



Special Reports

Autumn 2003

Life Decisions International

vol. vi • no. 4

SCHWARZENEGGER CALLED "REPUBLICAN IN NAME ONLY"

by Douglas R. Scott

Due to the *monumental* importance of the recall election in California, which has both state and national ramifications, Part 3 of "When Homemakers Roar: A Homemaker Takes On A Multi-Millionaire—And Wins" will be published in the Winter 2003 edition.

Arnold Schwarzenegger has been elected to the top office of the most populous and prominent state in the Union. Schwarzenegger left no doubt about his position on abortion. In fact, it was the first policy statement listed on his campaign website: "I support a woman's right to choose. I support the state's current family planning programs, and as governor, would make no changes to this policy." A candidate cannot be clearer.

Following Schwarzenegger's policy announcement that addressed several social issues, including abortion, a CNN report began, "Sounding more like a Democrat than a Republican, the GOP candidate said...he is pro-choice..." But pragmatism soon convinced the candidate to move to the political right, but not very far to the right, and he surely was not planning to stay there very long.

The Questions

California voters were faced with making two critical decisions that would greatly impact the future of the state. First, should the Governor, Gray Davis, be removed from office? Second, if the recall were to pass and Davis were removed from office, who should replace him? Both questions appeared on the October 7, 2003, ballot. Everyone could vote on question number two regardless of how they voted on the first question.

A majority (50 percent plus one vote minimum) of those casting a ballot was sufficient to recall the Governor. If a majority voted for the recall, the person who received the most votes under the second question would become the new Governor.

Essentially, then, the new Governor of the Golden State could have been elected with a single digit percentage—if the votes had split in such a way. If a majority had voted against recalling Davis, the second question would have become moot.

This is a highly unusual process to be sure, but keep in mind that we are talking about California. In most other states which allow the recall of elected officials, the voters would face question number one alone and the lieutenant governor would automatically succeed the recalled governor. In California, however, voting on the recall and electing a replacement at the same time avoids the expense of holding a second election.

Cast of Characters

There were far too many candidates (135) running for governor to list them all. In fact, the ballot, which had just two questions, was essentially a booklet due to the large number of politicians—both experienced and inexperienced.

Sumo wrestler Kurt E. "Tachikaze" Rightmyer was a candidate for Governor. So was former baseball commissioner Peter V. Ueberroth. Candidate and college student Daniel Watts has just one item in his platform—lower college student tuition. Professional golfer Paul "Chip" Mailander wanted the highest office in the state. Watermelon-smashing (among other items) Comedian Leo Gallagher was also on the ballot.

There were other famous, not-so-famous and even infamous characters who sought California's toughest job. Both Larry Flynt, the smut peddler, and Mary Cook, the pornographic film "actress," thought they should be running the state. One could also find the names of child actor-turned-adult security guard Gary Coleman and columnist/author Arianna Huffington on the ballot. It seemed that many people thought this was the moment to shine. But the race was a four-man contest virtually from the start and several candidates

dropped out before Election Day, even though their names remained on the ballot.

Governor Gray Davis (D)

Born Joseph Graham Davis, Jr., in the Bronx, New York, the future governor of California was the oldest of five children. The family moved to California in 1954, when the young Davis was eleven years old.

Gray Davis is arguably the most unpopular politician in the country. A poll taken of voters as they left their respective polling places showed that a staggering 72 percent disapproved of the Governor's job performance. A mere 27 percent gave the incumbent a positive approval rating. Gray Davis is the first governor to be recalled since 1921, when North Dakota voters threw out Lynn Frazier.

Davis, now 60, had previously been elected lieutenant governor, state controller, and to the state legislature. He was the first Democrat to win a race for Governor in 16 years. (It is not difficult for liberal Republicans to win statewide races in California.) So how is it possible that a man could be recalled after being reelected not even one year before? The answer is simple: dirty politics. And in California "dirty politics" usually involved some typical Gray Davis shenanigans, to put it kindly.

Prior to the 2002 Republican primary Davis spent a lot of time and money attacking Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan, the Republican who was most likely to oust the incumbent if he were to win the nomination to face the Governor in the next general election. Such attacks led voters in the Republican primary to reject the frontrunner, pro-abortion Riordan, and nominate a much weaker and moderately pro-life (at best) candidate, Bill Simon. Most political analysts agreed that Simon was far too conservative to win a statewide race—exactly what Davis was counting on.

True to form with the dirty politics for which Davis is infamous and shortly before the election his campaign accused Bill Simon of having a history of engaging in unethical business practices. If Riordan had been nominated, he surely would have defeated the unpopular Davis. The only hope Davis had to win reelection was to interfere in the Republican nomination process so he could face a weaker candidate—one he could paint as dishonest and radically conservative. The strategy worked and Davis defeated Simon, albeit with less than 50 percent of the vote.

The key issue dogging Davis had been the sorry state of the California economy. The Governor's personal style was also a major factor in the recall. Many people just find him to be unlikable. As California Attorney General Bill Lockyer put it to *The Sacramento Bee*, "Gray doesn't have any friends. It's a Shakespearean tragedy in a way."

Lieutenant Governor Cruz M. Bustamante (D)

The eldest of six children, Cruz Bustamante was raised in public housing in the comparatively conservative agricultural heartland. He was first elected to the state legislature in 1992, where he served as Speaker of the Assembly. Bustamante later won two campaigns for lieutenant governor.

Bustamante, 50, did not openly aspire to the governorship. But once it became clear that a recall election would be held, he placed his name on the ballot. Bustamante began his campaign urging voters to support him for Governor while making little mention of the woes facing Davis. While his relationship with Davis was often strained, Bustamante did not want to be seen as an opportunist who was seeking to gain from a fellow Democrat's misfortune. Consequently, Bustamante soon changed his tactic and asked voters to reject the recall but vote for him to replace Davis in case the recall passed, which would keep the office in Democratic hands. In the final days, however, it became clear that Davis would not survive and once again emphasis was placed virtually exclusively on convincing people to vote for Bustamante.

Senator Tom McClintock (R)

The only top contender who does not claim to be Catholic (because he is not), Tom McClintock was first elected to the state legislature at the age of 26. His passion has rested in the area of conservative fiscal policy. In fact, before California became such an economic mess, McClintock was warning that "the sky was falling"—and it has indeed fallen.

The father of an 11-year-old boy and 13-year-old girl, McClintock has championed a conservative position on virtually every issue. He was endorsed by most Californian and national pro-family/pro-life leaders.

McClintock's political positions were well-known in California politics. "I've been in the public arena for 20 years. Positions I've taken have not changed in 20 years," McClintock said. "I am pro-life...these are positions that people can count on." Schwarzenegger, on the other hand, embraced the political positions held by most Californians based on the poll numbers.

Due to liberal views on social issues, McClintock refused to end his campaign and endorse his actor opponent, despite pressure from both Schwarzenegger and the Republican establishment. It is believed that the Republican elite will retaliate against McClintock for this decision to stay in the race should he seek higher office in the future. Such “punishment” for those who do not fall into line is commonplace.

Arnold Alois Schwarzenegger (“R”)

Arnold Schwarzenegger was raised in the poverty of a farm town in post-war Austria. Schwarzenegger immigrated to the United States at the age of 21. It did not take long for the young man to find his place in the new land. He is now best known as a champion bodybuilder turned actor. (Could it be that the Founding Fathers had a “Schwarzenegger” in mind when they included the constitutional provision requiring persons who run for President to be “natural born” citizens—making Schwarzenegger ineligible?)

Now 56-years-old and the father of four children with NBC television correspondent Maria Shriver, Arnold Schwarzenegger was a late entry into the race for Governor. After spreading the rumor that he would not be a candidate, Schwarzenegger appeared as a guest on *The Tonight Show*, where he announced that he would run. (*Tonight Show* host Jay Leno and his wife are active in the Pro-Abortion Movement.)

Schwarzenegger’s key problems were also his assets. His political views were largely unknown—and generally still are—so it was difficult for other candidates to attack him on issues. While Schwarzenegger has a degree in business, he has no experience in government and is certainly clueless about how to run an economy, especially one the size of California’s. But he has surrounded himself with experts in various fields, such as billionaire and pro-abortion zealot Warren Buffett. After convincing the Republican establishment that he was their only hope to regain the Governor’s Mansion, the Schwarzenegger bandwagon was on its way.

Edstrong.com described Arnold Schwarzenegger as “a barely articulate, pumped-up bodybuilder with a cupboard full of skeletons. But could it be that [he]... was always destined for a career in politics?” Wendy Leigh, Schwarzenegger’s unauthorized biographer, went to Austria to research his roots and came away convinced that he plotted his political rise from an early age and he used bodybuilding and films as stepping stones.

Leigh portrays Schwarzenegger as a man obsessed with the pursuit of power. She quotes him as saying, “I wanted to be part of the small percentage of people who were leaders, not the large mass of followers. I think it is because I saw leaders use 100% of their potential...I was always fascinated by people in control of other people.”

While nearly 50 women claimed that Schwarzenegger had made inappropriate (or even criminal) sexual advances, the accusations simply did not stick. Maria Shriver did her impression of the Hillary Clinton “stand by your man” wife. (Shriver’s mother, Eunice Kennedy Shriver, has written eloquently about her pro-life convictions, but she works to elect her pro-abortion children and other relatives to public office.) Arnold Schwarzenegger just repeated the “they’re throwing everything at me at the last moment, including the kitchen sink” mantra and voters bought into it, never expecting a response to the actual accusations.

Rather than fault Schwarzenegger or force him to talk about the accusations leveled against him in detail, voters blamed the Davis campaign and *The Los Angeles Times*, which printed the stories. Conservative radio talk show hosts were instrumental in deflecting the accusations from the candidate and placing them on Davis and the newspaper; in the latter case choosing to shoot the messenger. Even though some of the women were clearly lying, Schwarzenegger had generally been given a “free pass.” The obviously biased *Los Angeles Times* also faced angry citizens because it ignored similar accusations that had been made against Davis.

Landslide

The recall passed with 55 percent voting in favor. Of the top three contenders to replace the beleaguered Davis, Schwarzenegger destroyed his competition. Bustamante polled a distant second and McClintock a *far* distant third.

Most analysts predicted that the winner of the race to replace Davis would have no more than 35 percent of the vote, which would mean that the triumphant candidate would rule with the support of a small minority of Californians. But to the amazement of virtually everyone, probably even Schwarzenegger himself, the winner garnered 50 percent of the vote—practically a landslide considering the crowded field of candidates.

The media, which absolutely loved the story they were seeing unfold before their respective eyes, was

quick to hail Schwarzenegger's million-plus vote victory as a defeat for the ideas held by conservative Republicans. Gary L. Bauer, chairman of the Campaign for Working Families, sought the Republican nomination for President 2000. He notes one example:

[A]s I suspected it would, the media spinning has begun. Top NBC media personality Tim Russert said...the Schwarzenegger victory represents a triumph of a new moderate Republican Party that can win anywhere *if* it just drops a few pesky issues. Guess which issues he is talking about? That's right—the issues we care the most about!

There is no doubt that such rhetoric by the liberal media will continue. It will become more pervasive as the 2004 Presidential Election draws closer.

Christianity: A Religion Or A Club?

One of the most disturbing aspects of the recall election was the fact that three of the four leading candidates (Davis, Bustamante, and Schwarzenegger) claim to be Catholic. Yet all three are pro-abortion and support domestic partnership legislation for homosexuals. As Governor, Davis flaunted his "Catholicism" in the face of church officials while ignoring (even refusing to meet with his own bishop) them, which clearly appealed to the state's anti-Catholic bigots.

Not willing to allow the candidates to go unchallenged, the American Life League (ALL) and Save California (SC) worked to expose them. ALL published a newspaper advertisement, which included photographs of the three amigos:

Each of these candidates claims he's a "Catholic" and that he'll be a governor who will serve the interests of all the people of California. But the truth is that each of these candidates' open support for legalized abortion will mean a violent death for thousands of California babies in the womb.

"When you consider that Schwarzenegger supports taxpayer funding of all abortions...domestic partnerships and homosexual adoptions, this is not consistent with what it means to be a Republican in California," said Randy Thomasson, SC's treasurer. "Arnold is out of step with a wide majority of Republicans in this state who want their family values protected." SC also used advertisements to criticize Bustamante for his liberal stand on social issues.

In one interview Schwarzenegger talked about his Catholicism and the positive impact religion has had on his life. "I'm Catholic. Yes, absolutely. I grew up as a Catholic and my mother was the one that [sic] was the spiritual leader in our house, so she took us. It was not even an option...So that's the way I grew up and I'm a spiritual person. I pray and I, you know, I communicate with God." (This is rather strange for a man who referred to those who promote Catholic values as "religious fanatics.")

The Shame of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles

ALL accused Los Angeles Cardinal Roger Mahoney of "turning a blind eye" to the pro-abortion positions expressed by "Catholic" politicians. "We're trying to let Catholic voters know that the top three contenders are all claiming to be something they're not..." Joseph Starrs, director of ALL's Crusade for the Defense of Our Catholic Church, told the Catholic News Service. Starrs said he is also hoping to convince Catholic bishops and priests that they should refuse Holy Communion to public officials who openly support abortion.

Archdiocese of Los Angeles spokesman Tod Tamberg said ALL President Judie Brown misunderstands church law. "The reception of Holy Communion by Catholics is a right guaranteed by the church, not a privilege determined by Judie Brown or anyone else at the American Life League," Tamberg said. "She's not Judge Judie, she's not Bishop Judie, and she's not Pope Judie. The bishops of the church, with the Holy Father, are the ones who interpret church law." In other words, the Archdiocese prefers not to be questioned about its actions—even by the most faithful followers of Catholicism; thank you very much.

Canon Law 915 states that those "who obstinately persist in manifest grave sin are not to be admitted to Communion." But we must not assume that everyone at the Archdiocese of Los Angeles gives Canon Law any credence. Maybe the name should be changed to "Canon Suggestions"?

Never one to be silenced (thankfully), Brown responded that "no Catholic has a 'right' to receive the Body and Blood of Christ..." She continued:

No human being is truly worthy of receiving the Sacrament, but a Catholic who persists in promoting a manifestly grave evil like abortion is clearly bringing sacrilege upon the Sacrament when he or she receives it. One need not be the Pope, a bishop, or a judge to recognize that

Canon Law number 915 is clear. Individuals who advocate abortion, which is intrinsically evil, are persisting in grave sin and should not be given Holy Communion. Schwarzenegger, Davis, and Bustamante are three such individuals.

Brown told LifeSiteNews it is “sad that personal attacks are the way archdiocesan officials have chosen to deal with this current scandal.” Tamberg, who really should be fired, is willing to openly debase Brown, a woman who takes her faith *very* seriously. Yet he is unwilling to do the same to pro-abortion politicians who take their faith *very*, well, conveniently. In response to Brown’s encounter with Tamberg, a fellow Catholic posted a message online:

This is a good example of why abortion is legal in this country. If the Bishops in this country do not clearly stand up for Church teachings, is it any surprise that those who have been granted fewer spiritual graces should fall into political expediency? Let’s pray that Cardinal Mahony corrects this...statement made by his spokesperson before “Catholics for a Free Choice” start using the sound bite to lead more souls to ruin.

Barb Kralis of the *New Oxford Review* argues that if the stance espoused by Tamberg were to be universally accepted, every member of the clergy would be required to “give Holy Communion without question to anyone approaching the Altar.” Kralis further examines Tamberg’s statement:

This would mean that it is O.K. [sic] for all bishops and priests to give Holy Communion to people publicly professing beliefs contrary to the doctrines of the Catholic Church or publicly living lives at serious variance with the teachings of the Church. This would include homosexual couples approaching the Eucharist arm and arm...directors of Planned Parenthood, Mafia figures, drug lords, et al.

“According to Canon Law, a bishop has not only the right but the duty to stop a grave sinner from committing sacrilege and scandal,” Kralis writes. “Canon 1369 tells bishops: ‘A person is to be punished with a just penalty, who...gravely harms public morals...’ The Church has an innate and proper right to coerce offending members by means of penal sanctions (Canon 1311). Diocesan bishops as well as the Pope possess legislative power, and the Code of Canon Law (Canons 1315 and 1318) expressly recognizes their right to enact laws for their dioceses.” Therefore, pro-abortion politicians should

be confronted in private. If they refuse to repent the Sacrament should be withheld.

Kralis points to just a few examples (of many) where clergymen took action in line with Canon Law:

- In August 2000, Mexican Norberto Cardinal Rivera responded to Mexico City’s push to liberalize abortion laws by stating that, “Anyone who promotes or practices abortion, including legislators and governors, will be automatically excommunicated by the Church.”
- In 2001, the Archbishop of Lima and Primate of Peru, Juan Luis Cardinal Cipriani, instructed his pastors to deny communion to politicians who refuse to abandon their pro-abortion views. The instruction read, “The pastor who has a parishioner in this condition can deny him Holy Communion in public, after warning him in private.”
- Calgary Bishop Fred Henry, refusing to recant his earlier warning that Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien’s official political decisions were risking his eternal salvation, told reporters on August 2, 2003, that he would likely refuse the Prime Minister Holy Communion: “As a Catholic, if he can’t listen to the pope and he can’t listen to the bishops, then we have a problem with the Catholicity of this man. We have a serious problem. You can’t go around calling yourself a good Catholic and act in a contrary manner. Acts have consequences. If the Prime Minister were to come to Calgary and line up for Communion in the ranks at the cathedral and I were the celebrant, I would probably refuse him...”

Maybe Tamberg should personally tell the clergy who are denying Communion to pro-abortion politicians that they are neither “judges,” “bishops” nor the “pope” and they do not understand church law; unless, of course, they actually *are* bishops or the Pope. Tamberg’s task may involve publicly slapping many priests, bishops, cardinals and maybe even a pope. Now who is misrepresenting Canon law?

The response of the Archdiocese is surprising to say the least. As an Evangelical Christian, I may not participate in Holy Communion in a Catholic Church. I understand the reasons for this rule; One must subscribe to the tenets of Catholic doctrine in order to really be “in communion” with the others present. I remember reading about this very matter at the Vatican. I do not receive Communion in a Catholic church out of basic respect. Yet I am *much* more in communion with the Catholic Church than any pro-abortion politician and they are not even *discouraged*

from participating in the Sacrament. Worst of all they do not even have the decency to voluntarily stop receiving Communion.

One can be sure that being pro-abortion is just one of many disagreements these politicians have with the church they call their own. It seems very elementary. Unless one believes what a religion teaches, one cannot truthfully embrace or identify with that faith. There is a word to describe Christians who do not accept the teachings of the Catholic Church—Protestant. And carrying this line of thinking to the logical conclusion, could one legitimately identify himself a Christian while denying the Trinity or believing that Jesus was nothing more than a “good man?” If so, Hugh Hefner would qualify to be the pope.

The Archdiocese of Los Angeles should be ashamed and its spokesman should apologize or be replaced. If the spokesman accurately expressed the opinion of the Archdiocese, many more people need to be sternly corrected or replaced. The attitude displayed by its spokesman further erodes the credibility of the Catholic Church in the minds of all people—Catholic, pseudo-“Catholic” and non-Catholic alike.

The Catholic Church is willing to ask me to not participate in Communion, but it will not do the same of its own “members.” Is this because I do not financially support the Catholic Church and they do? I must hope not, but if this is the case, someone will have some explaining to do someday. Regardless of the flawed reasoning used by church officials, failure to take action against Catholics who do not support the teachings of the church is simply wrong. It serves to lead others astray and to make a laughing stock of church leaders and their teachings.

Buy Your Hispanic Vote Here

According to LifeSiteNews the *London Telegraph* has reported that Schwarzenegger attempted to “purchase Catholic votes” with donations. His campaign told the press that the actor had recently made a tax-deductible donation of a house worth \$2 million to the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. The newspaper said “the revelation was designed to boost his appeal among...Hispanic Catholic voters—a crucial constituency representing about one quarter of the electorate.”

Another Schwarzenegger donation, publicized in the newspaper of the Diocese of Superior, was in the amount of \$1,000.00. It was to aid the restoration and enhancement of the Cathedral of Christ the King. The

actor also promised to visit the cathedral and make a larger donation in the near future. The coverage did not mention Schwarzenegger’s views against the Church on fundamental moral issues.

Protestants Take Aim; But One Misfires

Another pro-family organization, Californians for Moral Government (CMG), spent nearly \$1 million on radio and television advertisements, which alleged that there is little difference between Schwarzenegger and Davis. The narrator concludes with the question: “You have to ask yourself; if all we are doing is trading one bad liberal tax-raising politician for another, why bother with the recall?” CMG Chairman Rev. Louis P. Sheldon made the point very clear: “You may not need values to win an election but you need values to govern California. Neither Gray Davis nor Arnold Schwarzenegger possess the necessary moral standards.”

One of the most shocking news stories of the campaign appeared in *The Drudge Report*. Televangelist Pat Robertson was said to have “all but endorsed” the actor. Asked whether Christians could vote for the bodybuilder-turned-actor-turned-politician with a clear conscience, Robertson gave a lengthy reply:

Well you know I’m a bodybuilder. I do some pretty heavy weightlifting, so I think the weightlifters of the world need to unite. I tell you what those guys in California could use a big bruiser to knock some heads together. I mean they’re out of control over there. So what are they gonna do? I mean, you gonna have Bustamante, who is sort of the Governor Gray Davis lite? They don’t want any more Davis, so who else you gonna put in? I think you don’t have anybody else that’s coming up on the radar so the other alternative is just stay home.

LifeSiteNews reminds us that this is not the first time that Robertson has betrayed pro-lifers by “placing utilitarian pragmatics above serious moral considerations.” In 2001 he infuriated pro-life activists with comments that seemed to justify Communist China’s coercive population control program:

Well, you know, I don’t agree with it. But at the same time, they’ve got 1.2 billion people and they don’t know what to do. If every family over there was allowed to have three or four children, the population would be completely unsustainable...So I think that right now they’re doing what they have to do. I don’t agree with

the forced abortion, but I don't think the United States needs to interfere with what they're doing internally in this regard.

Protestants have their own brand of Cardinal Roger Mahoney, which is embarrassing to say the least.

Party Trumps Policy and Principle

Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was called a "Republican in name only" by actor and liberal activist Martin Sheen, was endorsed by a wide range of people. Pro-abortion Democrat endorsers included actor Rob Lowe and Warren Buffett. Pro-abortion Republican endorsers were former California Gov. Pete Wilson, former Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan and former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani. This is to be expected, but it is clear that few of these men would have endorsed Schwarzenegger if he were pro-life.

It is wholly indefensible that members of Congress such as David Dreier, Dana Rohrabacher, Christopher Cox, and Randy "Duke" Cunningham did not speak out *against* Schwarzenegger in the early going. All of these men have run for office touting a pro-life position. Rather than wondering where a candidate stands on abortion, maybe we should be asking where abortion stands with a candidate. It is clear that it does not rank very high with some people. And the same can be said of Pat Robertson and the elected officials who also jumped on the movie star's bandwagon. Their actions demonstrate an abysmal commitment to the pro-life/pro-family position.

How pro-life David Dreier could serve as campaign co-chairman and now lead Schwarzenegger's transition team is a mystery of Biblical proportions. He has worked alongside the likes of pro-abortion Riordan and Wilson to elect the same man. The most appalling aspect is that pro-life people were willing to put party over principle—justifying their actions along the way. It seems the goal was to defeat Davis and few people were particularly concerned about the kind of person who would replace him.

The recall election is just the most recent example of pro-life people being willing to give in where pro-abortion activists never would. How many pro-abortion people vote for pro-lifers because they like the candidates' position on economic issues? Few. It seems that the most basic of political strategies are involved here yet we act as though it is so complicated. Why cannot we act intelligently when the answer is so clear and simple?

The California Republican establishment, including the California Republican Party, the California Young Republicans, the California Republican Congressional Delegation, and the Republican Leadership Council, should be ashamed of endorsing the inexperienced Schwarzenegger over a qualified candidate like McClintock. It seems this is all like a football game or horserace to some people. It is all about winning. Yet they seem totally uninterested in the consequences.

But is Schwarzenegger really a Republican in name only? When retired General Wesley Clark joined the campaign for President as a Democrat many of his opponents criticized his past association with Republicans. To prove that he was indeed a Democrat, Clark listed his positions on several issues, the first of which was abortion. "I am pro-choice," he said proudly. Hence, the other Democrats running for President realized that Clark really is a Democrat. At least the abortion party knows what it stands for. And with the "big tent" of the Republicans, the new governor of California will fit right in.

Don't Stop Thinking About Tomorrow

Schwarzenegger called on social conservatives to join his campaign so that Governor Gray Davis could be defeated. Schwarzenegger essentially asked pro-life Californians to sell out on abortion for the *possibility* of a better state fiscal policy. What is thoroughly unconscionable is that far too many pro-life Californians were willing to do as the actor said.

Senator McClintock showed his true character and the strength of his convictions by refusing to end his campaign and endorse Schwarzenegger. Doing as Schwarzenegger suggested would mean that pro-abortion Republicans could legitimately expect pro-lifers to roll over and do whatever they are told in the future. We had been asked to trade Davis, whose political career is clearly over regardless of how much longer he served as governor, with Schwarzenegger, whose political career is just starting. Pro-life Californians needed to reject both men, but no one more than Schwarzenegger because he is truly dangerous.

Tony Perkins, president of the Family Research Council, shares the same concerns:

Some political observers are saying that if Arnold is successful as governor, there will be immense pressure on social conservatives within the GOP to begin backing candidates who have a shot at winning, regardless of their views on abortion and marriage. The truth is, however, that such pressure already exists, and this

“winning” philosophy has been proven wrong time and time again...

We certainly hope that Mr. Schwarzenegger is successful in fixing California’s many economic problems. However, we are also hopeful that his administration...mindful that many of the votes he received were from pro-life, pro-family Californians—will resist the left-wing forces that seek to further devalue life and deconstruct marriage in the Golden State.”

Perkins is an optimist. Why would Schwarzenegger even recognize our existence? He won in a landslide and even if every pro-lifer had voted for him there is no reason for him to think they will be unwilling to do so the next time around. California pro-lifers who voted for Schwarzenegger have turned the Pro-Life Movement in the state into a tiger with false teeth and no claws. And it did not have to be that way.

Gary L. Bauer had endorsed McClintock. We endorsed the same man and we share a common concern. Why did so many good people turn to the actor for the Golden State’s salvation? Bauer comments:

[I]t appears that millions of Republicans, including conservative Christians, are prepared to ignore him [McClintock] in order to vote for a pro-abortion, pro-homosexual rights “star.” Is this how people of faith are going to transform politics?

I understand the deep frustration so many Californians feel living under the socialism and cultural radicalism of the Davis administration. But in their support for Arnold, a “winner,” they have inadvertently sent a message to the national Republican Party that issues of the heart don’t matter; that support for tax cuts alone is enough to satisfy us. Believe me, there are those in the Republican establishment who will test just how little they can offer us and still get our votes.

...Am I overreacting to suggest that while the party of Clinton/Kennedy is likely to lose [in California]..., their values have won?...

The Republican Party I have dedicated my life to...has always stood for balanced budgets and saved babies, for lower taxes and traditional values, for government reform and ordered liberty under God. If we wake up...to find that socially liberal Republicans are in control of New York *and* California, our job will be a lot harder.

Scott has a warning for Republican leader who ignore pro-family voters: “It is not the winning but what has been won that is important. Did not we learn that in grade school? It would be better to lose every election than to be a party to ‘winning’ the deaths of more unborn children.”

If those in the Republican Party hierarchy believe pro-family voters will have nowhere else to turn so they can be expected to support the Republican candidate no matter what he or she represents they are in for a major letdown. We may just choose to stay home on Election Day rather than be used as an accomplice to what pro-abortion Republicans want to do. If the Republican elite believe that sitting out elections is a bluff, they are coming dangerously close to finding out for sure.

Must the state of the economy always trump the deaths of innocent unborn children in importance at the voting booth? Clearly, this is exactly what is happening with most voters who would classify themselves as “pro-life” and it is leading to political disaster for the Pro-Life Movement. How do we convince people to match what people say and what they do? How do we make life *the crucial* issue?

Our job has indeed become *much* harder. The worst part is that we have been put in this position by many of our own people. Have circumstances moved to the point where it is too late?

Grave Consequences

Several days before the election it became apparent where voters were headed. I issued a public statement:

It is imperative that people start to look at the long-term effect of what they do, particularly when they cast a ballot. If the recall passes and Schwarzenegger wins it is a disaster for the unborn child and another pro-abortion “Catholic Republican” will be given a national platform. If the recall fails and Davis stays in office, it is a sad day for the unborn, but those days are numbered.

A pro-abortion Democrat is easier to deal with than a pro-abortion Republican as the latter will undermine and seek to change the party’s position on abortion. At the very least an elected pro-abortion Republican weakens the impact of a pro-life plank in the party platform. I mean, would the Republicans have allowed pro-slavery men to run for office under their banner in the time of Abraham Lincoln?

“If a candidate equally as articulate, smart and charismatic as Arnold Schwarzenegger had run for

governor, a candidate with the same positions on the issues and the same lack of political experience, he or she would never have won the election,” said LDI cofounder and former executive director Patricia Pitkus Bainbridge in analyzing the reason why voters chose Schwarzenegger. “He won because he’s a movie star with a tough guy image. He won simply because he’s Arnold Schwarzenegger.”

Bauer is concerned about how the Pro-Life Movement will fare in the near future. While he is pleased that Davis will no longer be able to ruin California’s economy into the ground, Bauer worries that “the price we all pay for this victory could be substantial.” It seems we have already begun to pay the price, but Bauer predicts a more expensive bill is about to come due:

At the Republican national convention in New York City next year, you are going to hear “big tent” rhetoric—if not those very words—until you can’t take any more. “The GOP is big enough...” they will tell us for pro-abortion Arnold and pro-life Henry Hyde. It is wide enough for a pro-gay rights Governor, like George Pataki, and a pro-family Majority Leader, like Tom DeLay. It is deep enough for the pro-homosexual “marriage” Log Cabin Republicans and the Christian Coalition. But will such a party be principled enough to actually fight for the conservative social values of the great majority of its voters? “A house divided against itself cannot stand.”

Some of our friends in California have suggested that Schwarzenegger could move in our direction over time. Anything is possible. But as far as I know, the Pete Wilson crowd, that opposes everything pro-family conservatives believe in, ran his campaign and the only other major influence on him comes from the Kennedy clan. Call me skeptical.

Skeptical, no. Right on, yes. And there is one prediction that I would add. Schwarzenegger will be a primetime speaker at the Republican National Convention. He will be proclaimed the hero of the Republican Party and worshipped accordingly.

Every Democrat running for President is clamoring to show the abortion industry that he or she is in favor of more dead unborn children than the other candidates. Democrats take their platform very seriously, are proud of it and they fight for it. Pro-life Democrats are silenced and have *no* chance of winning the party’s nomination for President. Most Republicans run from the issue, but the party would gladly embrace and

nominate a pro-abortion candidate for President, so long as he or she will not raise taxes. Democrats are proud of their position. Most Republicans are cowards. Shameful. Simply shameful.

Pro-life Californians needed to deliver a message to pro-abortion Republicans by sending Schwarzenegger back to the Kennedy clan with a friendly, ‘hasta la vista, baby.’ But unfortunately far too many pro-life Californians missed this opportunity.

— Douglas R. Scott is president of Life Decisions International and the author of *Bad Choices: A Look Inside Planned Parenthood*. He was asked to and did serve as a political consultant to the Steve Forbes campaign for President in 2000.

Special Reports, an official periodical of Life Decisions International (LDI), is published four times per year. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every LDI Partner or members of its Board of Directors/Advisors or staff. Visit us at: www.fightpp.org. This publication may be copied so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided with the quotation. Write: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161. Phone: (540) 631-0380.

© 2003 Life Decisions International.