

August 1993

From Conception to Deception: The Nazification of the Feminist Movement

Ann Sheridan

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>

Recommended Citation

Sheridan, Ann (1993) "From Conception to Deception: The Nazification of the Feminist Movement," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 60: No. 3, Article 5.

Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol60/iss3/5>

From Conception to Deception: The Nazification of the Feminist Movement

by

Ann Sheridan

The author has written television scripts, worked for Military Intelligence, and numerous political campaigns. She is president of the Georgetown Ignation Society.



Society itself, and not just women and their pre-born children, are being destroyed by the pro-abortion feminist movement and the analogy to Nazi Germany is screaming at us, yet the sound of silence is deafening.

Silence at the distortion of reality! Silence at the collusion of the media in suppressing facts! Silence of politicians who claim they represent humanity while legislating entitlements to destroy certain categories of humanity! Silence at the euphemisms and the bastardizing of language surrounding abortion!

There is much about the feminist movement which has served women well. It is unlikely that so many female athletes would have walked off with so many medals at the Olympics if it weren't for Title 9. Job parity, educational opportunities in all the professions, the shattering of the glass ceiling, are now possible because stout-hearted women were willing to put in long hours of hard work for difficult goals.

In what amounts, however, to a horrifying series of ethical and political missteps, our foremothers' vision of women having value has been usurped by those who claim that for a woman to reach her true potential, her "reproductive rights" must be guaranteed and she must be allowed the "choice" to kill her preborn baby. With few exceptions, feminism is now inextricably part of this philosophy.

Substitute the euphemisms of "pro-choice" and "reproductive rights" in killing the pre-born for the euphemism of the Nazi's "final solution", and the end of all our dreams is at hand. These terms are as politically brilliant now as that term was fifty years ago and, as most things political, efficiently deflect us from the real issue which is, and cannot be anything but, infanticide.

There have been societies in history which practiced infanticide as part of their cultural heritage but there is no evidence whatsoever that it was an oversight on the part of the framers of the Constitution of this country that they didn't claim it

as part of our cultural right. Yet we've legally destroyed 30 million pre-born babies in the last twenty years since the Supreme Court . . . contrary to their Constitutional mandate . . . made law with *Roe v. Wade* and the connection is denied.

It's not the first time in this century connections have been denied. Although the analogy of feminism to Nazism is repeatedly dismissed as hysterical, if we are ever going to come to terms with either phenomenon, we must be open to examining the interdependence of both and the Fatherland is a good place to start.

It's probably fair to say that most Germans didn't know about the death camps and what went on in them but they knew about *Krystalnacht* and the stripping of the rights of Jewish citizens. They knew and they listened, raptly, as Joseph Goebbels . . . the ultimate master of the euphemism . . . promised to improve the quality of their lives by killing twelve million of the insane, the deformed, the retarded, Catholics, Gypsies, Jews, various non-German ethnic groups and all others who would impede their progress toward becoming the "super race."

They wanted a perfect society . . . a society where no one would have to experience the discomfort of poverty, of looking on less than "acceptable" human beings . . . and the Germans bought it, blindly, dispassionately, and with the full realization that they were helping each other to a richer life, a life glorified by nationalistic interests, Wagner playing in the background.

They cheered while their intellectuals made the case for racial purity. Their soldiers, handsomely uniformed and jack-booted, marched to an ancient and hollow-eyed drummer who exacted a terrible price for listening to the music and few paid attention to the words of the song.

Today, in this country, feminists are marching and the siren song of that same drummer is heard in the land. The message hasn't changed, it's only been updated.

Just as most Germans didn't see what lurked behind the walls of their crematoria, most pro-choice people in general and feminists in particular, have chosen to avert their eyes from what goes on behind the walls of abortion mills. While claiming the "right" to the procedure, they are unwilling to accept their complicity in this "final solution" to unwanted pregnancies.

Consider then, in that context, how it is possible for Jewish abortionists . . . members of a race/culture/religion which admonishes the world that the Holocaust must be remembered so it will never be repeated . . . to be involved in killing helpless, defenseless humans?

Are any of those aborted babies Jewish? Do the liberal demands of feminists take precedence over the wailing and rending of garments when Nazi victims are honored? In this abortion involvement, the one thing the world would have thought utterly impossible when the gates of Buchenwald and Dachau were opened has now happened: the holocaust has been trivialized! The ancient Greek playwrights, in their wildest tales about the gods, never even came close to what abortionists accept as perfectly normal behavior for humans. One can only weep that this paradox has gained such acceptance.

Add to that group the judiciary. Characters from Dostoevsky, Kafka, and

Stephen King now wield their gavels of judicial pathology in judgment of those who seek justice under what should be common sense, if not law. To wit: a judge in Florida, in one of the most inexplicable legal perversities extant, sentenced a young woman member of Operation Rescue to two years of solitary confinement . . . a sentence FAR in excess of what he routinely gives murderers and rapists . . . for breaking a piece of glass tubing in an empty room in an abortion clinic. The symbolism of breaking glass and avenging the slaughter of Jews on *Krystallnacht* should not be lost, but for too many, it is.

Pro-abortion feminists argue that these children whom they wish to abort will be burdens to their families and society. Some have Down's syndrome, some are misshapen, some are destined for poverty and ignorance, some were conceived in violence, some are the "wrong" sex, and all, for whatever other reasons, are unwanted not because they've given testimony that they will have nothing to offer but that they are going to diminish, in various ways, the quality of life of someone else.

Abortion is an extremely lucrative business. Since *Roe V Wade*, the sterile gloved hands of the abortion industry has reaped a staggering \$7.5 billion in blood money from those who kill their young and those who subsidize the killing. This money comes from grants, federal, state and local governments, Title X, various "charitable" organizations, millions of pro-abortion contributors . . . and the pregnant women. In what amounts to terminal capitalism in a world gone berserk, the financial charge to the mother/victim for a 1st trimester abortion averages \$250. The more advanced the pregnancy, the larger the baby, the higher the fee. Any self-respecting Nazi would have turned pea green with envy at such fiscal efficiency.

Although fetal parts are not easily discernible in the first three to four weeks of pregnancy, abortionists know that "amorphous" does not describe the third trimester baby. In trying to save their own skins over that of the baby's, they dismember it in-utero to preclude the possibility of being charged with murder should that unmistakable human being be born live and draw breath before it dies as a result of a botched procedure. Litigation, after all, has a way of cutting into profits, creating down-time on the job and can bring carefully managed reputations under public scrutiny.

Their medical and legal responsibility also requires they check everything expelled from the uterus. Envision then, the physician/ assassins counting fingers, toes, arms, legs, organs, head and placenta.

The increasingly preferred type of abortion by injection of triple strength doses of digitalis into the pre-born babies' hearts is considered "humane" and is felt to be less traumatic to the mother's body than saline injections or suction. Equally "humane", they reason, is the culling out, by digitalis injection, of those extra babies which have been conceived as the result of fertility drugs. This procedure conveniently saves the non-dismembered or scalded corpses for later experimentation.

From out of the dark, unnatural laboratories of the Holocaust, came these seeds of scientific willingness to advance the technology of human destruction. Just as the Joseph Mengele sensibility reflected the policy of Germany in those

baleful years, the sensibilities of the feminist movement pervade the halls of state legislatures, the United States Congress and the Supreme Court, not in the hope of making legislators account for tax dollars spent unwisely on programs which would obviate their claimed need for abortion, but for even more money to spend in subsidizing it.

It is more than merely symbolic that in his first official act, President Clinton sentenced untold millions more to death by lifting the gag order, imposed by President Bush. The Freedom of Choice Act (S.25/H.R. 25, FOCA), also unequivocally endorsed by Clinton, his wife, the Secretary of HHS, his administration, the Democratic party and Democratic leadership in Congress, will force states, with no exceptions, to allow abortion for any reason throughout the entire nine months of pregnancy, up to the moment of delivery.

This legislation is being actively supported by NOW, NARAL, Planned Parenthood and the ACLU. These are the same organizations which are against parental consent before minors have an abortion, arguing on the one hand that these are "babies having babies" but out of the other side of their twisted logic, claiming these "babies" are old enough to make the decision for themselves.

What the legislation doesn't cover is who's going to pick up the financial costs of post-abortion medical and psychiatric care which is, too often, required. Abortion clinics are not even covered by Health Department standards and it will be interesting to see if the proposed legislation requires the same level of basic cleanliness hot dog stands and gas station rest-rooms have to meet?

FOCA raises some very interesting parallels between liberalism, feminism, Nazism and slavery. Liberals and feminists argue that poor black women are discriminated against because they can't afford abortions and the government should therefore cover some, if not all, of the expenses incurred in the procedure. What this amounts to, by any standard of logic, is a demonstrable act of federally funded genocide of poor and minority babies. In this betrayal, we are left with the exposed specious protestations of Thurgood Marshall's legacy, of Jesse Jackson, Ben Hooks, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Nadine Winters and too many other black leaders who claim they care about these very people who are their constituents.

Additionally, one can only marvel at the deconstructionist, politically incorrect, multi-cultural blind idiocy in liberal white politicians, such as Ted Kennedy, Mario Cuomo, Howard Metzenbaum, Barbara Mikulski and their ilk, not being labeled as racists when they join in this move to exterminate black babies. Why is it beyond their combined legal comprehension that these babies are victims being deprived of basic life by unindicted serial killers, that they should be afforded the same protection by public officials and watchdogs of the law that slaves finally earned? How much courage can it take to protect the life of a baby, for God's sake, literally and figuratively?

In this abortion idiocy, we've come full circle back to where we were when we had to deal with the numbed humanity of both the Nazis and those who joined with them, and slave owners and those who rounded up the slaves in Africa and shipped them to our shores. History, the master teacher, continues to show us now how cheaply held certain life is and how easily, by working together, it can be ended as circumstances dictate. The venality, corruption and denial of

personal responsibility so endemic to so many in the political system is a perfect adjunct to the alliance between black and white politicians. It has set the stage for legislation legalizing fetal tissue research and is but a precursor to the profits to be reaped in fetus farming. Politics, truly, does make for some very strange bedfellows.

These servants of the people claim the need to compete with other nations in medical primacy, nations such as Sweden, where abortionists proudly admit to in-utero fetal experimentation in which the baby's skull is drilled into and live brain tissue is removed.

In Australia, truly the land of the mad scientist, pain experimentations are performed in which live embryonic babies, in petri dishes, are poked and prodded to test for reactions. If they won't admit that what is in that dish is alive with a degree of neural development, what's the scientific justification for the experiment? If they do admit it, there goes the argument that it isn't a live human being which can feel and react.

Just as the guards and the medical personnel in the death camps were able to go about their routines of eating, sleeping and socializing while fulfilling their daily job requirements, abortionists — those who work in the clinics and those who support their work — go about their lives convinced of the necessity of what they do. The banality of evil redux. Seig Heil!!!

And the media? That great bastion of truth, the 1st Amendment and the right of the public to know? There was a time when the personal "choices" of individual news persons were irrelevant but today, their bias is so pronounced and so pervasive that feminists . . . who want all transgressions against them, both real and imagined, reported thoroughly . . . should be, but seemingly are not only not alarmed, they are overjoyed by this kind of news manipulation. They call it fair reporting.

Fair? The media speaks of abortion in sanitized terms of legislation, lawsuits and polls. They routinely show pictures of calm mothers on treatment tables, towels delicately draped over the bottles and trays where the remains of the baby wind up. All very tasteful — and out of view of the mother who minutes earlier had that helpless, totally-dependent-on-her baby inside her protecting body.

Network news departments couldn't show enough of the videotaped beating of Rodney King at the hands of members of the Los Angeles Police Department but where was the footage of the L.A. police using nunchakus . . . a lethal martial arts weapon . . . against members of Operation Rescue praying in front of an abortuary? Praying! Not speeding! Not suspected of selling crack cocaine! Not carrying semi-automatic weapons. Not driving drunk! Not threatening the physical well-being of the officers! Not doing anything other than trying to prevent the murder of a pre-born child!

Where was the tape of the brutal violation of the most basic rights of free speech? Squelched by the same kind of mind-set which refused to report the Gestapo destruction of the rights of German citizens, the same mind-set that cowers behind the 1st Amendment to justify their appalling lack of objectivity in matters of abortion.

Not one network will show "The Silent Scream" or "Eclipse of Reason" yet

the most dehumanizing images of death, dismemberment, sadism, carnage and gore are shown daily on television, both on the news and in entertainment. Feminists and civil libertarians may laud this kind of censorship but history will, if it can be written by non-news people, judge them far differently.

Lest the animal rights groups be offended . . . actually any group that pushes for legislation which winds up threatening someone with a year in prison and a \$5,000 fine for destroying an eagle's egg yet advocates killing human babies should be resoundingly offended . . . the ability to make a rational choice is one of the products of an intellect, that innately human aspect of our nature which separates us from all other creatures on this planet.

Are feminists, then, smart enough, or dumb enough, to make rational and/or irrational choices? Obviously they have the choice to be good citizens, to vote, to go or not to go to church, what to wear and, within limits, when to pay their taxes. They may also choose to take illegal drugs, batter children, steal, dump toxic wastes or drive drunk. They can switch channels and for those who subscribe to the Hugh Hefner, Bob Guccione, Dr. Ruth school of moral philosophy, switch bed partners whenever it suits their fancy.

How did these women become so terrified of losing these choices that they're willing to kill their pre-born child to safeguard their right to make any choices? They argue that a woman should have control over her body which is, again, euphemistically absurd in view of the fact that close to ninety-nine percent of them had the choice of whether or not to conceive a child in the first place.

Child! Good solid word "child". It says exactly what it means . . . the product of conception . . . and unless the pregnant woman has been having some unusual four-footed, scaled or winged sexual partners, what she's carrying in her uterus can't be anything but human with human DNA and if it weren't alive . . . that word again . . . there would be no need for an abortion. No euphemisms there.

Daily, we're appalled by the overwhelming increase in child abuse, but it's a perfectly logical progression from the valueless state of being pre-born to the tenuously protected state of being recently born. Aside from giving and needing love . . . a fact which must be denied in the consciousness of those who support abortion . . . little children don't vote, they take up a great deal of our time and money, they whine, they get in the way, they need constant and endless attention and all the other reasons why the pro-choice feminists want to be rid of them. Hitler understood all too well the end result of devaluing children when he, in the final days of the Third Reich, sent expendable 12 year olds to the front to save what he thought, in his madness, was worth saving. The stage has been set for tomorrow's answers to what this society deems, in its madness, to be problems it can't . . . and won't . . . solve today.

If one doubts this progression, I would remind them of the feminists in New York who felt Hedda Nussbaum was a "victim" and we should feel sorry for her. Sorry? Have they gone mad? This is a woman who saw her lover, Joel Steinberg, beat, terrorize and murder a helpless little adopted child yet she couldn't turn away from him or turn him in to the authorities even though he beat her along with the child. She loved him. She loved him?

Keep in mind, also, that feminists, in defending Ms. Nussbaum because she

was abused by this monster with whom she shared custody of that defenseless female child have dismissed her responsibility for herself and her actions. Hedda Nussbaum, regardless of what was done to her, is not an animal. She is a human being with an intellect and that child needed her protection, desperately. This kind of brain-dead liberal reasoning which offers excuses to anyone for anything is at the very core of the breakdown of the courts, the family, governments, schools, religions and the very heart of this nation.

Feminists must ask themselves what they've done to encourage abuse. They took to the barricades in the sexual revolution, extolling the virtues of sexual freedom. Singles bars! One night stands! They were going to be "just like the guys". Nobody was going to legislate their morality.

Unfortunately . . . and predictably . . . while they were so busy defining morality as a religious issue, they failed to notice that the generic morality of responsible human social behavior was being abolished and what society has wound up with is Constitutionally protected anarchy advocating physical abuse of women, screamed at us by 2 Live Crew doing a warm up act for Ice Tea and Madonna. There was a time when those kinds of people doing a warm up act for anybody would have been told to "step outside". No longer! Those who enjoy savaging women, enjoy the show.

How did women become so intellectually numb that they failed to see that what they have between their ears was becoming irrelevant to what they have between their legs? Actions, ultimately, do have consequences, and the piper is getting paid.

Feminists have doctrinairily dismissed the role of housewife and nurturer, yet how many of us would be here today if someone hadn't put time in on those jobs? They've called the women who chose those roles "unfulfilled" and mocked them for the choice and the ground beneath their charge has liquified and ceases to bear any logical weight of the argument that they care about women.

They've called men the enemy and on this I would agree with them but for vastly different reasons having little to do with the fact that men hold the lion's share of top positions in business and industry, get a better break in the arts and media, make more money in sports and generally have their words imbued with greater authority.

More men than women perform abortions and they know how many of those babies are female. Men march in pro-abortion parades, and in what has to be a new high in euphemisitic blathering, swear their sensitive allegiance to the feminist cause while telling women it's all right to kill a baby which they could have fathered. One can only wonder how these men became so emasculated in this bonding effort; how, seemingly without even a whimper, they accept the fact that they have no legal rights . . . nor do most of them seek any . . . should they want that baby to live.

Phil Donahue, more creature/voyeur than man, leaps around a studio, urging women on to greater heights of feminism while extolling the "virtues" of aberrant behavior beyond the imagining of most species above slugs in the food chain. He ridicules the poor, sexually-well-adjusted female who refuses to buy into his hedonism. Being cut off at the mike though, is infinitely better, in the long run,

than tumbling head first into the "sensitive male" morass.

There is another even more laughable group of spokespersons for killing babies — male movie stars. They come to abortion rallies and while women stand in awe struck, slack jawed adoration, share their collected wisdom in the cause of pro-choice feminism. Keep in mind that these men not only make their living by making believe, they're advocating depleting the future ranks of ticket buyers. It is the stuff of opera-bouffe.

Jack Kent Cooke made the termination of the life of his pre-born child a condition of marriage to its mother and when she disobeyed him . . . got that? Disobeyed him . . . he divorced her. On that alone, he can retire the Male Chauvinist pig trophy.

As there has been only one recorded case of parthenogenesis . . . and that was two thousand years ago . . . there seems to be a bit of reality denial here. Men still get women pregnant but feminists, being pro-abortion, seem to resent this. How genuinely unfortunate that these women ever came to defining their relationships with men in terms of win/lose. Real men, men who value all life, who are comfortable with their roles of being men and not women, are not the enemy. Men who truly care about women, cringe at the climate feminists have created which spawns the kind of hatred where women, simply put, are fair game in a violent society and no different from being "one of the guys."

Regardless of the unisex pitch in today's society, real women are also not men . . . anatomically or otherwise . . . a point which seems to cause some psycho-sexual discomfort in the more strident element of feminism. Real women, as do men, have free will. They are accountable for their actions towards not only themselves but those entrusted to their care and respect, whether family, co-workers, friends or anyone with whom they deal in any aspect of their lives and those freely acknowledged responsibilities are the hallmark of pro-life women, regardless of socio-economic status, religious belief or ethnic background.

This is not and cannot be, the case with women who advocate killing their own and other's pre-born children. If one respects human life, one does not put any caveat on that belief. One doesn't say only certain people should be allowed to live and a society which legislates that certain people aren't worth saving is a society which is in mortal danger of not being worth saving.

Irrespective of NOW's Molly Yard and her euphemistic dismissal of post-abortion traumatic syndrome . . . now called "post procedure" syndrome . . . as a non-issue, Dr. Koop and his insufficient data or the academics from the American Psychiatric Association, this is a real, psychologically and physically crippling illness, and an inescapable after-product of "reproductive rights". Anyone actually involved one-on-one with the medical and mental care of women who have had abortions will attest to the crushing guilt, loss and sorrow they have to face.

Where are the feminists when their sisters turn to them for an explanation of how they could have made such a choice? All efforts at rationalizing such an act, regardless of who makes them, tragically fall on deaf ears. Abortion is an unnatural act and although humans often forgive, nature never does.

Should feminists feel particularly secure in a nation which has embraced, as

law, the tenets of a nation which sent 12 million innocents to their deaths? Do they think this society, which says it's perfectly legal to kill over 1,500,000 babies each year is going to hold their rights to be perpetually paramount? If the reasoning exists that only the perfect or wanted should be allowed among them, what's going to happen if they wind up with Alzheimers disease or AIDS? Dr. Kevorkian, in his Mengele mask, is waiting in the wings, the pump is primed and forced euthanasia is on the program.

A word to those who are upset that religious opposition could take away their right to kill their babies. ALL organizations have rules by which they do business. Banks set the terms and conditions of their lending money and one can't be president of the United States if one wasn't born a United States citizen. Although there are religions which have denied their *raison d'être* of moral reasoning and leadership, there are others which still hold moral imperative to be a more valuable and honorable *modus operandi* than popularity. It is, after all, what they're getting paid to do. These are religions, not country clubs.

One cannot logically claim to be a Muslim, orthodox Jew, Catholic or even a Christian if one doesn't accept what Allah, God or His Son, Jesus, hold to be inviolate about abortion. The social and financial gains so often sought in and by churches would be lessened, of course, but the theological fresh air which would flood the congregations would be morally invigorating and if some choose not to play by house rules, they should drop the protective mask of hypocrisy, get up from their comfortable pews and go elsewhere. They would be missed but it is their choice.

If this slaughter doesn't stop, women will be treated with even less respect than they were in the dark ages, a state towards which we have already started to return in the dehumanizing treks that are made hourly to abortion clinics. Ultimately, feminists are going to have to weigh what effect their pro-abortion position has on the quality of life today, tomorrow and forever. If they continue to think it more important that the future be tied to creature comforts; that abortion is a cure-all for poverty, family planning and social ills; that certain humans are not entitled to live; that there isn't enough money or time to take care of the misfits and the unwanted; there are millions who are saying: "Not with our tax money".

If women had stood up in Germany fifty years ago and told their neighbors and their Nazi leaders that they would not permit them to destroy humanity, the world would be a vastly different place today. For all our sakes, let us hope that fifty years from now, history will record that the feminist movement came back to "life" and redirected its vast resources, intelligence and heart towards a society where all citizens — born or waiting to be born — are afforded the same equality feminists claim for themselves today.

I leave you with an obituary notice, not for dead babies, but for the movement which killed them: "On January 22, 1973, the feminist movement in the United States slipped into a moral, social and intellectual coma and has, after a long and painful existence, succumbed to heart failure. The cause of death is listed as terminal deception, brought on by pro-choice women selling their pregnant sisters to abortionists."