

# St. Bernadette Respect Life Committee

## Newsletter

---

---

November 2005

### From the Pastor

By Rev. Mark J. Betti

This inaugural newsletter of St. Bernadette's Respect Life Committee brings with it a timely and urgent message. RLC members Jerry and Claire Schweitzer came to my office one evening and narrated the following:

"At the October 4 Diocesan meeting of parish Respect Life Committee Representatives, the representative of St. Brendan's Parish in Shallotte reported that the "morning-after pill", which is an abortifacient, is being made available, upon request, to students at UNCW and other state-funded universities in North Carolina. If the student is 18 years or older, no notification to the parents is required under state law.

State Representative Paul Stam (37th District) verified for us that in the recent past, the student health facilities at state universities in North Carolina were privately operated. A few years ago, the state took over the funding of these facilities. He also stated that the "morning-after pill" is available to students upon request at most, if not all, of these state-funded universities. Representative Stam gave us the following three facts:

1. All students enrolled at NC state universities and colleges pay a student health fee.
2. The total cost of the "morning-after pill" is less than the total amount collected from student health fees.
3. Health facilities at state universities in North Carolina usually run a deficit that is made-up from state funds.

Because we can't be certain that our taxes are not funding this particular program, what are our moral responsibilities in this matter? Do we pay our state taxes? Besides praying over this, telling you, and reporting back to our parish Respect Life Committee, what else are our responsibilities?"

I will answer Jerry and Claire's question first, and then offer suggestions as to what can be done.

Yes, we have the moral responsibility to pay our taxes. It is immoral (and illegal) not to pay the lawful taxes. Christians can look at it this way: If we do not pay our taxes, God will hold us responsible. If we pay our lawful

taxes and (in this case) the state uses that money for immoral purposes, then God will hold *them* responsible!

However, concerned Christians will want to take some action, so I and the Respect Life Committee offer the following suggestions:

1. A common way to voice displeasure with a particular issue concerning (mis)use of state funds is to write one's elected officials. However, in this case, Representative Paul Stam is as disappointed as we are that state funds are being used to provide the morning-after pill. Flooding his in-box with mail would be counter productive because he is already aware of what is happening! The Schweitzer's and I agree that it might be more effective to write the person in charge of student health services at the North Carolina universities. It is the Director of Student Health Services who should receive letters regarding programs offered at the student health facilities on campuses.
2. Parents of students on state college campuses (and indeed all parents) should discuss these issues with their children; specifically, that pre-marital sex is a mortal sin, as is taking a pill that causes a fertilized egg to be aborted.

I thank the Respect Life Committee for taking the initiative in publishing a newsletter for our parish, as well as keeping us informed about Life issues. Thank you!

---

---

"In order to facilitate the spread of abortion, enormous sums of money have been invested and continue to be invested in the production of pharmaceutical products which make it possible to kill the fetus in the mother's womb without recourse to medical assistance. On this point, scientific research itself seems to be almost exclusively preoccupied with developing products which are ever more simple and effective in suppressing life and which at the same time are capable of removing abortion from any kind of control or social responsibility." Pope John Paul II, March 25, 1995 *Evangelium Vitae*

On October 31, 2000, in Vatican City, after the "morning-after pill" went on sale in Italian pharmacies, Pope John Paul II wrote the following statement.

### **Pontifical Academy for Life: Statement on the So-called "Morning-after Pill"**

As is commonly known, the so-called *morning-after pill* recently went on sale in Italian pharmacies. It is a well-known chemical product (of the hormonal type) which has frequently - even in the past week - been presented by many in the field and by the mass media as a mere contraceptive or, more precisely, as an "emergency contraceptive", which can be used within a short time after a presumably fertile act of sexual intercourse, should one wish to prevent the continuation of an unwanted pregnancy. The inevitable critical reactions of those who have raised serious doubts about how this product works, namely, that its action is not merely "contraceptive" but "abortifacient", have received the very hasty reply that such concerns appear unfounded, since the morning-after pill has an "anti-implantation" effect, thus implicitly suggesting a clear distinction between abortion and *interception* (preventing the implantation of the fertilized ovum, i.e., the embryo, in the uterine wall).

Considering that the use of this product concerns fundamental human goods and values, to the point of involving the origins of human life itself, the Pontifical Academy for Life feels the pressing duty and definite need to offer some clarifications and considerations on the subject, reaffirming moreover already well-known ethical positions supported by precise scientific data and reinforced by Catholic doctrine.

1. The *morning-after pill* is a hormone-based preparation (it can contain estrogens, estrogen/progesterone or only progesterone) which, within and no later than 72 hours after a presumably fertile act of sexual intercourse, has a predominantly "anti-implantation" function, i.e., it prevents a possible fertilized ovum (which is a human embryo), by now in the *blastocyst* stage of its development (fifth to sixth day after fertilization), from being implanted in the uterine wall by a process of altering the wall itself.

The final result will thus be the expulsion and loss of this embryo.

Only if this pill were to be taken several days before the moment of ovulation could it sometimes act to prevent the latter (in this case it would function as a typical "contraceptive").

However, the woman who uses this kind of pill does so in the fear that she may be in her fertile period and therefore intends to cause the expulsion of a possible new conceptus; above all, it would be unrealistic to think that a woman, finding herself in the situation of wanting to use an emergency contraceptive, would be able to know exactly and opportunely her current state of fertility.

2. The decision to use the term "fertilized ovum" to indicate the earliest phases of embryonic development can in no way lead to an artificial value distinction between different moments in the development of the same human individual. In other words, if it can be useful, for reasons of scientific description, to distinguish with conventional terms (fertilized ovum, embryo, fetus, etc.) different moments in a single growth process, it can never be legitimate to decide arbitrarily that the human individual has greater or lesser value (with the resulting variation in the duty to protect it) according to its stage of development.

3. It is clear, therefore, that the proven "anti-implantation" action of the *morning-after pill* is really nothing other than a chemically induced abortion. It is neither intellectually consistent nor scientifically justifiable to say that we are not dealing with the same thing.

Moreover, it seems sufficiently clear that those who ask for or offer this pill are seeking the direct termination of a possible pregnancy already in progress, just as in the case of abortion. Pregnancy, in fact, begins with fertilization and not with the implantation of the blastocyst in the uterine wall, which is what is being implicitly suggested.

4. Consequently, from the ethical standpoint the same absolute unlawfulness of abortifacient procedures also applies to distributing, prescribing and taking the *morning-after pill*. All who, whether sharing the intention or not, directly co-operate with this procedure are also morally responsible for it.

5. A further consideration should be made regarding the use of the *morning-after pill* in relation to the application of Law 194/78, which in Italy regulates the conditions and procedures for the voluntary termination of pregnancy.

Saying that the pill is an "anti-implantation" product, instead of using the more transparent term "abortifacient", makes it possible to avoid all the obligatory procedures required by Law 194 in order to terminate a pregnancy (prior interview, verification of pregnancy, determination of growth stage, time for reflection, etc.), by practicing a form of abortion that is completely hidden and cannot be recorded by any institution. All this seems, then, to be in direct contradiction to the correct application of Law 194, itself debatable.

6. In the end, since these procedures are becoming more widespread, we strongly urge everyone who works in this sector to make a firm objection of moral conscience, which will bear courageous and practical witness to the inalienable value of human life, especially in view of the new *hidden* forms of aggression against the weakest and most defenseless individuals, as is the case with a human embryo.

St. Bernadette Respect Life Committee  
Rich Carberry, President  
Claire M. Schweitzer, Editor