battle to overturn Roe, as anti-abortion extremists try to make the case for legal personhood for pre-viable human life.

Second, we've never said the "status of the unborn is less human than that of the born." The unborn is as human as the born but that doesn't change the fact that pre-viable human life hasn't a right to life over a born woman. Terminating born life is a criminal act under our laws, as well it should be, and God doesn't disagree.

Finally, President Bill Clinton sinned, committed perjury but using Schultheis' reasoning, that shouldn't preclude him from speaking with moral authority about anything. So Rep. Schultheis, is there anything to which you believe Clinton no longer has a moral authority to speak about? Be very careful how you answer that.

Peggy Loonan  
Executive Director  
Life and Liberty for Women  
[peggy@lifeandlibertyforwomen.org](mailto:peggy@lifeandlibertyforwomen.org)