

The Institute for Progressive Christianity

IPC White Paper

An Unholy Alliance – How Neoconservatives and the Religious Right

Have Joined Forces to Fight Stem Cell Research

By: Eve Herold and Frank L. Coccozzelli

August 2007

An Unholy Alliance

How Neoconservatives and the Religious Right Have Joined Forces to Fight Stem Cell Research

By Eve Herold and Frank L. Coccozzelli

In June 2007, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate took up the issue of stem cell research once again, re-introducing a bill that had already been vetoed once by President Bush. The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act would have expanded U.S. federal funding (which currently applies to only 21 embryonic stem cell lines) to include about 200 new and superior cell lines. This year's version of the bill was passed in the Senate on April 11, but it fell four votes short of a veto-proof majority. Then the bill passed Congress by a vote of 253 – 174, only to be met once again with the slash of Bush's pen. The president has stood stubbornly by his anti-research policy against the wishes of the Congress, the Senate, and a large majority of the American people. His reason: the destruction of embryos, even for life-saving research, "crosses a moral line" that shouldn't be crossed.

This, however, is not the consensus among all religious faiths, let alone among mainstream Christians; it is a narrow proposition held mostly by neo-orthodox Christians. The concept that embryonic research is off-limits is being furthered not just by religious conservatives, but also by their often nonreligious neoconservative allies.

The slogan “Life begins at conception” has become so ubiquitous in the cultural *zeitgeist* that one can imagine it thundering forth from the first few pages of the Book of Genesis. It doesn't. In fact the idea that a human being springs instantly into being at some magical moment of conception is a thoroughly modern concept, first crystallized in 1869 by Pope Pius IX. Yet this idea seems to hold an almost paralyzing sway, not just over the debate about abortion, but over the debate about stem cell research as well. For the huge number of patients for whom this research holds their best hope of a cure, the extreme view of the very early-stage embryo as a full-fledged person with the same rights as any man, woman or child has stifled medical progress in the U.S. for the duration of the Bush administration.

Scientists believe that all stem cell research—especially embryonic stem cell research—has the ability to revolutionize our whole approach to health and healing. Rather than just managing the symptoms of disease, stem cells have the paradigm-shifting ability to actually *cure* by providing the body with abundant supplies of the specific cell types that it needs to heal from the inside out. The list of diseases that can be addressed through cellular therapies is enormous—it includes any condition that involves the wholesale destruction of cells and tissues. Other potential applications of this cutting-edge science could be just as revolutionary, and include the acceleration of drug discoveries, the growth of whole organs and the long-sought realization of gene-based therapies.

Yet the field is beleaguered by controversy, and remains a target of animosity from well-organized groups on the right. There's a widespread misconception that opponents in the disagreements over stem cell research align into two well-defined ideological camps: the life-respecting religious segment of society on the right, which is unanimously against embryonic stem cell research, and scientifically-minded, irreligious or simply morally indifferent people on the left. This is an oversimplification of the American cultural landscape, one that ill serves both the variety of religious thought and the spiritual underpinnings of many modern secular movements, including the nationwide pro-stem cell research movement today.

In the last few years, misinformation about embryonic stem cell research has been spread widely by one of the most successful public relations campaigns in recent memory. Opponents of embryonic stem cell research outrageously equate legitimate disease research with the holocaust, characterizing stem cell researchers as a bunch of “rogue scientists” conducting Nazi-like experiments on human beings.¹ On internet blog sites and right-wing talk radio stations, the whole field is referred to as “junk science” by media personalities who have no imaginable claim to scientific expertise. All around the country, anti-research zealots wrongly claim that scientists at universities like Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Stanford University and the University of Wisconsin want to clone human babies just so they can harvest their body parts. And Americans everywhere have become convinced (quite erroneously) that stem cell

research is somehow predicated on women having abortions. For a significant segment of the public, science fiction has replaced the facts.

Some of the anti-research claims would be easy to dismiss if it weren't for the fact that the fears they represent—and exploit—actually play an influential role in current U.S. policy. The real scandal of stem cell research is not that unethical research is being done, but that six long years after the Bush administration first instituted its wrongheaded policy, ethical, life-saving research is still being held hostage to a small but powerful political faction that opposes it. Politics is trumping science; the desire of religious and political extremists to turn America into a fundamentalist theocracy has eclipsed compassion for the sick and suffering; and the views of this radical minority are being imposed on the roughly two thirds of Americans who want to see the most promising research of our time move forward.

How could such a state of affairs come to be in an ostensibly democratic, post-Enlightenment, scientifically advanced society like that of the U.S.? Part of the answer lies in the historical confluence of two of the most reactionary groups ever to take root in American soil—the militant Christian right and neoconservatives. Analyzed separately, these groups appear to draw from radically different ideologies. But it so happens that in recent years, their goals have often coincided, and they have achieved unprecedented success through an attempt to transform the Republican Party into the party of theocracy. They, along with the ever-present current of anti-intellectualism in

American society, are the tributaries that have flowed into a charging river of social conservatism that has recently played its most influential role by providing hand-picked advisors to the Bush administration.

Right-wing Christian organizations such as the Christian Coalition, James Dobson's Focus on the Family, the Family Research Council and the Florida-based Coral Ridge Ministries have achieved unprecedented access to those in the halls of power. Members of these groups hold weekly conference calls and have regular prayer meetings with legislators on Capitol Hill and are close advisors to many of Washington's most powerful politicians, up to and including the president. There's no question that they play a major role in influencing legislators' votes on their pet issues, such as abortion, gay marriage and stem cell research. But it could be argued that powerful neoconservatives, hailing not from the pulpits of mega-churches but from the ivory towers of neoconservative think tanks like the American Enterprise Institute, the Project for the New American Century and its two offshoots designed to further religious orthodoxy in society—the Ethics and Public Policy Center and the Institute on Religion and Democracy—have had a far more corrupting influence on the democratic process. Yet their influence has remained shadowy to this day, little examined by the media and basically invisible to the average American. While paying constant lip-service to the religious right, the second Bush administration has also worked the neoconservative side of the street like no administration before them.

Men like Irving Kristol, Robert H. Bork, Bill Kristol (former Vice-President Dan Quayle's Chief of Staff and a co-founder of the Project for the New American Century), Paul Wolfowitz (who is often credited with being the architect of the 2003 invasion of Iraq), Richard Perle (Chair of the Dept. of Defense's Defense Policy Board under George W. Bush), George Weigel (a neo-orthodox² Catholic senior scholar at the Ethics and Public Policy Center) and Leon Kass (Chairman of the President's Council on Bioethics from 2001 - 2005) began their ascent in government beginning in the 1980s, continuing through the first Bush administration and peaking with the wholesale recruitment of like-minded neoconservatives into the ranks of the Pentagon and numerous government offices and advisory panels under Bush two. It has been the second Bush administration that so effectively brought neocons and the Christian right together under shared policies such as the invasion of Iraq and opposition to embryonic stem cell research. Neocons and Christian right activists have been so mutually reinforcing in recent years that it could even be argued that the churches have become the implementing arms of a shared neoconservative agenda whose goals include a radical undermining of American democracy.

Right-wing Christian conservatives such as Pat Robertson, James Dobson and Donald Wildmon make no secret of their desire to rewrite American history and remake our system of government into something resembling a Christian theocracy. It seems ironic that strong reinforcement for their movement has come from many

neoconservatives, some of whom have openly acknowledged their atheism (Irving Kristol, for example). This is an utterly counterintuitive alliance until one understands the ideological roots of neoconservatism. A closer examination of the ideas and experiences that have influenced ideology explains why neoconservatives have so vigorously applauded the ability of the Christian right to rally the faithful around emotionally charged flash points that can arguably swing national elections. It reinforces their own worldview, which prizes the ability of a ruling elite to control the masses of supposedly inferior humanity. While it wouldn't be safe to say that all neoconservatives are necessarily atheists, many of them see religion as a weapon that is instrumental to the achievement of political goals.

The seminal ideas of American neoconservatism are found in the thoughts and writings of the German-born 20th century philosopher, Leo Strauss. Strauss, who died in 1973, taught at the University of Chicago, authored fifteen books and mentored such notable intellectual protégés as Paul Wolfowitz, Francis Fukuyama, Eric Cohen and Allan Bloom. Strauss himself was largely apolitical, although many of his views are anti-liberal and anti-modernist. However, his followers have been anything but apolitical; Irving Kristol, Michael Novak and Father Richard John Neuhaus were originally not members of the mainstream liberal left but of a radical left that espoused socialism not just as an economic technique (as in Great Britain in the 1950s and 60s) but as a societal, transforming revolution. Irving Kristol even admits that he is a former

Trotskyite. Today's neoconservatives are different from more mainstream and libertarian-minded conservatives (of whom, quite a few support embryonic stem cell research and who, like mainstream liberals, can trace their political beliefs back to the Enlightenment). While historically many neoconservatives migrated from the far left to the far right, their defining characteristic has always been a combination of stridency and extremism. Today they can be described as Marxists of the right who took Strauss's essentially apolitical philosophy, applied their own radical bent to it and have taken it to extremes the German-born philosopher could not have imagined.

Although his ideas are still being debated, Straus is still considered by many to be the ideological godfather of the neoconservative movement. There is certainly no doubt that the current Bush administration tapped dozens of neoconservative ideologues for high-level positions in its government. Certainly an overview of Strauss's philosophy of governance finds eerie echoes in the administration's foreign and domestic policies, and might even provide clues as to the seemingly willful deafness of the administration to popular opinion.

Strauss's political philosophy is unabashedly anti-modernist and hostile to post-Enlightenment notions of democracy. Drawing upon a peculiar interpretation of the teachings of Plato, Strauss felt that liberal democracy often leads to moral relativism, popular nihilism and the eventual breakdown of all social institutions. He based this belief on what he saw as the innate inability of the common man to grasp true

knowledge or to face “the truth.” The truth, in this case, being that there is no God, that all religion is illusion and man is alone in the universe, subject only to the ruthless laws of nature and whatever rule of law he can fashion. Like Marx, Strauss saw religion as a mere opiate of the masses, but unlike his Communist contemporaries, he didn't regard it as an opiate that the common man needed to be freed of. He accepted, and even embraced, authoritarian religion as a necessary evil for the skillful manipulation of society.

In fact, Straussian philosophy dovetails beautifully with the right-wing Christian orthodoxies, the more authoritarian and coercive, the better.

It has been observed that politics makes for strange bedfellows, and the social-conservative movement has brought about powerful alliances between groups that formerly had little to do with each other. While Strauss and many of the founders of the neoconservative movement come from Jewish backgrounds but adopted an atheistic worldview, some of neoconservatism's most passionate supporters are Catholics of the ultra-traditional *Opus Dei* persuasion. The author Damon Linker has defined this group of religious conservatives as “theocons.” These include George Weigel, the journalist Michael Novak, and Robert P. George, who is one of the most inflexible members sitting on the President's Council on Bioethics. But even non-Christian neoconservatives respect the brute force of religion and the way Christian extremists have wielded it as a political weapon. As believers in the power of orthodoxy only, the neocons gladly strip

religion of its spirituality while using it as an instrument for social and political control. The concept of a loving, merciful God is of little use to them—the myth that must be imposed is one of a vengeful, furious deity who strikes terror into the hearts of those who must be governed.

For Strauss’s neoconservative progeny, it is through the orthodoxies of a largely negative religion that the masses could be controlled most effectively. In their universe, pluralistic democracy is a weak force that cannot hold society together. This idea is very much at home among the neo-orthodox Catholic and certain Evangelical crowds, who have been convinced that their countrymen, as a consequence of too much social freedom, have fallen into the moral dissolution that now threatens the institution of the family and the nation itself. The anti-stem cell research position of the neocons now makes sense as part of the iron rule of religious dogma—life begins at conception, and this cannot be questioned without the risk of eternal damnation—as a serviceable concept for helping the masses feel that they are on the right side of a virtuous myth, the myth of a God-fearing society.

There is another major intersection between neoconservatives and the Christian right, and that is a general antipathy toward any kind of meddling with nature. For religious dogmatists, the issue is seen as an injunction against “playing God” —hence a conservative view is called for in a wide range of bioethical issues, including stem cell research, cloning, and the withdrawal of life support for comatose or brain-dead

patients. For Straussians of the neoconservative variety, the injunction is simply about a pragmatic reluctance to engage in futile attempts to change nature. Strauss himself held a kind of nihilistic respect for nature, and thought that man's attempts to tinker with its inherent inequalities—between the weak and the strong, for example—were both ill-advised and doomed to create catastrophes worse than the original problems they sought to address. It could even be said that Strauss despised the radically egalitarian effect that science and technology have had on society, a state of affairs that must seem intolerably subversive of the “natural order.” By now it should be clear that the main point where the neocon agenda converges with the Christian conservative movement is in the blind appeal to religious orthodoxy.

Religious orthodoxy is a blunt instrument when applied to a complex issue like embryonic stem cell research, but that hasn't stopped its purveyors. In fact, the irrational phenomenon of placing a higher value on microscopic cells in a Petri dish than on living, breathing human beings might have temporarily strengthened the fundamentalists' hand, just as the president's long, drawn-out refusal to reevaluate his Iraq policy made him appear decisive for a while. Doing the unpopular thing in the face of widespread opposition can appear virtuous until the public catches on that the unpopular thing is just that for good reasons. The neoconservatives got it right by recognizing that the majority is not always right, but as is typical of a factious

movement, they have fallen short by failing to realize that in the long run, majorities are also capable of eminent common sense and sometimes even wisdom.

In their views on health care, neoconservatives, whether Protestant, Catholic or Jewish, seem to seesaw back and forth with shifting interpretations of “natural law.” The one thing neoconservatives and the religious right do seem to agree on is their acceptance of an orthodox Catholic view of natural law. The concept of natural law appeals to them because its invocation appears to support a single orthodoxy; The common feature of all neoconservatives is that they much prefer the authoritarian role of religion to the spiritual. However, in simply referring to “natural law” so generically, as if the concept has only one authoritative interpretation, research opponents are misleading the public.

Greek philosophers, especially Aristotle and the Stoics, first described natural law as a rational and purposeful order that is inherent to the universe. Mankind is seen as being subject to these fixed, eternal conditions, and his happiness is dependent on living in harmony with them—a condition epitomizing the Greek concept of virtue. In contrast to the later Catholic definition of natural law revised and adapted by Thomas Aquinas (and then again revised by Anglican theologian Richard Hooker), the Stoics saw the laws of the universe as being potentially separate from the will of a personal God. The gods of mythology were capricious and often irrational; natural law was just the opposite—eternal and inviolable. Natural law was applied to a multitude of human

issues, including birth, death and the rational life of moderation, but the Greek ideal was often heartless by today's standards.

In Plato's *Republic*, Socrates, in his dialogue, discusses the often harsh laws of life, death and illness. He credits medicine with "the invention of lingering death," and states that ". . . in all well-ordered states every individual has an occupation to which he must attend, and has therefore no leisure to spend in continually being ill." He goes on to say that the rich are exceptions to this rule, because they have the means to care for themselves without imposing a burden on society. But as for the common man:

When a carpenter is ill he asks the physician for a rough and ready cure; an emetic or a purge or a cautery or the knife—these are his remedies. And if someone prescribes for him a course of dietetics, and tells him that he must swathe and swaddle his head, and all that sort of thing, he replies at once that he has no time to be ill, and that he sees no good in a life which is spent nursing his disease to the neglect of his customary employment; and therefore bidding goodbye to this sort of physician, he resumes his ordinary habits, and either gets well and lives and does his business, or, if his constitution fails, he dies and has no more trouble.³

Despite the homage paid to authoritarian religion, this law-of-the-jungle attitude is quite discernible in the neoconservatives' support of laissez-faire capitalism and other forms of social Darwinism. They seem to twist and turn the concept of natural law into

whatever shape is needed to justify their position on the issue at hand. This process has been key in furthering the recent rapprochement between American evangelicals and Catholics, and between religionists and atheistic neoconservatives. Richard John Neuhaus, the former Lutheran pastor who became a Catholic priest, is said to be a favorite of Karl Rove's and possibly the most influential religious advisor to President Bush (who publicly identifies himself with Protestant Evangelicals). It may be rather complicated to connect all the dots, but once you do, it is easier to see how an administration could reject research on microscopic embryos while engaging in an unnecessary war that has killed hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians and displaced two million more ("Every human life is sacred, therefore we must save each and every embryo; the strong will inevitably vanquish the weak, and those who die in a "just war" are expendable").

The orthodox Catholic view of natural law, which is often invoked to justify opposition to things like birth control and stem cell research, elaborates on the Greek view by asserting the moral goodness of nature. "Natural law" must be just and good because it reflects the nature of God. It is not simply a set of impersonal laws but can be seen as the all-wise will of a personal God, hence the abrogation of this law by any human means is seen as sinful. Yet some contemporary neoconservative thinkers, such as Eric Cohen, flirt with both the Catholic and the ancient Greek view. Cohen implies that nature is something apart from God, amoral and not necessarily representing the

will of God, yet it still calls upon us to act in accordance with God's harder-to-discern moral law, which may lie hidden within nature.

In *The New Atlantis*, Cohen writes that “. . .science and medicine might be seen as *redemptive* [italics in the original] activities: as the restoration of justice in a world where biological nature often seems unjust.” In this way, Cohen can reconcile such divergent realities as the absolute humanness of zygotes and their low survival rate in nature (30 to 40 percent at best), with the will of God. To escape drawing the conclusion that God actually wills for the majority of human beings conceived to die within days, he suggests that we are called upon to remedy this travesty of nature's.

The problem is that Cohen attempts to somehow combine the dogmatic religious view that nature is the embodiment of God's will, and therefore good, with the Greek view that nature is flawed, and requires effort on our part in order to bring it into congruence with a higher moral order. While he emphasizes that medicine will never attain the presumed goal of banishing death, we should not “. . . abandon our hopes of medical progress to care for frozen embryos.”⁴ In other words, we should make heroic efforts to “save” every embryo in existence, even if it means going to the extremely unnatural length of transferring each one into the womb of a surrogate mother, as is the case of the Snowflake babies, which are “adopted” as frozen embryos. The position seems to be that nature is both good and evil, and that it is incumbent on us to discern

when we are called upon to remedy the natural order and when we are commanded to submit to it.

It should be noted that Catholic traditionalists also get into trouble on this point, being anti-embryonic stem cell research because of their stance that life begins at fertilization, yet unable to endorse surrogate motherhood because it violates their view of natural law in the area of procreation. That simply leaves all of the existing embryos that are not designated for reproductive purposes in a state of limbo, figuratively if not literally speaking.

Embryonic stem cell research is now one of those hot-button issues that religious conservatives and neocons alike have played like gambling chips in various elections where an issue was needed to help rally the troops. But objections to the research exist, and some of those objections surely rest on a sincere and spiritually motivated desire to protect the innocent. Some groups, primarily Opus Dei-style Catholics and fundamentalist evangelicals, vehemently oppose embryonic stem cell research because it destroys blastocysts, or early-stage embryos in the first few days of cellular division. Research opponents regard the harvesting of the undifferentiated, “master” stem cells of the blastocyst, and their use in research, as the destruction of potential human life. This is the crux of the objection to embryonic stem cell research. But to assume that those who consider themselves religious and who take ethical issues seriously are inevitably on the anti-research side of the equation would be way off the mark.

Many religions, religious denominations, and millions of deeply religious people have become pro-research not by ignoring the ethical issues, but by thoroughly exploring them. They believe that the effort to save *real* lives is a moral imperative when there is no loss to a potential life that will never be. This is the conclusion reached by a majority of religious Americans after considering the following facts.

Today there are approximately 400,000 frozen blastocysts that are cryopreserved at in-vitro fertilization clinics. For thousands of these embryos, the decision has already been made that they will never be transferred to a woman's body, and that means they will never grow beyond a tiny clump of undifferentiated cells briefly existing in a Petri dish. Like it or not, this is a reality. There are those who believe that those clumps of cells constitute a human being, but most of us, if pressed to think about it, don't think that microscopic cellular life is equal to, or the same thing as, *a human life*. We may not be sure as to what, ultimately, defines a life that we call human, but we don't think this is it. At the same time, most people believe that our compassion for the sick and suffering compels us to make use of these cells in research aimed at curing some of mankind's most devastating diseases.

In fact, there is nothing in the Gospels to indicate that Jesus would oppose stem cell research. His constant healing of the sick and disabled was not only one of his primary activities, it was in accordance with the Jewish notion of *Pikuach nefesh*, the moral imperative to save lives. The view that embryonic stem cell research is

permissible is shared by the United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism and several other Jewish denominations, and almost universally by the Muslim faith. Embryonic stem cell research is also supported by the Presbyterian Church, the United Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, the Unitarian Universalists and the Episcopal Church. These are not amoral organizations. They simply reflect the fact that healing and the amelioration of suffering in the sick are far more deeply rooted in their spiritual traditions than the modern concept that life begins at fertilization. They have been able to remain true to their spiritual roots while resisting the dogmatic pressures of modern authoritarian ideology.

Philosophers and theologians will continue to argue over when a human life begins, but even they may never reach unanimous agreement on what is, after all, a metaphysical question. In the meantime, we have millions upon millions of sick people worldwide. In the U.S. today, blastocysts are routinely thrown away as medical waste rather than being used to help find cures for real, suffering people. In this scenario, everything is lost, and nothing is gained. Most Americans find this policy both irrational and uncompassionate in the extreme.

Issues involving research using human embryos, of course, *should* receive social scrutiny and oversight, and it is within the legitimate purview of all religions to bring their values to bear on any public enterprise. But rather than indulging in a knee-jerk rejection of science, religious people everywhere would do well to recognize the

enormous humanitarian stake in scientific advances. Ancient religious scriptures written long before today's technologically advanced science may not give us black-and-white answers to the difficult questions we are faced with today. But as moral creatures, we should be able to identify the core values of our religious traditions and apply them wisely to modern problems. In addition to that, as participants in a democracy, we have a *duty* to seek a certain critical threshold of understanding about our world, in which science plays such a prominent part. We should be deeply suspicious of any person, agency or organization that attempts to deny us that understanding.

Stem cell research advocates often underestimate the significance of the battle to ban all embryonic research. While research supporters often interpret the fight over this issue as a mere skirmish that will soon play itself out, neoconservative research opponents view the battle as critical to their ability to impose orthodox notions of morality upon the general population. They see the issue as a signature battle in a titanic war between a secular pluralistic modernity (which they see as the road to inevitable chaos) and a society based upon religiously orthodox notions of natural law (the only thing they see as standing between us and the complete breakdown of society).

Over the last generation, certain neo-orthodox Catholics have been building bridges to evangelical and fundamentalist Protestants. But this "bridge-building" is

increasingly accomplished with roadways to the most rigid forms of Catholicism. And while some Catholics have yielded to fundamentalists' opposition on the theory of evolution, socially conservative Protestants seem to be increasingly amenable to Vatican notions of natural law principles that appear in their united opposition to abortion, end-of-life issues and stem cell research.

Neoconservatives more than willingly help their more stridently religious allies because it helps them achieve an "ideal" society where a single orthodoxy serves to unify the population, even to the point of providing the average citizenry a set of beliefs they would be willing to defend to the death. To this end, their think tanks such as the Institute on Religion and Democracy (IRD), seek to eviscerate non-orthodoxy in contemporary Christianity, often employing a very efficient media machine, as part of a carefully designed political program. It is no accident that Catholic Right neoconservative and IRD Member Emeritus and Board of Director member George Weigel wrote back in 1989 in his book, *Catholicism and the Renewal of American Democracy*, that Catholics were called "to make America Catholic" — albeit a form of Catholicism that a significant number of American Catholics now reject.

While we who support embryonic stem cell research tend to see our struggle as a temporary scuffle, neoconservative research opponents see themselves in a War to Save Civilization. Our opponents see the stakes to them as enormous, and we should fully

expect them to fight on well past any possible change in the White House in 2009. It is a sobering assessment that we should prepare for.

About the Authors...

Eve Herold is Director of Public Policy Research and Education for the Genetics Policy Institute. She is also a science and health journalist specializing in age-related diseases and the many issues confronting an aging society and is the author of the book *Stem Cell Wars: Inside Stories from the Frontlines*, published by Palgrave-Macmillan in September 2006. Since 2000, Ms. Herold has written and spoken extensively about the field of stem cell research. As a guest lecturer at universities, symposia and public events, she has spoken to diverse audiences throughout the U.S. about the science, politics and ethics of stem cell research. Ms. Herold is now working on a book about how contemporary society is turning away from the scientific worldview born during the Enlightenment and embracing more irrational attitudes in politics and culture. The book, called *A Flight from Reason*, will be published by St. Martin's Press in 2008.

Ms. Herold is a nondenominational Christian with a special interest in how religious and ethical issues intersect with science in contemporary society.

Frank L. Coccozzelli is a director with the Institute for Progressive Christianity. A Roman Catholic, Frank dissents from the Vatican's official position on stem cell research on religious grounds. Since 2001 he has been active in advocating for this research. He also writes a weekly column on the Catholic Right for the Talk to Action web site. Any questions concerning this paper should be directed to him. He can be reached at (516) 435-3800 or at fcoccozzelli@instituteforprogressivechristianity.org.

¹ Robert Barnes and Matthew Mosk, "Steele Apologizes for Holocaust Remarks: Compared Stem Cell Research to Nazi Medical Experiments," *The Washington Post*, February 11, 2006, B.1.

² Co-author Frank Coccozzelli defines neo-orthodoxy as differing from general orthodoxy by its radical nature. The neo-orthodox would like to impose pre-Vatican II orthodoxy on all members of American society, sometimes advocating armed insurrection to achieve this goal.

³ Louise Ropes Loomis, ed., "Republic, Book III," *The Great Dialogues: Plato* (Roslyn, NY: Walter J. Black, Inc., 1942) 295 – 296.

⁴ Cohen, Eric, "The Embryo Question II: The Tragedy of Equality," *The New Atlantis*, Fall 2004/Winter 2005.