“Scandal indeed is the media’s business while the care of souls is the business of the Church.”

—Father Tom Euteneuer

**INTRODUCTION**

Human Life International may be one of the better-known antichoice groups on the extreme fringes of the antichoice movement, but it is not because of its effectiveness or coherence. Its notoriety is largely based on a reputation for vicious, hyperbolic pronouncements and a body of scandals as extensive as any that we have come across to date. Its infractions over the past 30 years include accusations of racism, incitement to violence, infighting, a woeful lack of managerial oversight, financial malfeasance, nepotism and sexual misconduct. HLI has attracted well-deserved criticism from both inside and outside the church hierarchy. In fact, the organization seems to thrive within an atmosphere that generates exactly the sort of stereotypes about the church that generations of Catholics have devoted lifetimes to dispelling.

HLI is a declared enemy of reproductive choice—as well as any other person, group or practice that doesn’t fit in with its far-right worldview. The staff at UNFPA—as well as the citizens of Poland, the Philippines, Mexico, Spain, Brazil and Nigeria (among many others)—know only too well that local policymakers are willing to accept HLI’s assertions as fact.

HLI has often opted for shock over substance, mailing graphic medical images, displaying fetuses in jars to children and regularly appropriating the memory and circumstances of the Holocaust to describe abortion and stem cell research. Its representatives have spoken out against almost every conceivable minority group, expressing concerns that Asians, Latinos and Muslims will overrun the world; proclaiming
KEY FINDINGS

- HLI has ties to radical ultra-right figures such as Operation Rescue founder Randall Terry and antichoice activist Don Treshman.
- Founder Paul Marx was a prolific publisher with a tendency towards hate-filled speech.
- HLI’s trademark shock tactics range from mailing clinically graphic photos of abortions to making extreme statements on television.
- Human Life International created the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (CAFHRI, now known as C-FAM) in order to gain ECOSOC status at the UN.
- Organizational in-fighting has been costly—both in terms of lawsuits and diminished contributions.
- Other priests and members of the church hierarchy have criticized the organization’s anti-Semitic, anti-LGBT statements.
- Little information is available for four of the seven current members of the board.
- HLI supplies only vague information about its network of chapters, affiliates, associates and satellite offices.
- Population Research International, an offshoot of HLI, has passed off misinformation about the United Nations Population Fund to Congress.
- Father Thomas Euteneuer’s tenure as president took him from training as an exorcist to admitting he sexually abused a young woman during an exorcism.

that Jews were responsible for abortions worldwide; labeling homosexuality and feminism as degraded and satanic, respectively; and condemning black leaders in the anti-apartheid movement. The organization has repeatedly provided a platform for extremists using violent rhetoric—including some who have encouraged individuals to “let a wave of intolerance” wash over them or applauded sniper attacks on abortion doctors as a “superb tactic.” At various points HLI presidents have peddled ridiculous conspiracy theories, engaged in gross financial malfeasance—which caused organizational infighting that garnered national media attention—and admitted to as-yet-unspecified acts of sexual impropriety that occurred during one or more exorcisms.

That these scandals have often come from the very top of HLI’s command structure is not the only troubling feature of the leadership. The inflexible nature of HLI’s opinions pertaining to any of the issues on which it works is coupled with an unwillingness to create the systems needed to correct a stream of organizational calamities. This combination does not bode well for an organization that claims to be a major international player yet provides little if any actual evidence of such. Intransigence built on a tissue of misrepresentation eventually (and regularly in the case of HLI) comes crashing down.
HISTORY

An “increasingly sophisticated apparatus for stirring up trouble”

Human Life International’s origins can be traced to Father Paul Marx’s 1972 founding of the Human Life Center at St. John’s University. During his association with the Human Life Center, Marx developed his graphic shock tactics that later became the hallmark of HLI’s activism. Recounting a controversy-generating incident from a 1970s trip to Ireland that involved Marx displaying a fetus in a jar to a horrified audience of school children, Irish Family League co-founder John O’Reilly later admitted he was not comfortable with such practices, finding them “rather abrasive.”

By the early 1980s, Marx’s controversial methods of activism drew the attention of likeminded groups, some of which would eventually become well known in far-right political circles. Despite claims by Marx and his associates that he started the organization with nothing but $7,000 and an old car, two influential groups were instrumental in HLI’s founding: the American Life League (ALL)—one of the most polarizing groups on the far-right wing of the antichoice movement—and the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, later known as the Free Congress Foundation (FCF), a leading think tank in the New Right movement. With the help of FCF and the founders of ALL, Judie and Paul Brown, Human Life International set up in Gaithersburg, Maryland, and incorporated on December 28, 1981, in Washington, DC. The name of the initial registered agent for the corporation was L. Brent Bozell III, a prominent right-wing leader and former national finance chairman for the 1992 Buchanan for President Campaign. Bozell was also one-time president of the National Conservative Political Action Committee and founder of the conservative Media Research Center. He is currently executive director of the Conservative Victory Committee.

From its start as an ostensibly one-man operation with powerful silent backers and zero name recognition, in the space of a decade Marx transformed HLI into an “increasingly sophisticated apparatus for stirring up trouble.” During the 1980s, Marx perfected his signature blend of shock tactics, hard-line pronouncements, paranoia and international proselytizing into what still serves as the foundation of HLI’s view of an unceasingly nefarious world. For his secretive taping of conferences in the early 1970s, Marx regularly infiltrated meetings under false pretenses. This ruse lasted only temporarily. A mere four years after the organization’s founding, when Marx presented his doctorate in sociology as a cover for registration to the 1985 Christopher Tietze International Symposium on Future Practices and Policies to Promote Women’s Health, he was immediately identified by organizers and barred entry.

During the 1980s, HLI was so hampered by its own poor reputation it had to set up front organizations so that it could remain operational.

During the 1980s, HLI was so hampered by its own poor reputation it had to set up front organizations so that it could remain operational. By 1990, HLI had invented two affiliates: the Population Research Institute and Seminarians for Life International. While the second name is self-explanatory, the first appeared to recognize the need to obscure a hard-right political agenda behind a seemingly benign moniker. Headed by longtime HLI associate Steven Mosher, the Population Research Institute was created in 1989 to counter mainstream scientific research related to global efforts to combine population planning, reproductive rights and social development.

In addition, Marx was amassing a number of titles and positions outside of HLI but squarely within the antichoice world, strengthening the group’s standing...
within its community. His other roles included: former chairman of ALL’s national advisory board; member of the advisory council for the Couple to Couple League (CCL) for family planning; patron-advisor to Humanae Vitae House in Scotland; vice chairman of the board of Life Amendment Political Action Committee (LAPAC); board member of the US Coalition for Life (USCL); and founder and publisher of the International Review of Natural Family Planning.12

By the decade’s close, HLI had also established an expansive publishing campaign. For the head of a purportedly one-man operation who was occupied with crisscrossing the globe and holding positions on various extra-organizational boards, in his role as a publisher Marx also helped churn out a range of titles including: Birth Control: Why Are They Lying to Women? (pamphlet); From Contraception to Abortion (pamphlet); Eight Reasons You Should Consider Having One More Child (pamphlet); HLI Reports (monthly); Special Report (monthly); Escoge la Vida! (bi-monthly); Sorrow’s Reward (quarterly); Seminarians for Life International Newsletter (quarterly); Prolife and Profamily Parish Notes (monthly); and Confessions of a Prolife Missionary (autobiography).13 HLI developed a global distribution empire of “teaching materials”—not only literature but also films, audio and photographs—as well as the direct-mail fundraising that accounts for the majority of HLI’s income.15 In addition, HLI regularly mailed images that one Connecticut lawmaker would later refer to as “material depicting violent acts [and] clinically graphic material…. ”

Criticism and subterfuge

By the mid 1990s, HLI’s taste for controversy reached levels that made pushback inevitable. At the start of the decade, HLI’s largest and oldest branch, Human Life International Canada, was charged with violating Canadian tax
laws designed to ensure that charitable organizations forgo political activity. The Canadian Minister of Finance accused HLI Canada of breaching this law, and in 1994 HLI Canada’s charity status was revoked.21 Within the same period, the UN refused to admit HLI to Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) status—an important form of UN accreditation that allows NGOs access to meetings about economic and social matters in a consultative capacity.22 Based on what the UN characterized as HLI’s “attacks on Islam,” its stance “against the purposes of the United Nations,” its “aggressive language” and the “issue of tolerance,”23 the group’s application to the accredited group of NGOs was refused. Later, HLI would create the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute as a means of covertly obtaining UN ECOSOC status.

The Catholic hierarchy has repeatedly criticized both HLI’s ideology and its methods. In 1995, the Anti-Defamation League and Monsignor George G. Higgins, then-director of the Social Action Department of the United States Catholic Conference, condemned HLI for its repeated anti-Semitic statements. “It evokes the medieval imagery of Jews as devils, complete with horns,” Higgins said of the group’s comments, adding that such “anti-Semitic imagery has clearly been condemned by the church.”24 Only one year later, Father Richard Carney, then-chancellor of the diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph, rebuked the organization for a mailing titled HLI’s National Catholic Opinion Survey on the Homosexual Agenda. “There was a time when I would have supported and encouraged others to support the organization ‘Human Life International.’ No more!” Father Carney went on to inquire about the contents of the survey, “If there is a ‘homosexual agenda’ as they suppose, how did they find out about that while the rest of us are in the dark? In my view, it’s just an excuse to ‘bash.’”25

The pitch of such criticisms and failures quickly spiked. In the late 1990s the organization suffered its most stinging criticism to date and began exhibiting the first signs of organizational turmoil that would eventually morph into scandal. Demonstrating that HLI’s identity as an ultra-Catholic organization did not necessarily result in unalloyed support from the hierarchy. Archbishop Harry Flynn of the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis distanced himself from the group. Citing its president’s anti-Semitic statements, the archbishop of Marx’s home state refused to say mass at an HLI convention.26 Incensed by the archbishop’s refusal, HLI declaimed Flynn’s actions to be the result of a “leftist conspiracy … of militant homosexual activists, anarchists and others.”27 HLI was unprepared for growing public outcry questioning “whether such material [its trademark graphic images of medical procedures] is an incitement to deadly violence.”28 In the wake of John Salvi’s abortion clinic shootings, high-profile media outlets such as the New York Times probed the consequences of HLI’s distribution of graphic images29—such as an article which opens with HLI’s Father Matthew Habiger “proudly displaying a laminated poster of a bloodied fetal head pinched by forceps.”

From 1992 to 1999, HLI and its affiliates were listed in no less than eight civil lawsuits in the US and Canada, but the organization opted not to change its ideological course or tone. Instead, HLI—by this time publicly recognized as being much larger than a solitary figure with “only a car, $7,000 and a few good friends”—reverted to a standby tactic: professional misrepresentation.30 Just as Marx once crashed conferences, HLI took the morally questionable step of creating a shadow ECOSOC-approved organization as a way to infiltrate the UN. On August 11, 1997, the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (initially known by the acronym CAFHRI and later as C-FAM) was incorporated in Suffolk County, New
York. While technically a legally separate entity from HLI and HLI Canada, minutes from the first CAFHRI meeting in 1997 speak volumes as to the true nature of HLI’s relationship with the newly formed NGO. Under “funding” the minutes state, “Not public knowledge that HLI is funding office. Use discretion. Initially state that we are supported by multitudes of individuals/organizations. Don’t hide the fact that HLI is funder—just don’t volunteer that fact to uncertain/non-friendly persons.”

Three of the duties listed in the job description of its first director Ann Noonan, former affiliate representative of the ECOSOC-recognized World Christian Life Community, mentioned HLI.

• “Reports directly to HLI Canada UN liaison (Christen MacEachern)”
• “Coordinates with HLI Canada, major research projects”
• “Maintains expense/revenue (basic bookkeeping), banking weekly report/update to HLI Canada”

Picking up where its original incarnation had failed, HLI in the guise of CAFHRI received ECOSOC status and quickly went about the business of undermining any and all efforts at advocacy for family planning within the UN. “We attended all of the women’s meetings and essentially took them over,” stated Noonan’s successor at CAFHRI, Austin Ruse. “Memos were going back from the conference in New York to governments in the European Union that radical fundamentalists had taken over the meeting, and that was us.”

At roughly the same time, HLI relocated the Gaithersburg offices to its new 85-acre complex in Front Royal, Virginia, in August 1996. This move cost HLI an estimated $7.5 million. Two years later, HLI Endowment Inc. proceeded with a fiscally suspect property acquisition: a piece of vacant Miami residential property with a total assessed value of $34,238, inexplicably purchased for the vastly inflated price of $230,000.

In-fighting and accusations of financial wrongdoing
Within three years of these purchases, the 79-year-old Marx was suddenly recalled to his home diocese in 1999, allegedly for health reasons. Only a few weeks after HLI lauded their founder’s career in a farewell press release, Marx leveled charges against HLI through The Wanderer, a Minneapolis-based ultraconservative Catholic newspaper. Marx denied being recalled due to his health (despite the fact that a later lawsuit referred to his stay at the Mayo Clinic that year), instead claiming that his exit was forced by the new head of HLI, Father Richard Welch. Marx accused his successor of “spendthrift” habits and “nepotism” — the latter referring to Welch’s father holding a $65,000 a year position at HLI. Welch retaliated, recalling that upon his 1996 arrival to the nonprofit—which in 1998 claimed $7.4 million in income—HLI had no financial ledger, lacked an operating budget, hadn’t registered for fundraising in many states, and had a board made up of only 3 persons, one of whom was Marx. “People” recounted Welch “had been stuffing cash into suitcases to take [to the group’s branches] overseas.”

Charges continued to fly between former HLI employees—some of whom had resigned after Marx’s exit—and the organization. Welch was said to be planning on absconding with HLI’s money to Rome where he would live off the interest; HLI leaked a collection of personal correspondence sent from various bishops critical of Welch’s actions to the former president and his abbot; The Wanderer was accused of stealing documents from HLI’s offices; and finally, there was the “trashing” of HLI printed materials deemed “too inflammatory” in an effort to “change HLI’s image from that of an activist group” and make it more mainstream. Both sides intimated they would sue for defamation. Former HLI employees created a splinter group called “Donor Rights” to police the actions of the
HLI had suffered serious financial damage during the conflict. “Donations … dried up,” former HLI accountant Pat Demers attested at the time.

investigator handling the case, Mark Kalaris, went on record stating that the facts were “pretty much open and shut” against HLI. At the same time, HLI also contended with a barrage of what it referred to as “libelous e-mails” reaching donors, presumably sent by former employees. Among claims about HLI leveled in the e-mails: financial and sex scandals; fraud and tax evasion; that Opus Dei is a cult that was the “cause of the mess at HLI”; that Father Welch was selling the Front Royal property and moving to Rome to avoid prosecution; and that the organization would spend $1 million dollars on a public relations campaign to rehabilitate its image. Asking for a judgment of over $50 million to cover punitive damages, HLI filed suit against unknown parties for the distribution of said e-mails, going so far as to subpoena the Hotmail e-mail service for the names of the senders.

Spiritual warfare, sexual abuse

Following a brief search after Father Welch’s resignation, Father Tom Euteneuer was hired as HLI’s new president. Under Welch’s relatively brief tenure, he appeared to have taken steps toward placing HLI on a more sound footing, including moderating some of its more extreme stances, most notably distancing itself from the group’s former outright opposition to sexuality education. Euteneuer’s appointment marked not simply a return to, but an intensification of, Marx’s hard-line stances on sexual matters while at the
same time expanding the organization’s reach into unexpected realms.

In his nine years as president, Euteneuer created or approved a bizarre litany of press statements, articles, newsletters and educational materials that stretched in an unbroken chain of virulent denunciations across the decade. No issue was too small or too absurd – at one point, HLI publicly blasted Hasbro for releasing pink Ouija boards.54 Euteneuer took full advantage of the expanded platform offered to him by the Internet and increasingly popular 24-hour news shows. As the first HLI president who operated in an era of evolving digital media, he became a commenter and interviewee on a variety of antichoice websites such as LifeSite News, while appearing not infrequently as a guest on cable news shows. The combination of Euteneuer’s media savvy and his enthusiasm for apocalyptic denunciations of anyone disagreeing with any HLI position quickly assured him notoriety as a consistent source of the sort of blood and thunder sound bites that generated ratings.

Whether making repeated media appearances during the Terri Schiavo case,55 imploring the faithful to defeat gay marriage in order to keep Christian civilization from vanishing,56 or berating conservative talk show host Sean Hannity for being a “cultural Catholic,” Euteneuer’s steady stream of theatrics and overstatements kept HLI close to, if not always in, the spotlight. As seen in his denunciation of Hannity, while Euteneuer’s antics often attracted attention, they also managed to repel many who might otherwise have agreed with the organization’s positions. Similarly, Euteneuer attracted negative press with his harsh commentaries on Senator Ted Kennedy’s passing. Euteneuer stated that the departed senator “will not be missed by the unborn who he betrayed time and time again, nor by the rest of us who are laboring to undo the scandalous example of Catholicism that he gave to three generations of Americans.”57 Euteneuer also issued attacks on members of the clergy who did not fall into line with HLI’s approach to life issues. He urged well-known Jesuit priest Father James Martin to “hang up his collar”58 for supporting gay marriage and condemned a great number of American bishops in the wake of the resignation of the controversial Bishop Martino of Scranton, NJ.59 Euteneuer, the guardian of Catholic orthodoxy, was increasingly at odds with fellow clergy. Compounding these controversial attitudes were his high-profile Vatican certification as an exorcist, his various speaking engagements regarding this esoteric subject and his frequent, surreal descriptions of political occurrences as demonic or Satanic in nature.60

The culmination of constant media attention, hyperbolic comments, frequent disagreements with clergy and an immersion in spiritual warfare was Euteneuer’s sudden resignation from HLI in August 2010.61 Initially, no reason was given for his departure. Months later, it emerged that Euteneuer stepped down after allegations that he had broken his vows of chastity while performing an exorcism on a young woman. He released a statement admitting that during an exorcism “one particularly complex situation … led me to imprudent decisions with harmful consequences, the worst of which was violating the boundaries of chastity with an adult female who was under my spiritual care.”62 Amid allegations that there was more than one instance, Euteneuer went to ground. The investigation into his conduct is ongoing at the time of this document’s publication. Monsignor Ignacio Barreiro-Carámbula of New York was acting as interim head of the organization from 2010 until Father Shenan Boquet, the new president, and Father Peter West, vice president for missions, began serving in September 2011.
TIMELINE

1960s
Father Paul Marx begins teaching natural birth regulation to married couples and writing and lecturing about contraception and abortion.

1970s
1971 Marx attends and tapes a four-day meeting he later described as “a secret meeting called to prepare American society to accept legalized abortion” in the book Death Peddlers: War on the Unborn.
1972 Marx founds Human Life Center at St. John’s University.
1972 Marx first travels to Latin America with antiabortion materials.
Mid-1970s: Marx repels otherwise receptive Irish audience with the graphic, unexpected display of a preserved fetus.

1980s
1980 Marx is given a five year “sabbatical” from St. John’s, which he later describes as an “ouster.”
1981 Judy and Paul Brown help Marx incorporate HLI; L. Brent Bozell III is initial registered agent.
1985 Attempting to use his sociology doctorate as cover, Marx unsuccessfully attempts to infiltrate the Tietze International Symposium on Future Practices and Policies to Promote Women’s Health in Berlin.
1989 Seminarians for Life International (SFLI) and the Population Research Institute (PRI) are founded.

1990s
1990 Father Matthew Habiger joins HLI.
1993 Connecticut lawmaker labels HLI mailings “graphic material ... material unsuitable for persons under 18 years of age.”
1994 HLI Canada’s charity status is revoked; HLI denied Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) status by the UN. Habiger succeeds Marx as president.
1995 Both the Anti Defamation League and Monsignor George G. Higgins of the Social Action Department of the US Catholic Conference condemn HLI for repeated anti-Semitic statements.
1996 HLI breaks ground on the new $7.5 million headquarters in Front Royal, Virginia; Father Richard Welch joins HLI and alleges widespread financial problems.
1997 HLI founds the Catholic and Family Human Rights Institute (C-FAM) in order to gain ECOSOC status at the UN; Archbishop Harry Flynn backs out of a concelebration of Mass with HLI because of its penchant for anti-Semitism.
1998 Father Welch is named new HLI president.
1999 Marx is recalled to his home diocese. An internal power struggle between Marx and Welch commences—accusations are leveled by both sides concerning financial impropriety. Between 17 and 30 people leave the organization and a splinter group, Donor Rights, is formed.

2000s
2000 In August, Welch resigns. Father Tom Euteneuer is hired as his replacement in December, after a brief return by Habiger.
2003 Euteneuer trains at the Vatican to become an exorcist.
2003 HLI dismisses the rape of nine-year-old Nicaraguan girl as nothing more than an event being “used by feminists to push abortion legislation.”
2004 Euteneuer protests outside of Terri Schiavo’s hospice center.
2006 Euteneuer compares stem cell research to Nazi prison camps.
2007 While on-air Euteneuer tells conservative talk-show host Sean Hannity he would refuse him communion because of Hannity’s support of contraception.
2010 Euteneuer abruptly steps down as president of HLI; Monsignor Ignacio Barriero-Carámbula becomes interim president of HLI.
2011 Euteneuer admits to “violations of chastity” with a woman during the course of an exorcism. A few days later HLI follows with a press release stating that this was not an isolated incident.
2011 Father Shenan Boquet is named as president; Father Peter West is appointed to a new position, vice president for missions.
AFFILIATES

Employing the two most common metrics, size and income, HLI’s claim that it is “the world’s largest international prolife organization” has little support from its website or its financial records. While HLI accepts donations from individuals, the organization’s 990 tax forms reflect no dues-paying membership. Its website lists no information regarding criteria for membership or HLI’s current number of members. In terms of revenue HLI lags behind several other antichoice organizations. Total revenue of the American Life League for 2009 totaled $6,734,391, almost double the $3,638,382 reported by HLI in the same period.63

The HLI website mentions a variety of relationships with other entities without supplying clear information about their activities. During the 1990s HLI claimed 25 domestic chapters.64 Listed as “quasi-independent,” these chapters were designed as fundraising and literature sales auxiliaries to the central organization and received no funding from HLI headquarters.65 Currently, neither HLI nor HLI America’s websites offer information regarding these chapters.66 Internationally, HLI claims to have 99 satellite offices in 87 countries,67 though in other places it is said to have affiliates and associates in over 100,68 or as many as 105, countries on six continents.69

In 2006 and 2007 HLI’s grant recipients tally up to only approximately 50 names and addresses, most categorized as “affiliates” or “projects” – far short of the purported 99 offices.70

In a Catholics for Choice report released in 1994, it was noted that in some, and possibly most, cases HLI’s branches appear to have been groups established independently by local Catholic church leaders or antichoice activists.71 This seems to be supported by the bios of George Wirnkar (HLI’s regional coordinator of Francophone Africa as well as executive director of HLI Cameroon) and Emil Hagamu (regional director of English-speaking Africa). Both seem to have been heads of separate, pre-existing African antichoice organizations before attending an HLI conference in South Africa in 1996. The site further maintains that “not long after” the 1996 conference “he [Wirnkar], like Emil, officially merged his prolife work with Human Life International and became an affiliate.”72

On HLI’s webpage dedicated to its activities in Latin America, Spain and the Caribbean, three categories appear: “affiliates,” “associates” and the “other countries we work in.”73 Affiliates are defined as organizations with whom HLI maintains an “extensive working partnership,” while associates have a “newer, developing partnership.”74 The “other countries where HLI works” are not defined at all. Upon clicking any hyperlinked country’s name, one is directed towards the US Department of State’s informational page about that area. Only when site visitors click a hyperlink embedded within a sentence placed between HLI’s map and the Department of State-directed hyperlinks are they directed to contact information posted on HLI’s “Vida Humana” (Spanish for “human life”) homepage.75 Here, HLI describes the role of an “affiliate” as an agreement “to coordinate their efforts to better promote the sanctity of life”76 and provides individual contact links to “HLI’s affiliates in the Hispanic world.”

On the Vida Humana page dedicated to each country, however, some of these affiliates suddenly take on the title “representatives.” On some pages – such as those for Mexico77 and Argentina78 – HLI lists additional groups as “other affiliated organizations” whose relationship to HLI is not defined. Of the 17 countries with “affiliate representatives” HLI counts in Latin America, less than half have a website and only six of those websites are operational. (One, Panama’s, directs viewers to a US website designed to search for hotels.)79
The page for HLI’s Bolivian affiliate lacks any sort of organizational description altogether and consists solely of a few lines of contact information.80 Though HLI purports to have “associates” or to “do work” in a total of 12 additional countries “in Latin America and the Caribbean,”81 they provide zero contact information for these “affiliates” and “other countries” on the Vida Humana homepage.

A similar situation exists with the majority of HLI’s European affiliates. HLI’s European homepage82 lists a total of 21 affiliates from 19 countries, along with six associates from five countries. Nine of the affiliates are without websites and two sites are inactive, leaving half of the European affiliates without a web presence. Of the six European associates, only one (Portugal) has its own site, the entire substance of which is an almost seventy-line poem.83 It is also worth noting that HLI is entirely without an affiliate or associate in England, Scotland or Wales.

While certain countries, through no fault of their own, may currently lack the resources or infrastructure to implement and maintain a website, one would think that the world’s “largest prolife group” would be able to allocate funds to facilitate the creation of one of the most basic modern communication tools, a website. At a bare minimum, HLI could at least regularly update their own Vida Humana website in an effort to facilitate communication between their affiliates and those interested in helping them. The overall effect of this scanty information is to leave site visitors with an unclear picture of HLI’s actual presence in any given country. There’s a difference between “coordinating efforts” with separate but likeminded organizations (the impression left by the Vida Humana site’s definition of “affiliate”) and the more robust partnership described on the HLI site, which says they “train, organize and equip these organizations.”84

If it is difficult to determine the extent and depth of HLI’s true reach worldwide, in some countries, HLI has been manifestly quite disruptive. In the Philippines the organization has worked to obstruct immunization campaigns by spreading the misinformation that they were secret sterilization programs conducted by the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children’s Fund.85 In 2010, HLI actively supported candidates during the country’s elections, holding a conference about their choice of candidate to endorse on the grounds of their antichoice stance.86 In 2011, HLI’s affiliates also had a hand in frustrating the passage of a Reproductive Health Bill in the Filipino House of Representatives.87 In Poland HLI has helped set up websites catering to pharmacists who refuse to sell contraceptives, particularly emergency contraception, which they call “miscarriage pills.”88

In Spain, where the liberalization of abortion laws has met staunch opposition in recent years, HLI has proved a reactionary force. Following King Juan Carlos’ signing of a more liberal abortion law in 2010, HLI asserted, without proof or justification, that the king had excommunicated himself.90

Regarding the history and operating nature of the groups it has actually created and not just consensually appropriated, HLI is only slightly clearer. The HLI Endowment was founded in the District of Columbia as a 501(c)(2) nonprofit corporation—a title-holding entity that may hold property for the exempt organization with which it is affiliated—on May 17, 1991.91 The group focuses on donating materials, equipment
and money to nonprofit groups in the United States and around the world. In addition to its interactions with the secular world, HLI also has a division working to indoctrinate members of the clergy with its beliefs. *Seminarians for Life International* (SFLI) was founded in 1989 by Marx to convey an antichoice message to clergy, though relatively little specific information exists about the group. (SFLI is distinct from Seminarians for Life, which is an offshoot of Priests for Life.) Seminarians for Life International’s website, www.semsforlife.org, redirects to HLI’s website, which summarizes the circumstances of SFLI’s founding and mentions two “graduates” from their training program for clergy. An archive of SFLI newsletters contains no information about meetings of SFLI members or SFLI membership parameters. As of this writing, SFLI’s blog had not been updated in a year.

Few segments of HLI’s website mention anything regarding the size or structure of Seminarians for Life International. Among these mentions are blurbs in HLI electronic newsletter files that make claims such as SFLI training medical students from western Sub-Saharan Africa at SFLI-sponsored conferences—ostensibly training in some “ethical” capacity in addition to the students’ prior instruction in medical ethics. Outside of the newsletter, there is also HLI’s rather general claim on its website that SFLI is active in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Croatia, El Salvador, Honduras, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Puerto Rico, Romania, Singapore, Ukraine, the United States and Venezuela. The site then goes on to state that one of the expressed purposes of the group is to help members “establish their own prolife networks.” It also says that SFLI pursues its prochoice mission by “conducting training sessions at seminaries all over the world, reaching more than 2,000 seminarians every year,” but none of these networks have caused any ripples in the pond of “prolife” activity, nor have they generated many mentions on other sites. SFLI may be more than a lone priest or HLI employee with a firm handshake and a mailing list dragging a card table and a box of literature to specific events, but very little on the HLI and SFLI websites suggests, let alone proves, the possibility of this circumstance.
OFFSHOOT GROUPS

Located in Front Royal, Virginia, on the same compound that houses HLI’s headquarters, the Population Research Institute was founded in 1989 by Father Paul Marx.\(^9\) PRI describes itself as “non-profit research group whose goals are to expose the myth of overpopulation, [and] to expose human rights abuses committed in population control programs.”\(^10\) PRI’s history displays an emphasis on attacking groups that support family planning while “proving” that overpopulation is not a problem for developing nations. Perhaps PRI’s most infamous attack on family planning came in the form of a report delivered on October 17, 2001, to the United States House of Representatives International Relations Committee.\(^101\) In the report, PRI claimed that recipients of United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) financed family planning projects that led women to have “suffered forced abortion, forced sterilization and destruction of personal property” at the hands of local officials. PRI linked these abuses directly to UNFPA.\(^102\)

The following year, no less than three groups—a team put together by Catholics for Choice, a trio of British parliamentarians and a group from the US State Department—visited China to investigate the veracity of PRI’s claims.\(^103\) None of the groups found any evidence to substantiate PRI’s claims, with the State Department delegation explicitly stating that they uncovered “no evidence that UNFPA has knowingly supported or participated in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization in the PRC. Indeed, UNFPA has registered its strong opposition to such practices.”\(^104\) Despite the repeated, high-profile debunking of PRI’s claims and over 150 UN missions held during the previous decade which failed to confirm the contents of the organization’s forced abortion claims, the Bush administration did not reverse a prior decision to block $34 million in congressional funds previously allocated to UNFPA. Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York would later claim that the administration’s decision to obstruct allocation of the funds was “based solely on testimony from the Population Research Institute … the only organization that has ever made these claims.”\(^105\)

Discussed earlier, the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (C-FAM) was founded in 1997 under the guidance of Theresa Bell, then executive director of HLI Canada.\(^106\) While C-FAM defines itself as “a nonpartisan, nonprofit research institute dedicated to reestablishing a proper understanding of international law, protecting national sovereignty and the dignity of the human person,” in reality it is an organization created by HLI with a very different agenda.\(^107\) In the wake of HLI’s failure to obtain ECOSOC status on the grounds of its aggressive language, attacks on Islam and stance “against the purposes of the United Nations,” C-FAM was created to carry out HLI’s aims of subverting international family planning within the UN.\(^108\) In minutes taken at a C-FAM meeting occurring only a week after the group’s incorporation, the proxy role of C-FAM is made explicit. Regarding C-FAM finances: “THE PAY PERIOD FOR EMPLOYEES WAS BI-WEEKLY AND TO ‘COINCIDE WITH HLI.’”\(^109\) Regarding media releases: “MEDIA RELEASES ARE TO BE CLEARED THROUGH OTTAWA”—Ottawa being the location of HLI Canada’s headquarters and Theresa Bell’s office.\(^110\)

Even more damning are documents submitted as evidence by former C-FAM director Ann Noonan in a wrongful termination suit she filed against the organization in October 1997 for, among other things, “employment discrimination and violation of civil rights law.”\(^111\) Of particular interest is an organizational command-structure chart, which was divided into “invisible” and “visible” halves, the former at the top of the page and the latter at the
bottom. In the “invisible” section of the organizational chart is a box reading “Board of Directors” that contains the names “Steven Mosher” of PRI and “Theresa Bell.” Immediately below the top box another reads “CEO: Theresa Bell.” Only after progressing down the page does Ann Noonan’s name and title of “Director” appear at the top of the section labeled “Visible.” Another document reveals that C-FAM’s first official address, 866 United Nations Plaza, is an address from which HLI Canada regularly operated, despite not being registered to do business in New York. During the trial C-FAM was represented by Clifford Pearlman—one of the original incorporators of C-FAM. In an affidavit, Pearlman stated that “upon information and belief, the everyday operations of CAFRHI [C-FAM] fell on Austin Ruse and Theresa Bell.”

The most blatant piece of evidence as to the inseparable relationship of the two entities can be found in a 1998 HLI fundraising letter produced by then-president, Father Richard Welch. In the letter Welch states: “Even though the UN has officially blocked us from being present—we’ve set up an ‘alternative’ method of watching what goes on there and informing the world. I’m talking about the office we set up (with your help) right near the UN a little less than a year ago. I can’t reveal the office’s name, because it still flies under feminist radar! … And it’s like a ‘spy satellite’ that watches every move the UN makes related to the life issues … [and] meticulously examines every important document that the myriad of UN agencies and commissions spew forth.” Throughout the course of the letter, Welch repeatedly makes reference to C-FAM as “our office,” and at least once refers to it as “our UN office.”

As HLI’s “UN Office,” C-FAM held Economic and Social Council status, one of the main requirements for which is that: “The organization shall undertake to support the work of the United Nations and to promote knowledge of its principles and activities, in accordance with its own aims and purposes and the nature and scope of its competence and activities.”

—ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31

These standards, taken in light of C-FAM’s repeated actions at the UN—registering more attendees than allowed at UN meetings, intimidating participants by encircling them and praying, taking participants’ badge information down without authorization, spreading misinformation about other NGOs—plus complaints filed by other NGOs, are sufficient evidence of C-FAM’s being in violation of this resolution. Additionally, there are the explicit statements made by C-FAM’s president of 14 years, Austin Ruse:

“To participate in the UN the way that I do, you must have at least a veneer of supporting the UN…. They try assiduously to keep us out and they use almost any means necessary, and one of them is speaking out against the UN.”

Ruse was clearly unashamed about his organization openly flouting the rules it was required to follow.
FINANCES

HLI is registered with the IRS as a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt charity organization. HLI records and claims no dues-paying membership and the group’s long-term finances have historically relied upon individual donor solicitations. Recently, a prominent charity-monitoring website listed the primary sources of HLI’s revenue as “individual donors, planned gifts and foundations.” An examination of the group’s 990 IRS tax forms from the early 1990s to the present reveals that HLI’s high-water mark for income was during the mid-1990s ($7,946,236 in 1996). In the decade that followed, HLI’s income underwent fluctuations that ultimately ended in a period of sharp decline. In 2009 the organization’s total income ($3,457,736) had not only fallen to under half of the previous decade’s all-time high, but had dropped below levels reaching back 15 years.

The initial drop in HLI’s funding over the previous 15 years dovetails with the 1999-2000 internal scandals that beset the organization. According to parties on both sides of the dispute, much of the impetus for the internal turmoil was generated by alleged instances of financial malfeasance. In 2000, former HLI president Matthew Habiger characterized his initial impression of HLI’s financial situation upon joining the organization in 1990 as “eighteen years of mismanagement,” which he then spent “three years working like crazy to clean up.” Welch would later claim that an IRS audit of the organization during this period almost led to the group’s charitable organization status being revoked. Recently resigned and fired HLI employees made counter-charges of financial impropriety against Welch (including nepotism, squandering of funds and plans to abscond to Europe with organization funds). From September 1999 to April 2000—a period not even stretching to the resolution of the worst of the internal upheaval—contributions to HLI plummeted 28 percent.

The following decade saw HLI take strides in the organization of its finances. Nonetheless, in 2011 nonprofit watchdog Charity Navigator gave HLI only two of four possible stars for efficiency. The 2010 990 forms for the HLI Endowment list several staff members as receiving the exact same amount of compensation from this entity as they did from HLI itself.

Among HLI salaries listed in its tax returns filed for the year ending in September 2010, the highest went to Executive Vice President Mike Mueller ($60,000), followed by John Martin, another Executive Vice President, ($56,714) and secretary Lori Hunt ($40,705). Interim president Msgr. Carambula is listed as earning $33,572, while former president Father Tom Euteneuer received a salary of $28,299—which may have been in addition to a diocesan salary—as well almost $13,000 in “other compensation”—which could include a retirement fund, health insurance or reimbursable expenses. Though HLI’s 990 form from 2008 lists three employees with higher salaries than Mueller’s 2009-10 salary, none of these individuals are listed in the 2009 return in the section titled “Compensation of Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, Highest Compensated Employees and Independent Contractors.” (This may have been because of changes in reporting requirements from the Internal Revenue Service.) At least one of these top three salaried employees, Director of Education Brian Clowes—at $65,898, HLI’s top-earner for 2008—is still with HLI at the time of writing. Another curious detail is that the 2010 990 forms for the HLI Endowment list Mike Mueller, John Martin, Lori Hunt and Tom Euteneuer as receiving the exact same amount of compensation from this entity as they did from HLI itself.
Concerning who owes whom how much, there is an odd finding on HLI’s 2008 990 form. In Part IX of Schedule D, the organization lists almost $2.5 million “due from (c)(2) affiliate.” On the 2008 filing, HLI does not list the name of the 501(c)(2) that owes $2,466,310. The previous two years, however, HLI only named a single 501(c)(2) affiliate, HLI Endowment, Inc. In previous years the amount transacted between HLI and HLI Endowment, Inc. hovered just below $200,000, and in the column with check-boxes set up to clarify the nature of transactions and transfers between HLI and its (c)(2), only the boxes listed as “Reimbursement arrangements” and “Sharing of facilities, equipment, mailing lists, other assets or paid employees” are checked “Yes.” That HLI chooses either not to disclose the creation of a new (c)(2) or the name of the only (c)(2) listed just 365 days prior is somewhat puzzling. What is also confusing is that the likely candidate for the unspecified 501(c)(2) is having transactions with HLI that are ten times larger than the previous two years. The debt remained on the books in the 2009-10 filing.
ISSUES

Abortion
Contraception
Sexuality Education
Vaccinations
Sterilization
Population Control
In Vitro Fertilization
Stem Cell Research
Euthanasia
Feminism
Homosexuality

For the purpose of an overview, it is sufficient to say that if HLI has an opinion on any given “life issue” – contraception, abortion, sex education, vaccines, vasectomies, tubectomies, population control, in vitro fertilization, stem cell research, euthanasia – then that opinion is an inflexible and extreme one. If they do not have an extreme and inflexible opinion on such an issue, it is presumably only because they have not yet heard of it. The same can be said of opinions about any ideologies and lifestyles that run contrary to its extreme philosophy of “life” – such as feminism and homosexuality. HLI leaves no room for disagreement.

The cornerstone of HLI’s ideological edifice are: 1) a prohibition against abortion under all circumstances and 2) an irrationally inflexible interpretation of church doctrine.

On abortion, HLI states: “Human life begins at the instant of conception. The willful taking of innocent human life by any means constitutes homicide and is a great moral and social evil.” Regarding abortion in cases of incest, rape or the endangering of a woman’s life, HLI clearly states that “there can never be any justification … even in so-called ‘hard cases’ (rape or incest). In the rare instance where the life of the mother is threatened, a doctor must try to save the life of both mother and child.”

In his book Facts of Life, HLI’s chief agent of doctrinal clarification Brian Clowes states “the three fundamental logical arguments against all hard case abortions:

1. The first is purely practical: The true “hard cases” (life of the mother, rape and incest and fetal defects) are extremely rare.
2. Pro-abortionists use any law that allows hard case abortions to gain and maintain abortion on demand.
3. Finally, handicapped preborn babies and those conceived through rape and incest are just as worthy of protection as all other preborn babies.”

Clowes then expands upon the first point extensively, insinuating that the treatment of “hard cases” is overblown because they occupy such a small percentage of pregnancies and thus represent a statistical – and given his successive two points, the implication would also appear to be a moral – aberration. Clowes then rounds out his argument by asserting that through the termination of pregnancy generated by incest or rape – he refers to such circumstances as being “less than perfect” in their beginning – we are “rejecting God’s gift to us.”

Contraception, stated Marx, is the “chief source of baby-killing” – a position that is an obvious extension of HLI’s definition of life beginning at conception. As the founder of HLI and creator of its ideology, Marx asserted that contraception “is a pervasive, metastasizing moral cancer that destroys the church, the family, the youth, and the nation … it engenders runaway VD (think of AIDS!); it has no redeeming features whatsoever, being intrinsically evil or dishonest.” HLI has unequivocally stated on numerous occasions that contraception is directly linked to, and frequently the cause of, abortion. Perhaps the most succinct explanation of HLI’s position on contraception comes from Brian Clowes, who has stated that “the whole idea is to just get people on contraception so they can sell them abortion.”
Marx went about describing the link at greater length. In his pamphlet “From Contraception to Abortion,” he wrote:

“In every nation, bar none, contraception has led to abortion—and from abortion to infanticide, the prelude to full-blown euthanasia! Once the purposes of sex are torn loose from procreation and the family, the homosexual thrust rears its ugly head, teen pregnancies and abortions skyrocket, VD burgeons out of control, the divorce rate escalates, the birthrate falls, while the barnyard approach to birth control called sterilization becomes commonplace. Soon we see the swift disintegration of the family.”

Clowes’ bio page on HLI’s website leads with the following personal quotation: “If parachutes had the abysmal safety record that condoms do, skydiving would have been outlawed a long time ago.” This opinion regarding the safety of condoms is offered despite the abundant medical evidence to the contrary. Hormonal methods of family planning are referred to in almost all instances as “abortifacients.” Former HLI president Tom Euteneuer condemned them by arguing that “if we believe life begins at the moment of conception, we have to defend it against [this] chemical attack.” The apparent subtext of Euteneuer’s comment, given HLI’s view of when life begins and, thus, the supposed level of moral depravity that can be extrapolated from any abortion performed under any circumstance. “Since it is legal in the USA to kill a baby up to the time it is born,” an HLI document covering position statements conjectures, “what then can be the objection to killing children after birth? The cheapening of human life brought about through legalized abortion leads to infanticide and,” the group states “widespread child abuse.”

As may be surmised by HLI’s views on abortion and contraception, the group’s views on sexuality education are solidly negative. Paul Marx was an early opponent, writing in an edition of HLI Special Report: “Purely biological, value-free sex education only increases the problems it is supposed to solve. In every country, humanistic, ‘organ recital’ sex education has been followed by ever-more sexual irresponsibility among teens, ever-more teen pregnancies, ever-more illegitimate births, ever-more abortions, ever-more VD, ever-more ‘living together’ and ever-more ruined future marriages…” “No. No to sex education,” stated former president Richard Welch. “Human Life International does not endorse any formal, explicit sex education as a separate entity of the curriculum.” So controversial is sex education of any sort that even tacit support of the issue by staff served as one of the flashpoints for a power struggle that nearly tore HLI apart in 2000.

HLI’s then-president Richard Welch and chairman Matthew Habiger wrote a letter to Dr. Hanna Klaus, founder of the TeenSTAR abstinence-only sex education program, to apologize for previous defamatory remarks directed at TeenSTAR by HLI founder Paul Marx. This letter was taken by Marx and his supporters as an endorsement of the sex education program and an attempt to move HLI towards a position of support for the program.
In reality, other than having taken the apparently outrageous step of broaching the topic of sexuality in a classroom setting, the abstinence-based TeenSTAR program did very little to contradict HLI’s pronouncements on sexuality. Described as a curriculum that “teaches that condoms do not prevent HIV and other sexually transmitted infections, that gay relationships are ‘deviant’ and that stay-at-home mothers make for better families,” TeenSTAR has also been criticized by prochoice groups, including the Center for Reproductive Rights, which called its program “a discriminatory, gender-biased and medically inaccurate extra-curricula sex education program.” As an example of the organization’s extreme position and sensitivity pertaining to sex education, Welch and Habiger never openly endorsed TeenSTAR—the pair only went so far as to state that “if these Cardinals (James A. Hickey, former archbishop of Washington, DC and Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, former president of the Pontifical Council for the Family) are pleased with the contents of your program (TeenSTAR), that is a strong endorsement of its value. We defer to their judgment. While HLI affiliates such as C-FAM now support TeenSTAR, any sex education programs failing to adhere to abstinence and natural family planning are harshly rebuked.

HLI’s history with vaccinations is a disquieting and often paranoid one. Shortly after the release of Merck’s HPV vaccine Gardasil, then-president Tom Euteneuer went on record saying he considered the drug the “newest marriage of the culture of death with junk science.” Euteneuer fumed that the “most wretched” aspect of the inoculation was Merck’s claim that it was a vaccine against cervical cancer. Only one sentence later, Euteneuer paradoxically and somewhat childishly stated, “Well, it will certainly protect some women from cervical cancer in the future but that’s not the point.” Euteneuer closed his diatribe against Gardasil with a statement hinting at a dystopian future of forced HPV vaccinations, stating dramatically, “Don’t fall for it because pretty soon they will be forcing you—and your kids—to drink their potions to the dregs.”

Less than a month later Euteneuer would write a column titled “HPV Vaccine—Hate to Say ‘I Told You So,’” in which he distorted a Centers for Disease Control recommendation to administer a three-jab regimen of HPV shots to girls ages 11-12 and to all women by the age of 26, making it seem like a government mandate. Euteneuer then closed the piece with the alarmist warning, “We are dangerously close to a chaos that becomes the breeding ground of men and women with totalitarian ambitions for your kids.”

“We are dangerously close to a chaos that becomes the breeding ground of men and women with totalitarian ambitions for your kids.”

—Father Tom Euteneuer

During the World Health Organization’s efforts to inoculate against tetanus in a number of countries—Mexico, Nicaragua and the Philippines—during the early 1990s, HLI claimed that the vaccines were being used to surreptitiously sterilize women. HLI’s argument was based on the fact that the human chorionic gonadotrophin (hCG) hormone was a component of the vaccine—which was only being administered to women. Because one of the activities of this hormone involves modifying the function of the uterine lining during pregnancy, HLI claimed that the hormone was being coupled with the “tetanus toxoid carrier” in order to produce antibodies against both the toxoid and hCG—resulting in antibodies that not only attack tetanus, but also “attack subsequent pregnancies by killing the hCG which naturally sustains the pregnancy.” In reality, the WHO’s vaccine was created to prevent neonatal tetanus—health experts claim one of the
most effective ways to inoculate against tetanus is a vaccination administered during pregnancy.162

HLI’s conspiratorial streak is best exhibited in its views on vasectomies, tubectomies or anything it can fit into the parameters of consensual or forced sterilization. The group’s official position on the issue defines it as a “mutilation of the body designed to stop the functioning of a healthy human organ. As such, it is bad medicine. The medical risks are being understated by sterilization proponents. Sterilization is being used genocidally in Third World nations and against certain racial and ethnic groups in all developed countries.”163 Brian Clowes stated that the only medical procedures designed to “inhibit or destroy the function of healthy organs” are abortions or “male and female sterilizations.”164 He continued, “We never hear of the natural function of any other organ or system being deliberately sabotaged,” either ignoring or forgetting basic procedures such as tonsillectomies or appendectomies.

Clowes characterized vasectomies in a dire, quasi-apocalyptic statement: “The effectiveness rate of vasectomy is 99.8 percent, or one pregnancy in 500 years.”166 “Hysterectomies are often portrayed as completely routine and without consequences,” Clowes said about a method of female sterilization sometimes used on older women in developing countries, “especially by population control pushers.”167

As the group’s positions on vaccinations and “sterilizations” readily illustrate, HLI is keenly focused on the issue of population control. The organization is skilled at creating spurious conspiracies around the issue: “The concept of overpopulation is a myth being promulgated for assorted purposes, including the redistribution of wealth and power.”168 Paul Marx went further, arguing that people should have more children. In his pamphlet “Eight Reasons You Should Consider Having One More Child,” he wrote:

“Today most people have been brainwashed to think that our worst problem is overpopulation. In many parts of the world, though, the real problem is underpopulation, despite today’s overpopulation…. The concern over poverty and hunger in our world is indeed legitimate. But experts have proven that the world’s resources could support many times the five billion people who exist today.”

HLI’s preference for conspiracy theories over facts extends throughout its work on population. Rather than pointing out reasonably that government incompetence can exacerbate hunger and the impacts of environmental change, its spokespeople prefer to blame other, often more sinister influences.

“Inefficient governmental, economic and other cultural forces, coupled with ignorance—and sometimes involving malevolent political machinations—are the primary causes of world hunger and environmental change.”169

One of the few areas that may not seem like an immediate target for opposition by HLI, given the procedure’s focus on bringing children to infertile couples, is in vitro fertilization (IVF). Once again, the point of contention is the definition of life as beginning at conception. As Brian Clowes explains, “Prolife activists object to IVF mainly because it requires the intentional killing of many human embryos…. Embryos that appear to be defective in any way are simply discarded as biological waste. If a woman becomes pregnant with multiple embryos, an abortionist often commits a ‘pregnancy reduction,’ a fancy name for selective abortion.”170

When the Nobel Commission awarded its prize in Physiology and Medicine to Dr. Robert Edwards, the creator of in vitro fertilization in 2010, HLI’s interim president, Monsignor Ignacio Barriero-Carámbula, avowed his disgust with the institute. “One wonders what else the Nobel Committee could do to further harm its reputation,” Barriero stated.
“The scientist is regarded as a hero,” he continued, “but what he has really done is create a market for manufactured humanity.” He then reduced IVF to “a means for the ultra-rich to tamper with every genetic aspect of the person, creating designer human beings.” This theme of a genetically engineered future can also be seen in Clowes’ comments regarding the fate of discarded embryos not used in the process. “Naturally,” Clowes conjectures, “other researchers hate to see all of these perfectly good embryos go to waste, so they extract them alive and experiment upon them.”

The majority of HLI’s argument against stem cell research derives from this same line of thinking. Discussing the Obama administration’s policies, Euteneuer noted that the administration is “pro-embryonic stem cell research, pro-euthanasia, pro-assisted suicide,” referencing his recurring theme of a terrifying dystopian future by adding that “Bioethicists like this strive to create a ‘Brave New World’ for the weakest and most vulnerable of those created in God’s image: those who doctors used to swear an oath to protect.”

In a conversation with Fox News commentator Neil Cavuto in 2006, then-president Euteneuer rejected stem cell research for medical illnesses with a comparison to Nazi death camps. Replying to Cavuto’s question about whether dismissing embryonic stem cell research could withhold promising developments for a large number of people with Alzheimer’s or Parkinson’s, Euteneuer responded in the negative. “Well,” HLI’s president countered the question, “anybody who knows a little bit of the history of World War II knows that that was kind of the logic that was used and came up in the Nuremberg war trials. The Nazi prison guards said these people were just going to be killed anyway, whether we did it or somebody else did it.”

Historically, HLI has also been very vocal on its opposition to euthanasia and assisted suicide. “Food, water and other basic human needs must never be withheld from patients, regardless of their medical prognosis,” the organization states. “It is never acceptable for medical personnel or others to end the life of a patient.” The most high-profile expression of this mindset on euthanasia and assisted suicide occurred in the case of Terri Schiavo. Tom Euteneuer was a fixture outside of the hospital during the course of Schiavo’s illness, where he celebrated mass, engaged in media interviews and often spoke on behalf of the family. When the animated sitcom Family Guy produced an episode parodying the Schiavo case, Euteneuer wrote a column calling for a boycott of the show and vilifying the show’s distributor, the Fox Network.

“Historically, HLI has also been very vocal on its opposition to euthanasia and assisted suicide. “Food, water and other basic human needs must never be withheld from patients, regardless of their medical prognosis,” the organization states. “It is never acceptable for medical personnel or others to end the life of a patient.” The most high-profile expression of this mindset on euthanasia and assisted suicide occurred in the case of Terri Schiavo. Tom Euteneuer was a fixture outside of the hospital during the course of Schiavo’s illness, where he celebrated mass, engaged in media interviews and often spoke on behalf of the family. When the animated sitcom Family Guy produced an episode parodying the Schiavo case, Euteneuer wrote a column calling for a boycott of the show and vilifying the show’s distributor, the Fox Network.

Something the organization calls “family life” falls squarely within HLI’s “life issues.” This vague, seemingly innocuous phrase creates the grounds that allow the organization to combat the lifestyles and ideologies it perceives as threatening HLI’s very rigid notions about gender roles and moral behavior. “HLI,” states one of the group’s promotional pamphlets, “promotes health and happiness of the nuclear family: A monogamous, loving marriage of man and wife open to the creation of new life and to nurturing and caring for children.”

Feminism, which fails to meet HLI’s family life parameters, has been a target of the organization since its inception. In addition to making negative comments about feminists, Paul Marx’s preoccupation with the subject is shown by his book titled Feminism and the Different Psychology of Men and Women. In a fact sheet about sexuality released by HLI during the tenure of
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Matthew Habiger, the group addressed the “changing role of women” by stating that “what should be stressed here is the complementarity of the sexes. An imposed equality wrongly wipes away all psychological differences. Men and women are equal in personal dignity, but otherwise different.” Matthew Habiger, the group addressed the “changing role of women” by stating that “what should be stressed here is the complementarity of the sexes. An imposed equality wrongly wipes away all psychological differences. Men and women are equal in personal dignity, but otherwise different.” Matthew Habiger, the group addressed the “changing role of women” by stating that “what should be stressed here is the complementarity of the sexes. An imposed equality wrongly wipes away all psychological differences. Men and women are equal in personal dignity, but otherwise different.”

Another president, Father Richard Welch, dismissed a feminist expo held in 2000 as nothing more than “a platform to address the needs of abortionists and homosexual activists.”

In her book, Steichen calls feminists “enemies of God, of life, of nature, of the normal.”

In the foreword of Ungodly Rage, feminism is referred to as “an infectious communicable disease of the spirit for which there is no easy cure.”

Another book formerly distributed by HLI was titled The Feminist Takeover.

In recent years HLI has frequently included the adjective “radical” when denouncing feminism—and though it notes that women regularly contribute to its website and hold positions within the organization, the group’s vehement dislike of any abandonment of traditional gender roles and responsibilities is obvious to all. As recently as 2006, Tom Euteneuer made the sweeping generalization that “women are honored, respected and dignified as women by prolife and profamily Christianity as nowhere else in history.” Elsewhere in the same column, he attacks modern feminism with the statement that “politically notions of women’s dignity always trample on the authentic good of women and even end up destroying them.”

In a press release titled “The Fury of Radical Feminism Scorned,” Euteneuer commented on “the hypocrisy of Uruguay’s radical feminist leaders” for the breach of polite etiquette that occurred when they “accused six US congressman of meddling in foreign affairs.” When half a dozen US representatives sent letters urging their Uruguayan counterparts not to decriminalize abortion, this, according to Euteneuer, “unleashed the wrath of leftist Senator Monica Xavier.” The reality of the situation is that Senator Xavier did nothing more than ask her country to take diplomatic action against the foreign legislators in question after the discovery of their interference. Euteneuer also asserts that many of the individuals running abortion clinics “are feminists” and that “many of the feminists are involved in witchcraft very deeply. And Satanism.”

HLI has reserved special vitriol for gay rights organizations. One of HLI’s position statements on homosexuality declares that “homosexuality is deviant behavior that is socially, and personally, destructive.” In March 1987, Marx stated, “Collectively, homosexuals are acting as a gigantic biological vacuum cleaner scouring the earth for germs—and the collecting bag is the United States. AIDS is the first fruit of this ugly process, but we can be certain that it will not be the last. As long as homosexuals travel, we can look forward to an unremitting stream of plagues stemming from these disgusting practices. Homosexuality is the number-one public health problem of our times.”

In line with its founder’s opinions on homosexuality, HLI has an unhappy history of both employees and associates making extreme comments on this issue.

HLI was an early supporter of the controversial psychologist Paul Cameron. Among Cameron’s “research” from the 1980s were the following findings: that only 2 percent of gay men live to age 65; that homosexuals are more likely to become serial killers, child molesters, murderers and thieves; and that people are fifteen times more likely to be killed by a homosexual than a heterosexual during a murdering spree. Cameron suggested castration and the death penalty as a means of combating the homosexual lifestyle. His proposed solution to the AIDS crisis of the late 1980s and early 1990s was the “elimination of the carrier,” though
he only recommended that this tactic be employed if other steps like branding HIV positive patients on the face had proven unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{190} It was only in the aftermath of the media firestorm that descended upon Cameron while he was preparing to attend an HLI conference in Toronto during 1995 that the group showed even the most remote concern about any of his opinions. When HLI asked Cameron to disavow his statements on murder and face-branding, Cameron refused – only then did the group cancel his workshops at the conference.\textsuperscript{191}

In the 1980s HLI also sponsored speaking engagements to promote the work of Father John Harvey who founded the anti-gay group, Courage. Modeled on the Alcoholics Anonymous 12-step program, Courage is a group that believes homosexuality is an illness or addiction that must be fought. Harvey has cut off questions about homosexuality with the rejoinder, “Do you believe that all homosexual genital activity is by its very nature immoral? If the answer is no, then dialogue is out of the question.”\textsuperscript{192}

In 1996 HLI mailed out a document to selected recipients titled “HLI’s National Catholic Opinion Survey on the Homosexual Agenda.” The heading of the document states, “Here’s your chance to respond to the homosexual assault on morality, our children and the church.” Following the seven survey questions – which take up only slightly more than half of a page – are five full pages imploring the recipient to send money and explaining the importance of the survey. The mailing then goes on to claim that “many church leaders … simply don’t understand the extent of the homosexual attack on morality and the church.”\textsuperscript{193}

If the recipient enclosed a minimum donation of $39.70 when submitting a survey by post, the mailing promised a special gift in the form of an audiotape, \textit{Understanding the Homosexual Condition}. Subjects addressed in this highly informative tape were: “Why anonymous sexual contact is so important to homosexuals;” “Why sexual promiscuity is rampant among homosexuals and why it’s virtually impossible for homosexual ‘couples’ to have monogamous relationships;” “What parents can do to prevent homosexual development in their children;” “Why homosexuals are drawn to careers in acting and the theater;” and “How homosexuals can be cured – with actual case studies.” The survey closes with the dire warning for recipients to “Remember—we’re facing an all-out homosexual assault on morality and the Church. Unless we unite now, we will lose this battle.”\textsuperscript{194}

“Homosexuals reproduce sexually by molesting children. This creates a cycle of violence and disordered behavior that creates future generations of abusers and predators.”

---Jason Jones (former HLI public relations director)

Here are a small sampling of HLI quotes over the years on the subject of homosexuality:

“Our unwillingness to face the truth about the sinful and unnatural nature of homosexuality is slowly eroding our values, our faith and our families.”

– Matthew Habiger\textsuperscript{195}

“Sex belongs only to marriage where a man and a woman are completely committed to each other and open to life. This rules out fornication, adultery, sodomy, bestiality and masturbation.”

– Matthew Habiger\textsuperscript{196}

“Homosexuals reproduce sexually by molesting children. This creates a cycle of violence and disordered behavior that creates future generations of abusers and predators.”

– Jason Jones (former HLI public relations director)\textsuperscript{197}
“Gay marriage will be coming to your state soon. If we don’t fight it, our souls, our families and basically, our very civilization, will find themselves at ‘the end’ of the line in very short order.”

— Tom Euteneuer

“Opponents of the church know that there is a well-documented and strong correlation between male homosexuality and child sexual abuse, but claim that there is no evidence supporting this connection. And, of course, those who are currently attacking the church hope that they can undermine its moral authority to preach on the sinfulness of homosexual behavior and its opposition to ersatz homosexual ‘marriage.’”

— Brian Clowes
CONCLUSION

The evidence shows that Human Life International is a self-sabotaging confederacy of zealous opportunists, apocalyptic fearmongers and self-righteous reactionaries. It seems hell bent on imposing a moral order that has its roots in a wholly fictitious history where the morals of all matched the ideals espoused by the HLI leadership. When one observes how frequently the group undermines its stated purpose with indiscretions and theatrics, the fact that HLI uses “prolife” issues as its starting point is arguably a matter of convenience. The organization has chosen a series of leaders who have repeatedly and unapologetically produced deeply offensive declamations, as was the case with three of HLI’s prior four leaders, at least one explosive scandal. Whether rolling off a catalogue of racist and homophobic quotes, providing a platform for those espousing violent extremism, engaging in financial malfeasance, spreading potentially lethal misinformation around the world, attempting to subvert the government of China and the United Nations or sexually victimizing psychologically and spiritually vulnerable individuals, HLI’s reflexive facility for monstrous controversies has little to do with its purported “highest good,” which is preventing “the willful taking of innocent human life.”

HLI has sought to capitalize on its infamy to manufacture a public image as the world’s largest and most influential antichoice group. By no measure but their own vaporous benchmarks is HLI the world’s largest anything. Grants and hazy agreements of mutual support exchanged with preexisting antichoice groups around the world—which are often merely a sketchily defined name lacking even a working website—do not square with HLI’s self-promotion as a robust, unified empire defending the world from its long list of evils. Even HLI’s attempt to pass itself off as an authentic Catholic voice tends to alienate clergy and laypeople alike with the very hyperbolic press theatrics and graphic promotional mailings it uses to make its far-right views heard.

HLI is in a perpetual cycle of scandal and misrepresentation. Its institutional incapacity to avoid scandal generates notoriety. It subsequently use that notoriety to fabricate a reputation for effectiveness that has no basis in fact. In turn, that reputation is used to acquire funds and those funds are distributed abroad in an effort to fortify its engineered reputation before another internal scandal emerges with the potential to raze the unstable edifice that is Human Life International.

HLI is in a perpetual cycle of scandal and misrepresentation. Its institutional incapacity to avoid scandal generates notoriety.

The group holds no opinions that are not extreme in their inflexibility. HLI makes no exceptions for any idea or anybody it does not wholly agree with. It is so inflexible in its opinions that it regularly alienates the laity and clergy of the church. It makes active enemies of individuals who not only agree with 98 percent of its stances but do HLI the service of providing them with a platform to carry out their campaign of organizational misrepresentation—Sean Hannity as the prime example. HLI’s frequent conspiracy-mongering about a looming one-world government that either exists or is currently forming is also a detractor for many who might otherwise be supportive. HLI’s overt ties with one organization that has publicly admitted to subverting the aims of UN while holding official UN status as an NGO, and with another that exists for no other reason than to controvert sociological
and statistical data, only intensify the strong undercurrent of subterfuge that has alienated potential support.

HLI is an organization that defines human life as beginning at the moment of conception and has taken on the task of saving every one of those lives without exception. The reality of HLI, however, is an organization which can barely exert a measure of control upon its staff and leaders and which is perpetually occupied with saving itself while simultaneously shouting to the world that HLI is in perfect health and that it is the world that needs saving.

Three decades of theatrics, scandal, caricature, distortion and parody: This is Human Life International.
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Compiling the backgrounds of prominent persons working for, or with, HLI presents some problems. There is a lack of information about certain high-level individuals within HLI, most notably board members. While HLI’s presidents and high-profile figures in C-FAM and PRI have well-documented pasts, many important members of the HLI hierarchy are biographical ciphers. For a charity—not a private business protecting investors—claiming to be the “world’s largest prolife organization,” there is a shocking deficit of information about several members of HLI’s board.

Father Paul Marx, founder and president, 1981-1994

Recognized by some as the patriarch of the antichoice movement, Father Paul Marx was the fifteenth of seventeen children and entered the priesthood at the age of 15. Marx received a bachelor’s degree from St. John’s University in Collegeville, Minnesota. He then attended the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, and the Catholic University of America in Washington, DC, where he earned a doctorate in family sociology.

Beginning his antichoice career during the 1960s with family-focused couples counseling within the church, by 1972 Marx had founded the Human Life Center at St. John’s—where he served on the university’s faculty until being removed because of what the administration cited as “extreme” views.

With the help of the American Life League, the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress and L. Brent Bozell III, Marx founded Human Life International in 1981. Throughout the 1980s Marx built a reputation for shock tactics and racist pronouncements. HLI’s founder first came to international attention in the 1970s by horrifying audiences in Ireland with his unexpected exhibition of an aborted fetus in a jar. Alarming messaging and graphic mailings would become the bedrock of HLI’s propaganda efforts. In 1997, HLI produced postcards so outrageous that the mayor of New Britain, Connecticut—responding to the outrage of the town’s citizens—referred to the act as “terrorism” that was not “not the act of rational people.”

Marx’s first identified racist quote was in 1977, when he printed the first in a long line of anti-Semitic statements that recurred throughout his career. Writing “it is a strange thing how many leaders in the abortion movement are Jewish,” Marx then recounted that a “famous genetics professor in Paris told me that the leaders of the abortion movement in France were Jewish. I saw one, a Jewish female liar, do her thing on behalf of abortion at the World Population Conference in Bucharest.” As head of HLI, Marx would go on to make racially charged statements regarding the anti-apartheid movement, Asians and Latinos. Of the political ambitions of black South Africans, at one point Marx wrote that it would be “difficult ... to get tribal peoples one step away from the bush to manage a modern economy and to rule themselves peacefully and democratically.” Marx also made several racially charged comments about people living in the US: “I guess we have 250,000 Vietnamese here already, and they are going to have large families; the Orientals always do. God knows how many Mexicans cross the border every night.... And if we ever have to fight the Russians, I wonder if these people will be willing to stake their lives.”

By his own admission, Marx would frequently use his sociological credentials to “attend PP [Planned Parenthood] meetings incognito,” and later, meetings such as the Biennial Convention of Dignity, held by Dignity USA. The latter group he described as “an organization of Catholic Homosexuals who reject the church’s teaching.” These misrepresentation techniques would later be expanded upon by Marx’s successors with the creation of front groups such as C-FAM. Marx was castigated for his unsavory statements and actions by both the Anti-Defamation League and ranking church officials. When church criticism was harsh enough to cause Marx to pay attention—as was the case in Archbishop Harry Flynn’s 1997 backing out of a concelebration of mass with the group—he brushed off the reprimand as a “leftist conspiracy ... of militant homosexual activists, anarchists and others.”

Marx was also responsible for founding the Population Research Institute—a group assembled to “counter mainstream scientific research regarding global efforts to combine population planning, reproductive rights and social development.” Marx sat on a number of extra-organizational antichoice boards, groups including, but not limited to, vice chairman of the board of Life Amendment Political Action Committee (LAPAC) and board member of the US Coalition for Life (USCL).
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By the late 1990s, however, a power struggle between Marx and Father Richard Welch engulfed HLI, nearly destroying the organization. In the wake of Marx’s recall by his abbot, Marx and Welch carried out a vicious press battle that ended with a purportedly coerced apology from the organization’s founder.217 Marx did not return to HLI, but would continue to be held up as a role model by later president Tom Euteneuer.218 Marx passed away in 2010.

Father Matthew Habiger, president, 1994-1997, August-December 2000

Habiger was ordained in 1968 and began work with HLI in 1990, at which time he commenced a “ten-year tour of duty proclaiming the gospel of life throughout the world.”219 As a board member of HLI while Father Marx was still active, much of Habiger’s work centered on publications and visits abroad to HLI affiliates. Habiger has referred to abortion clinics as “death camps and mills” and as late as 1995, despite the unceasing controversy and the multiple reprimands directed at his immediate predecessor for the same thing, is on record referring to abortion as a “holocaust.” Habiger has also labeled homosexuals and feminists “protagonists of death.”220 During his tenure as president, HLI released its “National Catholic Opinion Survey on the Homosexual Agenda.” Along with the survey was a solicitation form asking for donations and listing a series of bullet points, such as: “If you can bear a thought as grim as this, try to imagine the emotional and moral devastation children suffer when ‘raised’ by homosexual ‘couples!’”221

In September of 1995 at the UN Conference on Women in Beijing, Habiger passed out materials not only urging individuals to battle abortion but ultimately encouraging those present to subvert the government of China. Included was a letter that objectified the group’s de rigueur lack of cultural sensitivity by stating that “when the Great Wall of China falls and Communism breathes its last gasp, HLI needs to be there to deliver the Chinese people from their Communist-imposed Culture of Death.”222

In the past, Habiger has also stated that nationalist socialism, communism and democracy are impediments of conscience, as the individual is not truly free under any of them. On the one hand, democracies fail to recognize man as created in the image of God, and on the other, “tyrannical states”—nationalist socialism and communism—destroy both the unborn and the elderly.223 These statements seem to imply Habiger’s endorsement of either theocracy or monarchy.

Habiger’s tenure as president also coincided with financial troubles that nearly destroyed HLI. It was during his presidency that Richard Welch joined the organization and first discovered money being moved in suitcases and the organization operating in several states where it did not possess the necessary certifications.224 That Habiger was replaced after a far-shorter period as president than his predecessor—and amid apparent financial catastrophe—has never been explained. After Father Welch resigned in August 2000, Father Habiger returned as president until December of that year.225

Habiger is now a member of the “outreach team of priests” for another nonprofit, Natural Family Planning Outreach.

Father Richard Welch, president, 1998-2000

Apparently set on the priesthood by third grade, by the time he entered the Redemptorist Order at 17 Welch was a veteran of antichoice protests, attending demonstrations with his mother from an early age and giving his first antichoice talk at the age of 16.226 At age 20, he hosted a radio program focusing on antichoice issues. Ordained in 1980, just seven years later Welch directed the largest Catholic school in Puerto Rico and served as rector of a cathedral.227 During the late 1980s and early 1990s Welch was a high-profile participant in Puerto Rico’s “rescue movement,” the activist element of the antichoice cause. His participation in the movement led to “numerous arrests and RICO [Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act] lawsuits.”228

While leading clinic blockades—up to that point the only blockades in the history of Puerto Rico—Welch generated media attention by throwing holy water at prochoice demonstrators and drew criticism for using his own school students in the protests.229 Court documents from the case state that on different occasions Welch and his associates caused “extensive property damage” outside the clinic, including “broken locks, damaged gates, vandalism, strewn litter on the grounds,” and while inside the clinic ripped out electrical sockets and jammed door locks.230 Welch and his supporters also blocked access to the clinic with buses and, on occasion, stood in the waiting room of the clinic and refused to leave, even after told to do so by staff.231 The most distressing incidents, however, were when Welch and company “entered the clinics and intimidated or harassed patients and staff,” as they did on September 26, 1992 when “Welch invaded the LMC [Ladies Medical Center] and pushed plaintiff Gonzalez from the clinic entrance all the way through the waiting room to the back office, trapping her there for a number of hours.”232 In 1994, at only 46 years of age, Welch produced an autobiography, Blood of the Martyrs: the Journey of a Catholic Priest to the Rescue Movement, which coincided with his final RICO trial.
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Despite this terrorizing and violent history, or perhaps because of it, Welch was hired by HLI in 1996. Only a year later he was selected by the board to serve as president.233 Upon accepting the position, Welch began cleaning up what he would refer to as “eighteen years of financial mismanagement.”234 Welch’s organizational approach—structural, financial and ideological—placed him at odds with Marx, however, and the conflict between the two would be the genesis of the budget scandals and staff firings that marred the late 1990s and early 2000s at HLI. At the onset of Marx’s forced retirement, when he was already in his home diocese, the organization’s founder announced he was “not comfortable” telling donors that their money would “be used wisely and efficiently” under Welch.235 During Welch’s tenure donations to the organization dropped 28 percent;236 two dozen employees stepped down or were fired; Welch’s father was hired for $65,000 in an administrative assistant position; and the organization was anonymously accused of graft and sexual scandals while simultaneously engaging in a number of lawsuits.237

Writing in his 1994 biography, Welch perhaps gave a clue towards his later troubles as head of HLI when he noted previous struggles that he had with the temptations of power and the abuses that can follow from it:

“I was motivated more by the notion of getting power and authority.”238

“I got myself into position[s] of authority very fast, and very consciously, and this authority began to erode the foundations of my priesthood, of my spiritual life. Ambition of this sort is deadly for a priest ... more so than for anyone else. It can destroy you.”239

On August 1, 2000, Welch stepped down as the head of HLI.

Father Thomas Euteneuer, president, 2000-2010

The fourth of seven children, Tom Euteneuer did not decide to join the priesthood until he withdrew his enlistment in the Marine Corps at the last minute—having already completed training at Quantico.240 He was ordained in 1988 and served in five parishes of the Diocese of Palm Beach, Florida, in one case serving as the spiritual moderator for the diocesan Respect Life Office.241 From his early years in the clergy, Euteneuer engaged in picketing abortion clinics and “sidewalk counseling.”242 In 1999 he opened a crisis pregnancy center directly across the street from a Fort Pierce, Florida, abortion clinic—Euteneuer referred to clinics as “temples of a demonic religion”243—a set of circumstances later chronicled in the 2010 HBO film, 12th and Delaware. In 2002, Euteneuer stood as the plaintiff in a suit he brought against the same abortion clinic.244 The unsuccessful lawsuit was an attempt to invent the purpose of the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act to allow “sidewalk counselors” to operate unimpeded.245

Following Welch’s departure, Euteneuer was selected as HLI’s president in December 2000. In an article published in HLI Reports shortly after he accepted the position, Euteneuer closed the interview by assuring that the organization would steer away from the accusations of a perceived weakening of ideology that were thrown at his predecessor. In what could clearly be construed as a call for hardening the organization’s stances and tactics, Euteneuer stated, “We need to make sure that we are implementing the mission of HLI according to the mission of the founder.”246

During his tenure at HLI, Euteneuer took the ideology of the organization’s zealous founder and pushed it into even more extreme, often fantastical, territory. Taking full advantage of the emerging 24-hour news cycle and the rapidly expanding reach of the Internet, Euteneuer did not miss any opportunity to stand in front of a camera or produce inflexible opinions and bombastic statements that would be posted to a variety of antichoice websites. Euteneuer’s theatrics, in combination with a multi-platform media structure expanding at such a rate that it was desperate for content—even if said content existed on the fringe of the newsworthy—guaranteed HLI coverage from certain outlets. Euteneuer stayed in the spotlight during the years of the Terri Schiavo dispute,247 often saying mass outside of her hospital, and was vocal in HLI’s dismissal of Sen. Mark Foley’s admission of sexual abuse at the hands of clergy.248 Whether scoffing at the 2003 rape of a nine-year-old Nicaraguan girl as nothing more than an incident being “exploited by feminist organizations to press for abortion legalization,”249 demanding that Nancy Pelosi be excommunicated from the church250 or comparing stem cell research to the Holocaust,251 Euteneuer could be counted on to generate inflammatory statements.

Just a passing glimpse of some of Euteneuer’s comments as president quickly illustrates his willingness to roundly denounce any number of people, ideas and institutions that did not comport with his worldview 100 percent.
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On gay couples adopting children:
“In its simplest terms, kids need a mom and a dad, and are forever stigmatized by being the child of a gay marriage.”

On contraception:
“The ideologically-motivated fanatics in control of Congressional committees have done it again: in the face of clear evidence that abstinence is the only— I repeat— the only way to successfully beat the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the Third World, they have zeroed out all funding for abstinence in the 2008 budget.”

On adolescent and teen culture:
“Vampires, witches, Ouija boards, Satanic rock music and video games— innocent fun? I don’t think so. The proliferation of these dark forces is creating a subculture of youth who are suffering the effects of occult involvement.”

On popular cinema:
“A whole generation of teenage girls is absolutely swooning about the new vampire flick, Twilight, and its sequel, New Moon…. This is anything but a fantasy. It is a potential gateway to grave spiritual danger…. “

“Gone are the days of Bella [sic] Lugosi’s Dracula (1931) where good was good and evil was evil…. Harry Potter culture … has for over a decade now been indoctrinating kids to think that the occult world is normal and that all this evil messaging is harmless when dressed up as entertainment. That’s vampire logic— and just what the devil wants us to think.”

As early as 2003, Euteneuer began training at the Vatican to become an exorcist. Upon receiving his certification, Euteneuer began practicing exorcisms in the United States. His experiences led him to write the book Exorcism and the Church Militant. While conducting exorcisms Euteneuer remained the head of HLI, but his two chief obsessions—demons and abortion—were in no way mutually exclusive. Not long after his certification, the tone of many of Euteneuer’s pronouncements adopted a character that already imbued his harsh position statements with an extra-dimensional and extreme quality. Euteneuer later wrote that “the problem of demonic infestation has already become, shall we say, ‘legion’ in our culture,” making a reference to a group of demons called “Legion” in the Bible. He began holding lectures on the topic of exorcism, one of which, An Evening with an Exorcist, was still available in audio form online at the time of writing. During this period, Euteneuer came to categorize abortion as “a perfect demonic system which offers a perverse form of worship to the devil.”

The synthesis of Euteneuer’s overwhelming preoccupation with both the diabolical and abortion occurred with the publishing of his second, aptly titled book, Demonic Abortion.

Without warning, Euteneuer stepped down as president of HLI in late August of 2010 and returned to his home diocese in Florida. Claiming exhaustion after 15 years of work, he stated in a press release issued shortly after his resignation, “I am ready for a break!” Little else was heard from Euteneuer or HLI regarding his departure in the months following. In January 2011, a story questioning the fate of Euteneuer appeared in the Palm Beach Post. The story pointed out that despite strong sales Euteneuer’s books had been pulled from HLI’s website. This prompted a response from an HLI spokesman, who commented, “Rumors stating that the book was ‘pulled’ or ‘recalled’ are not true.” Exorcism and the Church Militant, the representative declared, sold out in three months and HLI had simply chosen not to order another printing.

Finally, on January 31, 2011, Euteneuer broke his silence. In a statement, the priest admitted that while engaging in an exorcism “one particularly complex situation clouded my judgment and led me to imprudent decisions with harmful consequences, the worst of which was violating the boundaries of chastity with an adult female who was under my spiritual care.” Euteneuer then professed that his indiscretion was an isolated incident, involving only one woman. Without explicitly stating what occurred between himself and the woman in question, Euteneuer insisted, somewhat perplexingly in light of his previous description, that the “violations of chastity happened due to human weakness but did not involve the sexual act.” In the days that followed, HLI released a statement contradicting Euteneuer’s insistence that only one woman was involved, and HLI’s interim president later released a statement that said the young woman involved was “gravely harmed.”

Monsignor Ignacio Barrio-Carambula, interim president, 2010-2011

Assigned as interim president of HLI in the wake of Father Euteneuer’s resignation, Monsignor Barrio-Carambula has been involved with antichoice actions since his ordination in the Archdiocese of New York in 1987. He joined HLI in 1998, at which time he was listed as the head of the group’s office in Rome. After relinquishing leadership he returned to this position.
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HLI’s website lists Monsignor Barriero’s areas of expertise as “Church Teaching on Population Control; What It Means to be a Pro-Life Priest; The Catholic Family; and Bioethics and the Catholic Church.” While the monsignor’s opinions concerning the first three topics are consistent with HLI’s stated positions, and in some cases are far less hyperbolic than those of his peers, concerning “Bioethics and the Catholic Church” Barriero is especially vocal.

In October of 2010 Barriero blasted the Nobel Prize Committee for awarding its prize in physiology or medicine to Dr. Robert Edwards, the creator of in vitro fertilization. Despite Edwards having engineered a form of fertilization that could help untold numbers of couples experiencing trouble conceiving, Barriero attacked the doctor in a press release. “One wonders what else the Nobel Committee could do to further harm its reputation,” Barriero fumed, going on to add that “the scientist is regarded as a hero, but what he has really done is create a market for manufactured humanity.” Though some may find this puzzling given HLI’s otherwise unyielding insistence on “life” under all circumstances and at all costs under even the vaguest of definitions, Barriero argued that Dr. Edwards’ discoveries have done nothing but create “a means for the ultra-rich to tamper with every genetic aspect of the person, creating designer human beings.” Monsignor Barriero claims otherwise, but genetically engineered human beings or government programs working to such an end have never been verified to exist.

Prior to passage of the US healthcare bill in 2010, the Uruguay-born Barriero went on the record stating that acceptance of the legislation would start the United States “moving towards a tyrannical, socialist government that would be the source of all sorts of moral evils.” In recent years the United States Council of Catholic Bishops has advocated for healthcare that serves everyone, especially poor and immigrant populations, but Barriero claims, “We ... have to consider that this health program or any other administered by the Federal Government is another step towards socialism, and as a consequence towards the establishment of a despotic and dictatorial government.”

Father Shenan Boquet, president, 2011-
Father Boquet came to Human Life International from a parish in Louisiana, his home state. He is known as a lecturer and for his appearances on conservative Catholic media outlets such as Ave Maria Radio and the EWTN Network.

Father Peter West, vice president for missions, 2011-
Father West came to HLI after 13 years with Priests for Life, where his responsibilities included lecturing to clergy around the country and serving as a staff writer. He has participated in the “Freedom Rides for the Unborn” organized by Priests for Life, which is touted as a continuation of the civil rights movement and finds parallels between abortion and slavery.

This view has been rejected by reproductive rights activists from the African American community, including Loretta Ross, co-founder of the SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective, who said, “This interpretation is an insult to all enslaved and formerly enslaved people.”

Father Frank Pavone, director of Priests for Life, said that he and Father West have “spoken about the spirit of collaboration we want to exercise between Priests for Life and Human Life International, in the same way that Father Paul Marx and I collaborated when I first became director of Priests for Life in 1993.”

Father West’s newly created position of vice president for missions for HLI is described as involving extensive international travel.

Brian Clowes, director of research and training worldwide
Having joined Human Life International in 1995, aside from the organization’s presidents Brian Clowes is the most visible and most-quoted figure in HLI. His bio on HLI’s website says that he has produced over 90 scholarly articles, and that he is the author of nine books. It also claims he is the author of the previously mentioned report responsible for the Bush administration’s defunding of UNFPA, but the report in question, “Why the United States Should Not Resume UNFPA Funding,” is seldom mentioned in the context of the UNFPA debacle. (See Steve Mosher, below, for more information about UNFPA funding.)

In addition to his publications, Clowes is responsible for several issues of HLI’s “Special Reports” series, and for promoting the organization through frequent international travel.
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Much of Clowes’ writing focuses on strengthening the supposed links between contraception and abortion, and between homosexuality and pederasty. Regarding his opinions on the first subject, Clowes stated, “The whole idea is to just get people on contraception so they can sell them abortion.” He continued, “The way they start trying to legalize abortion is to legalize contraception first … and of course it fails tremendously, and so women start looking for illegal abortions…. Now we have to legalize abortion. It’s a really neat little system that works every time.”

Clowes has much to say about the second of his ideological preoccupations, the purported link between homosexuality and pederasty and how it validates the church hierarchy’s position against homosexuality while vaguely explaining away clergy sexual abuse. “Due to clergy sex abuse scandals,” Clowes opened a 2010 document titled “Homosexuality and the Church Crisis,” “The moral authority of the Roman Catholic Church has been subjected to an opportunistic siege by prominent individuals and organizations who see the chance to advance their goals, including the ordination of women and the suspension of the requirement for priestly celibacy.”

In the report, Clowes brushed off much of the public outrage and the calls for church reform, insisting that the crisis has “already largely subsided, and stringent means have been enacted to prevent the abuse from reoccurring.” He goes on to say that “the sexual desire for adolescent boys, has always been a hallmark of homosexuality” before roundly dismissing calls for action and criticisms of an endemic problem within the church as no more than “homophile groups … exploiting the current crisis in the Church in order to achieve their goals, a classic strategy of infiltration and subversion.”

Steve Mosher, president of the Population Research Institute

Handpicked by HLI founder Paul Marx to be the head of PRI, Steve Mosher has been the president of the organization since 1989. While PRI’s alleged purpose is to “objectively present the truth about population-related issues,” Mosher has depicted those involved with international family planning as “killing machines.” He characterized the central cause of PRI as a series of “battles against the International Planned Parenthood Federation,” and has referred to the Global Fund for AIDS as the “Global Fund for Abortion, Prostitution and the Homosexual Agenda.”

As a student at Stanford University studying in China during the early 1980s, Mosher first gained international notoriety while conducting research for his doctorate in anthropology. Following numerous violations of regulations put in place by the Chinese government as a new host country for Western academic researchers, Mosher was expelled from the country in 1981. Though the exact subject of Mosher’s initial anthropological research in China is unclear, it is apparent that over time his focus shifted to the population control policies of the Chinese government. Mosher soon began documenting cases of women undergoing nonconsensual abortions conducted by the government. He later compiled his findings in a report which was released in Taiwan. In what can most generously be described as an act of gross negligence, Mosher’s publication failed to conceal, or in any way distort, the faces of the women whose photographs he had taken while creating his report on forced abortions.

Upon returning to the United States, Mosher was expelled from Stanford because of his action in China. The school’s administration characterized his actions as “illegal and seriously unethical conduct” that “endangered his research subjects.”

Though frequently billed as an anthropologist, a sociologist and an “expert,” Mosher’s bio fails to mention him holding a doctorate in any subject. Regardless of his having been expelled from the country 30 years ago, the same bio on PRI’s website touts Mosher as an “internationally recognized authority on China.” This 30-year experiential gap with the country is often shown in Mosher’s unfounded, hyperbolic claims about China. “In 20 years,” Mosher sinisterly predicted about a country to whose internal policies he has no access, “the population control program will be targeted on the old. It will start with ‘re-education’ meetings where the parents will be told that their son will be better off if they die. The old people will be ‘voluntarily’ held by authorities until they decide to die.”

Despite Mosher’s questionable qualifications, he was asked to speak as an expert witness before Congress, where his version of China’s abortion policies played a destructive role in the decision to defund UNFPA. PRI’s research figured heavily at another Congressional hearing about the United Nations Population Fund, where Josephine Guy, lead author of the PRI report “UNFPA, China and Coercive Family Planning” spoke at length about her investigation. Mosher was also present.
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Austin Ruse, president of the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute

A self-described “professional Catholic,” Austin Ruse began his career on the religious right as a freelance writer, with articles published in the National Catholic Register, The Wanderer and Catholic World Report. This led to a stint as editor-in-chief of Excelsis, a newsletter connected with ChristiFidelis, an organization of Catholic laity committed to the Latin mass and other “authentic” expressions of Catholicism. From Excelsis Ruse moved on to become a deputy director of C-FAM.

As deputy director, Ruse stepped into the presidency at C-FAM in 1998 after his predecessor, Ann Noonan, was fired after only two months. Noonan would eventually go on to file suit against C-FAM for her termination, with some of the documents filed in that suit claiming that Noonan’s problems first arose when “Ruse, a male deputy director of the defendant’s CAFHRI’s office, displayed an open hostility toward younger female superiors, including plaintiff, working at defendant’s CAFHRI’s office.”

As president of C-FAM, Ruse has proved an almost inexhaustible source of statements and actions most notable for their lack of tact and general self-awareness.

On lobbying:
“How do you become a lobbyist? You just send me an e-mail and you come to my office and in fifteen minutes you’re going to be a lobbyist. Seriously, it’s pretty much that easy.... You just come. I mean all I did was rent an office and get a phone and a computer and put a sign on the door and that was it. Wholly unqualified I am.”

On the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW):
“What a terrible pity. CEDAW is nothing more than radical feminism writ large and dangerous. It calls for the kind of radical leveling that offends most sensible people. Governments have been pressured and conned into supporting it.”

On undermining the efforts of the UN:
“We have so much fun, we sit in the corner of that conference room and cackle, we’re having so much fun. The other side sits there looking so glum. And the thing about it is, it’s like working in a shooting gallery where all of the targets are a thousand feet high and they’re all around you and it does not matter where you shoot, you hit something really good.”

On the influence of collegial organizations:
“’What’s going on? Where is everybody?’ on noticing that there that there were only about 50 people at the opening ceremony of a World Congress for the Family meeting in the Netherlands.”

Aside from his litany of outrageous quotations, Ruse has also been accused of spreading misinformation that actually put individuals’ lives in danger. In the wake of the conflict in Kosovo, PRI sent Ruse to the area. While in Pristina, Ruse delivered the message that the UNFPA was in league with the Serbs. Ruse instructed members of the community that the UNFPA’s family planning services were another form of “ethnic cleansing.” “We were in a post-conflict situation, operating under very tough conditions,” said Stirling Scruggs, UNFPA’s director of information, following this incident, “if that rumor had persisted it could have put our people in the line of fire.”

HLI Board of Directors

Interestingly, given the oversight problems of which HLI has been accused, there is little or no public information available about four of the seven current HLI board members.

Patricia Plitkus Bainbridge, MA, chairperson

Bainbridge is the former Diocesan Director of the Respect Life Office for the Catholic Diocese of Rockford, Illinois. In her role with the Respect Life Office, Bainbridge produced a monthly column titled “Lifelines” for the Diocese’s newspaper the Observer for three years. Some of the column’s titles were: “Planned Parenthood: Web of deceit and destruction”; “Trying to eliminate abortion stigma won’t erase the wrong”; “Safe, legal, and rare?”; “The ugly face of radical feminism”; “Defiance and the start of the culture wars”; “Catholic’ website promotes pro-abortion candidate”; “It’s about ‘choice’... Or is it?”; and “Is common ground possible?”
Key Individuals (continued)

In the past Bainbridge has stated that “Planned Parenthood will do whatever it can to undermine political authority as it continues to draw young people into its web of deceit and destruction.”305 She has referred to feminists as “duplicitous” and prochoice feminists as “radical feminists.” In a 2007 posting on her blog, Veritas Vos Liberabit, Bainbridge implied that the Merck drug company, in its attempts to link HPV to instances of cervical cancer in its FDA-approved “One Less” campaign while raising awareness of its then-new Gardasil HPV vaccine, was actively spreading misinformation.306 Bainbridge’s grounds for this criticism hinge on the fact that Merck’s description of the disease as “common” is linked to sexual intercourse, the multitudes of the abstinent thus being unaffected. She went on to criticize Gardasil’s 70 percent success rate, insinuating that the absence of complete success in the face of improved safety amounts to a corporate enticement to intercourse and the first step towards government-mandated, forced HPV vaccinations of young girls—a circumstance which was precluded by opt-outs when introduced in two bills in the Illinois Legislature in 2007.307

Richard J. Clair, Esq, director
No information is available.

Dr. William Colliton, Jr., MD, director
Colliton is a Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the George Washington University Medical Center and a member of the American Association of Pro-Life Ob/GYNS (AAPLOG). Dr. Colliton has published articles with such titles as, “Birth Control Pill: Abortifacient and Contraceptive”308 and “Condom Availability for Youth: A High Risk Alternative.”309 In 1988 as a representative of Right to Life of Maryland Inc., Colliton testified before the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Health and Human Services on the scientific and ethical issues involved in using human fetal tissue obtained from elective abortions.310 During the course of his testimony Colliton argued against fetal tissue transplants not on the grounds that they were ineffective or dangerous, but because they “cannot help but give an aura of respectability to induced abortion.”311

Frank Dennehy, MD, director
Frank Dennehy is a family practitioner operating in Front Royal, Virginia.312

Lisa Jenkins Cahill, director
No information is available.

Father Barnabas Laubach, director
No information is available.

Stuart W. Nolan, Jr., director
Nolan has been involved with a number of conservative organizations. A lawyer by training, he began his career at the law firm of Wood, Maines & Brown, Chartered, based in Washington, DC.313 Now a shareholder in this company—Wood, Maines & Nolan, PC—Nolan’s work with the firm centers on representing broadcasters, “especially those interested in expanding the coverage of evangelistic media,”314 as is the case with his role as general counsel for the Catholic Radio Association. Additionally, Nolan has worked with several conservative think tanks, including the Heritage Foundation, the now defunct pro-free market Progress and Freedom Foundation, and the Capital Research Center.315

Nolan founded LegalWorks Apostolate, PLLC, as well as the WitnessWorks Foundation for a Culture of Life. In addition to sitting on the board of HLI, Nolan is also on the board of advisors for Life Decisions International—a group best known for its boycott list of organizations that support Planned Parenthood with funding (such as Whole Foods, JP Morgan Chase, Bank of America, Olive Garden and The Gap). While LDI does not freely offer those supporting their views a complete rundown of organizations to boycott,316 the entire boycott list can be purchased at Life Decisions International’s website.
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Other publications from Catholics for Choice

Catholics for Choice produces a wide range of publications on Catholic healthcare, Catholic public opinion, conservative Catholic organizations and the rights of Catholics in the church. For a full list of CFC’s publications, please visit our website, catholicsforchoice.org.

If you would like to reference this publication, please include the citation: Catholics for Choice, Human Life International, Washington, DC, 2011.
Catholics for Choice seeks to shape and advance sexual and reproductive ethics that are based on justice, reflect a commitment to women’s well-being and respect and affirm the capacity of women and men to make moral decisions about their lives.