

The Marketing of Aborted Baby Parts

By: Mark Crutcher | President, Life Dynamics Incorporated

Original Release Date: February, 2000

Updated: March, 2007

In April of 1997, Life Dynamics began an undercover investigation into the marketing of body parts harvested from babies killed by elective abortions. This investigation lasted approximately 31 months. Most of the information in this report was provided by employees who worked at Comprehensive Health for Women (Comp Health) – a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic located in Overland Park, Kansas.

The System

Federal laws, and many state laws, make it illegal to buy or sell human bodies or body parts. However, they can be legally donated for medical research and certain other legitimate purposes. In such cases, the supplier is allowed to recover from the recipient any reasonable out-of-pocket expenses that were necessary to fill the recipient's order.

Some abortion industry insiders, wanting to financially profit on the growing market for fetal tissue and body parts, have devised a scheme to circumvent these restrictions. This is how the system works:

1.) A baby parts "wholesaler" enters into a financial agreement with an abortion clinic in which the wholesaler pays a monthly "site fee" to the clinic. For this payment, the wholesaler is allowed to place a retrieval agent inside the clinic

where he or she is given access to the corpses of children killed there and a workspace to harvest their parts. In most cases, this retrieval agent is an employee of the wholesaler. In other instances, the retrieval agent is a clinic employee who was trained by the wholesaler.

2.) The buyer – usually a researcher working for a medical school, pharmaceutical company, bio-tech company or government agency – supplies the wholesaler with a list of the baby parts wanted.

3.) When such orders are received by the wholesaler, they are faxed to the retrieval agent at the clinic who harvests the requested parts and ships them to the buyer via FedEx, Airborne or a similar common carrier.

4.) These parts are "donated" by the clinic to the

wholesaler who turns around and “donates” them to the buyer. The buyer then “reimburses” the wholesaler for the cost of retrieving the parts.

On the surface, this system does not appear to violate the legal prohibitions against trafficking in human body parts since, technically speaking, no one is buying or selling anything. The loophole is that site fees and retrieval reimbursement amounts are unregulated. The law requires that such payments be reasonable and reflect the actual cost of securing the parts, but there are no state or federal laws which establish guidelines or sets limits regarding these payments. Additionally, no governmental or law enforcement agency is charged with overseeing the system.

This means that the wholesaler is free to set site fees and retrieval fees at any amount. Despite the fact that the baby parts business is teeming with profound moral implications, and despite the fact it has enormous potential for financial abuse, it is allowed to operate on the honor system.

It is certainly no secret that this sort of self-policing never works in environments where large amounts of money are involved. In this case, the result is that the corpses of children killed by

elective abortion are now marketed like old car parts salvaged from the local junkyard. Rhetoric like “site fees,” “donations,” and “retrieval reimbursement costs” are simply code words designed to conceal that fact.

The Players

Although other organizations are well known to be involved in the wholesaling of baby parts, this document focuses on just two companies, the Anatomic Gift Foundation (AGF) and Opening Lines.

AGF was founded in 1994 by Jim and Brenda Bardsley in a doublewide trailer house on the Satilla River outside rural White Oak, Georgia. This AGF facility is also a catfish farm called Sweetwater Farms. The Bardsleys are the president and vice-president of the organization and Jim Bardsley’s brother, Brent, is its executive director. The group’s headquarters has been moved to Laurel, Maryland, but the White Oak address is still listed among AGF’s several locations.

AGF also has offices in Arizona and Colorado. The Phoenix facility appears to only provide adult tissue and is not known to be involved in the marketing of baby parts. However, the Aurora,

Colorado, office is located inside a freestanding abortion clinic (Mayfair Women's Clinic). AGF's employee at this facility is a woman named Ying Bei Wang. AGF also claims to have operatives in abortion clinics on the east coast and in the midwest.

Pathologist Miles Jones, in West Frankfort, Illinois, founded Opening Lines in 1997. Jones' business partner, Gayla Rose, handles its daily operations. Opening Lines is currently harvesting baby parts only from abortion clinics in the United States, but claims to be actively pursuing sources in Canada and Mexico.

[See the Opening Lines marketing materials in The Documents - Section A - pages 2 - 8]

As for ties between AGF, Opening Lines and the abortion industry, the National Abortion Federation listed AGF as a member in 1998, and in 1991 both Miles Jones and Gayla Rose were cited as donors in the National Abortion Federation's annual report. The last known addresses we had for these organizations are:

*Anatomic Gift Foundation
96 Satilla Drive
White Oak, GA 31568
(912) 576-5889
(912) 576-3727 fax*

*Anatomic Gift Foundation
13948 Baltimore Avenue
Laurel, MD 20707
(301) 953-2702
(301) 953-2701 fax
1-800-300-5433
web: anatomicgift.com*

*Anatomic Gift Foundation of Arizona
1313 N 2nd Street, Suite 2
Phoenix, AZ 85004
(602) 528-3715
(602) 528-3717 fax*

*Anatomic Gift Foundation (Mayfair Women's Clinic)
14446 E Evans Avenue
Aurora, CO 80014
(303) 696-9761 (Mayfair)
(303) 755-8601 AGF voice & fax*

*Opening Lines/Professional Arts Lab
A Division of Consultative and
Diagnostic Pathology
PO Box 508
502 W St. Louis Street
West Frankfort, IL 62896
(618) 937-2439
(618) 937-1525 fax
1-800-490-9980*

The Baby Parts Orders

Accompanying documents to this report include over 70 orders for baby parts that were received by Comp Health beginning in 1988 and lasting until 1998. Also included is a partial listing of frozen parts being stored at this abortion clinic during the week of November 17, 1997.

The wholesalers for these baby parts were AGF and the International Institute for the Advancement of Medicine (IIAM). IIAM was at

one time heavily involved in the baby parts business but has since withdrawn. It was founded by Jim Bardsley who eventually left to start AGF.

During our investigation, we were only able to acquire one Opening Lines parts order plus a copy of information furnished to Opening Lines from a University of Florida researcher regarding parts she wanted to acquire. In addition, we were able to obtain several airbills from both FedEx and Airborne for Opening Lines parts shipments.

Regarding the AGF/IIAM baby parts orders, there are certain things that should be noted:

1.) A requirement that parts be retrieved within a few minutes of fetal death dramatically increases the likelihood of a live birth. This is also an indicator that the purchaser is suggesting that the abortionist alter his procedure in order to meet certain specifications.

2.) When “no dig” or “no digoxin” is written on the order, the purchaser is telling the abortionist that the baby can’t be killed by injecting digoxin into its heart. Again, this increases the chances of a live birth and is another indicator that the purchaser is trying to control what procedure the abortionist will use.

3.) Some orders have notations such as “no anomalies” or “no congenital abnormalities.” This confirms that these abortions – including the very late term ones – are being done on healthy babies.

[See the AGF and IIAM Baby Parts Orders in The Documents - Section B - Subsection I - pages 9 - 75]

[See the Comp Health Inventory of Parts in The Documents - Section B - Subsection II - page 76]

[See the Opening Lines Baby Parts Order Form in The Documents - Section B - Subsection III - page 77]

[See the Opening Lines Shipping Orders in The Documents - Section B - Subsection IV - pages 78 - 87]

The Money Trail

To demonstrate how profits are generated from the sale of baby parts, we began by compiling a chart of the payments made by AGF to Comp Health between December of 1996 and October of 1997. These figures were taken directly from Comp Health’s accounting ledger and are

confirmed by their check book register showing that corresponding deposits were made from January to November of 1997. Copies of these two financial documents were given to us by an ex-employee of Comp Health. However, the ledger pages are so large that they would be unreadable if reduced to a size that would fit on a website. That is why we had to create this chart instead of simply including the ledgers themselves. Copies of the original ledgers are on file in our office.

[See the Comp Health to AGF Payment Chart in The Documents - Section C - Subsection I - page 88]

An interesting item on the chart is the column titled "\$10/hr." Figures listed under this heading reflect compensation for the time AGF's retrieval technician was actually working inside Comp Health's building.

If site fees are compensation for the actual costs associated with the retrieval process, the question becomes: what are these "\$10/hr" payments for? After all, Comp Health did not incur any additional costs just because AGF's technician walked in the door. That makes it implausible for payments reflected under the

"\$10/hr" column to be reimbursement for any actual costs associated with the retrieval of baby parts.

We have heard that AGF representatives are now claiming that the hourly fee is to cover blood work performed in association with the retrieval process.

There are at least three reasons why this explanation cannot be true. First, this is precisely the kind of expense that AGF claims its site fees are intended to cover. Second, medical procedures such as blood work are paid for by the incident, not by the hour. Third, and most important, blood work is a legitimate expense directly related to retrieval. As such, under normal accounting procedures this would be an itemized expense.

The point is, there is simply no logical basis for creating this nondescript accounting category for the purpose of including a legitimate expense. So the question remains: What is the "\$10/hr" category about?

The answer is obvious. AGF knows that it cannot legally pay for baby parts based on volume. However, they have logically assumed that the

longer one of their retrieval technicians is at work the more tissue and parts are procured. Given that, a “per-hour” payment arrangement could be used as a substitute for payments based on volume. Some might argue that if Comp Health demanded more money, AGF could simply increase the site fee. However, as the chart shows, the site fee remains constant from month to month. That means if Comp Health experiences a bad month (low patient count, low donor rate, sub-standard tissue quality, etc.), AGF still pays the same site fee amount they pay during a good month. For AGF, imposing a higher site fee would simply exacerbate this situation. That may explain this “\$10/hr” arrangement. In effect, it provides financial protection for AGF against high site fees during low-yield months, since AGF’s retrieval agent would be in Comp Health’s building fewer hours. Of course, this also gives Comp Health a financial incentive to keep patient counts and donation rates as high as possible.

In addition to the site fees, we know that AGF was paying the retrieval technician at this facility \$10 an hour to harvest the tissue. Since abortions were only done on select days, it is highly unlikely he worked a standard 40-hour week, but to be safe we will assume that he did. Calculating \$10 an hour over a 40-hour week

and 52 weeks in a year, AGF was paying the retrieval technician who worked in the facility \$1,733.33 a month.

Other costs AGF could legitimately recover would be those necessary to administer the project. It seems unrealistic that this would require an additional full-time employee. But again, for the purposes of this report we will assume that it did. We will also assume that this person was paid the same as the retrieval technician who worked at the clinic.

Finally, there are always miscellaneous costs associated with any operation requiring employees (matching FICA payments, health care insurance, etc.). Another item in the miscellaneous category would be the amortization of equipment (instruments, hood/ dissection table, etc.) plus the cost of disposable supplies necessary to retrieve baby parts. Being overly generous, we set the miscellaneous amount at \$2,000 a month.

Combining all the retrieval costs listed in this section provides a figure that AGF could legitimately recover from researchers to whom it transferred baby parts. Billing amounts above that would indicate that these transactions were not donations, but sales. Keep in mind that, in every

case where the actual amount is not known, we purposely and wildly exaggerated the estimates in favor of AGF. Given that, the average monthly retrieval costs are:

Site Fee (Rent)	\$572.73
\$10/Hr Fee	\$617.27
Salaries (2 x \$1,733.33)	\$3,466.66
Misc.	\$2,000.00
Total	\$6,656.66

If AGF was complying with the laws against trafficking in baby parts, their fees for providing those parts should roughly correspond with the amount above. However, when we calculated how much AGF was invoicing its customers it became clear that this was not the case.

Getting that figure was possible because one of our undercover operatives provided us with a copy of AGF's price list which they called a "Fee for Services." We were also furnished daily log sheets for baby parts orders that were filled at Comp Health during February of 1996. (While there were only 17 log sheets representing 12 different dates, this clinic only does abortions on specific days during the week and these logs account for the entire month.)

In short, we simply took AGF's internal log showing how many baby parts they sold in February of 1996 and priced out those logs

using AGF's own price list.

[See the AGF Price List in The Documents - Section C - Subsection II - page 89]

The "SOURCE" box at the top contains the AGF internal ID code, 511, which identifies Comp Health as the source clinic. The "TECH" box includes the notation "LDA" which are the initials of *Lawrence Dean Alberty* – the retrieval agent who worked for AGF inside Comp Health. Donor information includes the mother's ID number, age and race (ex: 24W is a 24 year-old white woman), blood type (ex: ABO+), weight, plus the baby's gestational age. In some cases, the dead baby's sex was noted by a male or female symbol, and in some, the length of the baby's foot is placed beside the line marked "US CRL."

The notation "Tissue information" describes the type of part being shipped. A "FRG" designation means that the specimen was fragmented. The "AGF #" is Anatomic Gift Foundation's internal ID code for the tissue shipment, and "BLD" is their internal ID code for the maternal blood test. "Researcher" means the person ordering the part.

[See the AGF Tissue Logs in The Documents - Section C - Subsection III - pages 90 - 106]

According to these logs, during February of 1996, AGF sold the following parts from 69 different babies:

47	Livers
11	Liver Fragments
7	Brains
21	Eyes
8	Thymuses
23	Legs
14	Pancreases
14	Lungs
6	Arms
1	Kidney/Adrenal Gland

The above figures total 152 “specimens”. The logs show that they also sold the blood from three babies for a final specimen count of 155.

NOTE: According to the retrieval agent who harvested all of the parts listed above, in order for the blood of an aborted child to be sold, the dead baby had to be brought to him intact.

According to their price list, AGF charges either \$90 or \$130 for a second-trimester specimen, and either \$220 or \$260 for a first-trimester specimen. The lower prices apply if the specimen is to be shipped fresh and the higher amount is used when it is shipped frozen. Whether a part is shipped fresh or frozen is not always reflected on the daily logs, therefore, we could not price these parts orders exactly and had to give a price range.

The tissue logs show that of the 69 babies dissected, there were 37 first-trimester babies which produced 39 specimens, and 32 second-trimester babies which produced 116 specimens. Using AGF’s price list reveals that the following amounts were charged to researchers for the parts listed:

First-Trimester Specimens (39)	Minimum \$8,580.00
	Maximum \$10,140.00
Second-Trimester Specimens (113)	Minimum \$10,170.00
	Maximum \$14,690.00
Total For All Specimens (152)	Minimum \$18,750.00
	Maximum \$ 24,830.00

We were unable to find out how much AGF charges for baby blood, so the figures above do not include a cost for the three instances in which blood was sold. Since there is obviously some charge involved, if we had been able to include it AGF’s income would have risen by a corresponding amount.

The Money Trail – Analysis

The fundamental question is whether site fees and retrieval reimbursements are being used as proxy payments to circumvent the state and federal laws which make it illegal to buy or sell human body parts. As we examine that issue, it is crucial to remember that for any transfer of aborted baby parts to be legal they must be

donated and not sold. By law, the only financial remuneration that is legally allowed is recovery of the actual and reasonable costs associated with the retrieval process.

Our figures show that when AGF's monthly retrieval costs (\$6,656.66) are subtracted from the retrieval income shown in the section above, in February of 1996 AGF billed researchers between \$12,093.34 and \$18,173.34 more for parts than it paid to acquire them.

In short, AGF appears to have made between \$12,000 and \$18,000 in baby parts profit from this one abortion clinic in this one month. And remember, that profit amount is based on costs to AGF that we purposely overestimated. An audit based on AGF's actual expenses would inevitably reveal higher profits than those reflected here.

NOTE: When analyzing the financial data, one problem we encountered was that our site fee documentation was for 1997, while the daily logs were from 1996. However, we felt comfortable assuming that the monthly site fees didn't change much from one year to the next.

The Money Trail – Miscellaneous

The tissue logs reveal that one baby is often

chopped up and sold to many buyers.

For example, babies taken from donors 113968 and 114189 were both killed late in their second-trimester and cut into nine pieces. By applying AGF's price list, we see that each baby was sold for between \$810 and \$1,170 depending on whether their parts were shipped fresh or frozen.

Another interesting financial revelation is seen when the tissue logs are analyzed on a "per-day" basis. During the time these logs cover, the heaviest traffic day was February 22, 1996. On that day, AGF sold 39 baby parts. According to their price list, AGF would have invoiced the buyers between \$3,510 and \$5,070 for these parts, again depending on whether they were shipped fresh or frozen.

Even compared to the \$6,656.66 amount that we grossly overestimated to be AGF's monthly operating expenses, AGF recovered between 53% and 76% of their entire month's overhead from sales generated on this one day. If AGF's actual monthly expenses were used instead of our exaggerated estimation, it is possible that AGF recovered their entire month's overhead on this day.

AGF vs. Opening Lines

Since we began releasing information about the trafficking of baby parts, a common perception held by those who viewed this material has been that AGF is more ethical than Opening Lines.

While it may be true that AGF is less flamboyant than Opening Lines, it is a mistake to assume that this makes AGF more principled. The issue is whether someone is profiting from the sale of baby parts, not whether they are crass about it.

A good barometer to use in comparing AGF to Opening Lines is pricing. There is certainly no reason that the retrieval costs of one company should exceed the retrieval costs of the other. Bluntly speaking, whatever the actual costs are to pluck the eyes out of a baby or chop off its leg, there is no legitimate reason for it to vary significantly between AGF and Opening Lines. Since the law stipulates that they are not allowed to recover from buyers any more than their actual retrieval costs, and since those costs should be virtually identical for both, it would logically follow that their fees should be virtually identical.

As you examine the Opening Lines price list, notice that, unlike AGF's "per specimen" pricing scheme, Opening Lines bases its prices on the type of body part being ordered.

[See the Opening Lines Price List in The Documents - Section C - Subsection IV - page 107]

Earlier in this document, we used AGF's "Fees for Services" list to price out tissue logs generated at Comp Health during February of 1996. This allowed us to determine how much AGF billed for parts they harvested at Comp Health during that month. The chart below applies Opening Lines prices to those same logs.

40 livers > 8 weeks	\$5,000.00
7 livers > 8 weeks	\$1,050.00
10 liver fragments > 8 weeks	\$875.00
1 liver fragment > 8 weeks	\$105.00
7 brains > 8 weeks	\$1,050.00
4 eyes (pair) > 8 weeks	\$200.00
13 eyes (single) > 8 weeks	\$390.00
8 thymuses > 8 weeks	\$600.00
29 limbs	\$2,175.00
14 pancreases > 8 weeks	\$1,050.00
14 lungs > 8 weeks	\$2,100.00
1 kidney > 8 weeks	\$100.00
Total	\$14,695.00

Recall that when we applied AGF's price list to these same orders, we found that they sold these baby parts for between \$18,750 and \$24,830, depending on whether they were shipped fresh or frozen. Opening Lines would have sold the same parts for \$14,695.

In other words, AGF charged a minimum of \$4,055 more than Opening Lines would have, and possibly as much as \$10,135 more. Given the logical assumption that Opening Lines' operating expenses are roughly the same as AGF's (\$6,656.66 per month), Opening Lines would have cleared \$8,038.34 profit from the sale of these baby parts. And while that would represent an astonishing 120% return on investment in just one month, it is still between \$4,000 and \$10,000 less profit than AGF would have made on those same parts.

To help the reader of this report have a more complete understanding of the "mechanical" aspects of the baby parts business, we are providing documents that describe the recommended methods for procuring parts. These instructions came from Comp Health and were given to retrieval agents employed at that facility. Also included in this section are a few pages of hand-written instructions. These are notes made by Dean Alberty from oral directions he was given when he first began harvesting parts at Comp Health.

**[See the Procurement Protocols in
The Documents - Section D - Subsection I -
pages 108 - 126]**

Another aspect of the baby parts business is the question of whether women are ever coerced to donate their baby's body. According to people we talked to during our investigation, coercion is not a problem because it is not necessary. The consent document is usually just "thrown-in" with the other papers the patient is told she must sign before the abortion can be done. In most cases, the woman never knows that she gave permission.

Beyond that, people in the baby parts business recognized long ago that even if they harvested aborted babies without the mother's permission, the possibility of being caught is virtually zero. When a woman leaves an abortion clinic, she has no idea what happens to her dead baby and almost no incentive to find out. Furthermore, if she decided to pursue the issue it would be impossible for her to ever determine for certain whether her baby's corpse was thrown in a dumpster, flushed down the sewer system, incinerated, carried off by a medical waste company, or sold for parts. In fact, it would be impossible for even a trained law enforcement investigator to make such a determination. The reality is, regardless of what the clinic says happened to the dead body, there is no way for an outside entity or individual to prove otherwise.

Despite that, however, some clinics do request consent. In those cases, fetal tissue donation is inevitably sold to the patient as “something good” that can come from her decision. Although patients are not supposed to be approached about tissue donation until after they have given written consent for the abortion, we were constantly told by industry insiders that the subject is often brought up during the initial counseling session. Obviously, for women who are hesitant about going ahead with the abortion, this could be a compelling emotional inducement to proceed.

In clinics where this “something good” approach is used, it is generally reinforced with a consent document that is, in reality, little more than a subtle sales pitch designed only to secure the patient’s permission. This is evident in the consent form used at the Mayfair Women’s Center, an abortion clinic in Aurora, Colorado. During our investigation, we were not able to obtain any other consent documents but we were assured that this one is typical of those used around the country. In fact, among the people we dealt with in the baby parts business, it is almost universally accepted that the wording for these documents was actually produced by one of the wholesalers.

[See the Mayfair Consent Form in The Documents - Section D - Subsection II - page 127]

This particular consent form is for an 18-year-old girl named Christina Stile who had her abortion at Mayfair on June 29, 1993. Tragically, the signature on this paper turned out to be the last time this young woman ever wrote her name. The abortionist, Ron Kuseski, botched the procedure and within a few minutes Ms. Stile was in a permanent vegetative state. Since her abortion, she has required around-the-clock care and will do so for the rest of her life. We were never able to document whether her baby was chopped-up and sold for parts. Also, we were never able to determine whether Kuseski altered the procedure to obtain the parts and, if so, whether this played a role in the injuries she suffered.

Trafficker’s Reactions

Immediately after we began releasing information on the marketing of baby parts, the operator of Opening Lines, Myles Jones, closed his West Frankfort, Illinois, facility and, literally, sneaked out of town in the middle of the night. Since then, we have received several reports

about Jones and his assistant, Gayla Rose, resurfacing in other states.

In December of 1999, AGF announced it would no longer be providing baby parts. Apparently, this was in response to public exposure in the media and protests by pro-life activists at their Maryland headquarters.

We have always been aware that there are other wholesalers in the baby parts business besides AGF and Opening Lines. However, we have also learned that some researchers are now cutting out these middlemen and going directly to the abortion clinics. In these cases, the site fee and reimbursement system is often replaced with one based on bartering. Our information is that the most common scenario is for a medical school to provide free pathology reports to an abortion clinic in exchange for free baby cadavers and/or body parts.

This new bartering arrangement seems to be an attempt by the clinics and these schools to blunt any charges that they are trafficking in baby parts. However, if an abortion clinic is trading baby parts for services which it would otherwise have to pay for, and the school is trading services for baby parts it would normally have to buy, both are still

in violation of those statutes which prohibit trafficking in human body parts.

20/20 and the Congressional Hearing

In response to information released by Life Dynamics, on March 8, 2000, the ABC News program 20/20 aired a segment about the marketing of body parts from babies killed during abortions. On the following day there was a Congressional hearing on the same issue.

The 20/20 broadcast was a classic Good News / Bad News situation. On one hand, millions of Americans learned that there are people in this world who traffic in the dead bodies of children killed by abortion. On the other hand, because 20/20 was intentionally deceptive in several aspects of this story, the viewer was given a distorted picture.

For example, the 20/20 narrator consistently portrayed the people involved in the trafficking of baby parts as “*businessmen*” who had “*slipped in*” to the abortion industry. The subtle message was that these people were outsiders despite the fact that Life Dynamics had provided them with documentation proving that every one of them had links to Planned Parenthood, the National Abortion Federation, or both. It was clear that

20/20 wanted the viewer to perceive that this was not something being done by the abortion industry but by profit-driven infiltrators. The incredible part is that, by the time this report was over, viewers could have easily concluded that the abortion industry was a victim of the baby parts scandal instead of its perpetrator.

Another problem with the 20/20 piece was its fixation with the financial details of the baby parts business. The underlying message seemed to be that chopping up the unborn and selling their parts is not a moral issue until someone makes money off it. It was like suggesting that the problem with the Nazi Holocaust was the environmental impact created by the smoke from the ovens.

Also, whenever the issue of baby parts was being discussed, the image on the screen was of a petri dish containing tiny slivers of unidentifiable white tissue. For all the viewer knew, the parts they were seeing on the screen could have been slices of fish.

After the show, I complained about this to the ABC producer, Kim Skeen. Following some heated discussion, she reluctantly agreed that these visuals did not give an accurate account of

what was actually going on. She then said that the network had made a conscious decision that it was not going to broadcast footage of dismembered babies or baggies full of tiny human body parts. I pointed out that neither ABC nor anyone else in the media applies this standard of sensitivity to other issues. The public is constantly bombarded with graphic and disturbing images related to other atrocities, and the most you'll ever hear is a warning to send small children out of the room. Skeen never responded to this charge except to repeat that ABC was not about to show dead babies or their dismembered bodies on national television. Her attitude was that if this approach created a distorted view of reality, so be it.

Another indefensible part of the 20/20 report was the kid-glove treatment accorded Planned Parenthood president, Gloria Feldt, when she was interviewed on the broadcast. Having recognized the potential public relations nightmare this issue presents, Feldt piously feigned outrage about the baby parts trade and even included an obligatory call for anyone who violates the laws that govern such things to be prosecuted. The problem is, the baby parts trafficking documentation we provided to 20/20 came from a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic.

However, that fact was never even brought up during the Feldt interview.

When I asked Skeen why Feldt was not confronted with this, she said that Feldt was indeed asked about it but that her superiors at ABC had decided not to air the response. She said they did this to keep the show from looking like a “hit piece” on Planned Parenthood. I then asked her if ABC always shows this sort of sensitivity toward the targets of their investigative reports. For example, if they were exposing a scandal in the auto industry, would they pull punches and intentionally exclude the tough questions in order to keep the show from looking like a “hit piece” on General Motors.

Of course, she would not respond to that but it didn't really matter. We both knew the answer. This was hardly the first or last time the media has ridden shotgun for Planned Parenthood. You can also be assured that Feldt knew that this is how the game is played long before she ever agreed to the interview. Even a casual observer of the American media recognizes that it reserves its “Gotcha!” journalism for those it does not like, but for its sacred cows it's “*Hear No Evil / See No Evil / Speak No Evil.*” And make no mistake; within the American media there are no cows

more sacred than Planned Parenthood. That is why Feldt was able to be so totally at ease while lying through her teeth on national television. She was not going to be challenged and she knew it.

The Congressional Hearing began the morning after the 20/20 piece aired. In the weeks leading up to the hearing, those of us at Life Dynamics clearly saw that we were headed for a train wreck. In fact, about fifteen minutes before the hearing began, I gave an interview to Greta Kreuz – a reporter for the DC area affiliate of ABC Television – in which I emphatically made that very point.

This debacle was caused by several flawed decisions made by me. First, I went into this process with a fundamental misunderstanding about the nature of Congressional hearings. I naively assumed that they are about uncovering truth when, in reality, they are about political gamesmanship, media hype and career advancement. My failure to recognize this early in the process caused me to trust the wrong people.

Immediately after we first began publicly releasing information about the baby parts trade, Senator Bob Smith of New Hampshire contacted us. He was outraged at what we had uncovered

and said that he wanted to hold a hearing in the Senate. We informed him that we had a large amount of additional information that we had not made public and would turn it over to him if the hearing became a reality. During our many conversations with Senator Smith, the sticking point was that Senate protocol makes it difficult to issue subpoenas. We all agreed that this was a major stumbling block given that the main players in this scandal were not about to testify without being forced to.

About this same time, we started getting calls from staffers representing the Republican members of the House Commerce Committee. They also wanted to hold a hearing and asked if we would release the additional information to them. They were aware of the Senate rules that made it hard to get subpoenas and they used that as leverage to convince us to work with them rather than Senator Smith. On several occasions, they emphatically assured us that getting multiple subpoenas would be no problem. They also informed us that a hearing could get scheduled much faster in the House than in the Senate.

However, they also made it clear that they were only interested in a hearing under two conditions.

First, we had to give them the additional data before giving it to Smith so the House could beat the Senate to the hearings. They told us point blank that if the Senate held a hearing first, some Senator would end up with all the “face time” in the media and the House would have no interest in a hearing after that. Second, they informed us that they were aware that 20/20 was conducting an investigation and they wanted us to understand that they were not going to hold the hearing if 20/20 backed out. The consistent theme was that the motivating force for members of the House is what they call “face time” in the national media.

Meanwhile, 20/20 was telling us that they didn’t care whether a hearing happened in the Senate or in the House, but unless a hearing was held in one or the other they would probably drop the baby parts story altogether. That put us in the bizarre position of having to make sure the 20/20 piece happened in order to keep Congress interested, while having to make sure that a hearing was held in order to keep 20/20 on board.

About this time, it was becoming increasingly obvious that, at best, Senator Smith would only be able to get one subpoena. We were also being told by sources outside his office that

another major obstacle was that the committee that would be assigned the hearing was chaired by Republican Orrin Hatch of Utah. It was made clear to us that, if Hatch chose to do so, he could make the Senate hearing happen and “*grease the skids*” for the necessary subpoenas. Instead, when Smith’s staff began trying to pull the hearing together they encountered unexpected resistance from Hatch.

We were initially surprised at Hatch’s reluctance to get on board. For many legitimate reasons, his claim to be pro-life is rarely taken seriously and this hearing would have been a perfect low-risk opportunity for him to shore up his standing within the pro-life community. Of course, our surprise evaporated the moment we discovered that some of Hatch’s largest campaign contributions come from the same pharmaceutical companies we were exposing as the main buyers of dead baby parts. In other words, for a successful hearing to be held in the Senate, the pharmaceutical lobby’s handpicked boy would have to be willing to sell them down the river.

That sobering reality left us with a hard decision to make. We felt a profound sense of loyalty toward Senator Smith, but our primary

responsibility was to get this story in front of the American people. We also knew that, to make the hearing effective, we would need at least four subpoenas and Senator Smith was telling us there was a real possibility that he would not be able to get any. Given that, and in light of the Orrin Hatch situation, a hearing in the Senate was starting to look improbable.

At one point we seriously considered abandoning the whole idea of a Congressional hearing. We were never convinced that even a successful hearing would have much effect and we would have been perfectly happy to just take our case directly to the American people. But that was no longer an option since 20/20 was now telling us that without the hearing they would drop the story. We had also discovered that no other national media outlet would take the story because we had already released our undercover material to 20/20. They were not going to spend the time and money necessary to produce a program on this subject as long as there was a risk that they might be scooped by 20/20. In other words, if we lost 20/20 we would lose the national exposure this issue needed.

Given all of these realities, I reluctantly made a decision to go with the House. When we informed

Senator Smith of this, he was graciously disappointed but he understood that subpoenas were the key to success. Then, in a demonstration of complete unselfishness, through his staff he continued to give us advice on how to make the House hearing a success. Regrettably, we were about to learn the hard way that we had walked away from a good honest man who truly cared about this issue, to join a collection of bungling political opportunists. We would soon discover that because we traded commitment with no subpoenas for subpoenas with no commitment, we would end up with neither.

The House Commerce Committee staffers who had called us, and the only people from that group we ever had contact with, were Marc Wheat, Brent Delmonte, and Mark Paoletta. After we made our commitment to support the House hearing, we started giving them the previously unreleased information. Almost immediately, we began to sense that we had made a mistake. Although we were aware that they were obsessed with beating the Senate to hearings, we had no idea that this quest for a political victory over the Senate was going to become the guiding principle behind the hearing.

On several occasions we complained to these three that their willingness to put speed and their political agenda ahead of the pro-life cause was jeopardizing the mission. However, each time we expressed this concern they assured us that the hearing would be a good one, while at the same time making no attempt to conceal the fact that their primary objective was to be first. This remained true even after it was obvious that the Senate was not going to hold a hearing at all. These guys weren't taking any chances.

Another problem was that there was little, if any, commitment by these people to ensure that the House members who would be conducting the hearing were informed, educated, or engaged. Despite the fact that Life Dynamics had spent almost three years investigating and researching this issue and knew more about it than anyone else in the country, our repeated offers to come to Washington – at our expense – and educate Committee members and staff were consistently rejected.

At one point, we found out that the House Commerce Committee staff was coordinating the date for a hearing with the people at 20/20. We also learned that it is not unusual for this sort of thing to happen. Granted, a reasonable argument could be made that this causes no

real harm and that it may increase the public exposure for the issue in question. However, those of us at Life Dynamics were never totally comfortable with the idea that ABC Television would be the one to decide when a Congressional hearing would be held and not the United States Congress. We were certainly aware that politicians and the media routinely manipulate the public, but seeing them actually join forces made us a little uneasy. In any event, it is no coincidence that the hearing took place one day after the 20/20 broadcast.

As time went on, it became clear that – contrary to their rhetoric – the people we were dealing with did not look at this as an opportunity to stop this barbaric practice but as an opportunity to advance their political careers. Evidence of that was seen a few weeks prior to the hearing when we learned that, somewhere in the bowels of the Commerce Committee, the decision had been made that radical pro-abortion Congressman Fred Upton (R-MI) was going to chair the hearing. Obviously, someone who is legitimately pro-life – assuming they are not mentally disturbed – would never consider allowing some pro-abortion to lead a hearing into whether the abortion industry is trafficking in dead baby parts. But Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta not only told us this

might happen, they tried to convince us it was a good idea. That forced us to assume that they were either incredibly naive or motivated by agendas other than those being stated.

In either case, we were not taking the bait. Our attitude was that if someone was going to sabotage the hearing, they were going to do so without the help of Life Dynamics. So we informed the Commerce Committee staff that we would not provide any further data or assistance as long as the hearing was assigned to a sub-committee chaired by a pro-abortion. As we had done many times in the past, we again pointed out that our only goal was to educate the American people about this barbaric practice and that we would much prefer to have no hearing than a bad one. A few days later, the hearing was reassigned to a sub-committee chaired by supposed-pro-lifer Michael Bilirakis (R-FL) and we resumed the flow of information.

As the process continued, our next concern was in the way Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta were processing the information we gave them. We had provided them with orders for baby parts, price lists for baby parts, brochures and advertising materials for baby parts, internal abortion industry financial records documenting

the sale of baby parts, abortion clinic protocols for the harvesting of baby parts, tissue logs, parts inventory lists, shipping documentation and much more. Then we spent hours on the phone going over each of these documents with them to make certain they understood their significance. Our frustration was that they always seemed to be largely disinterested in this “*meat and potatoes*” stuff. Their only real interest was in Dean Alberty – the abortion industry employee who had put us onto the baby parts trail in the first place.

Alberty had worked as a retrieval agent for both the Anatomic Gift Foundation and Opening Lines. He eventually became sickened by what he was doing and decided to get out. The final straw came when he was brought a stainless steel bucket containing twins who had survived their abortion and were still moving around. When he told the abortionist that he would not harvest parts from them because they were still alive, the abortionist filled the container with water. Once they had drowned them, Alberty then retrieved the parts. Prior to this episode, Alberty claims that the only time he dissected living children was when he believed they were dead and only learned otherwise after he had cut them open and witnessed the heart beating.

Immediately after the twins incident, circumstances put Alberty into contact with Life Dynamics. For the next 31 months, he worked undercover for us gathering the documentation we needed to prove that the abortion industry was trafficking in the bodies and body parts of the babies they kill.

From the day we began working with him, there was never a question in our minds about his knowledge of the inner workings of the baby parts business. In fact, he once told us that he was actually instrumental in the formation of Opening Lines and we eventually determined that he was telling the truth. However, during our time with him it became clear to us that he was, quite understandably, a deeply wounded and traumatized individual. For that, and a variety of other reasons, we knew that using him as the centerpiece of the hearing instead of the hard data we had accumulated was a formula for disaster.

Another problem we anticipated had to do with the nature of people who become spies. During our years of infiltrating the abortion industry, we have dealt with many of them and continue to do so today. One thing we have learned through this experience is that spies are unpredictable and unreliable. Moreover,

they lie to the people for whom they are spying. That is why we never trust anything they tell us until and unless we are able to get independent documentation.

As for Alberty, from the first day we began talking to him there were several instances in which he told us things that we either knew at the time were not true or discovered to be untrue later on. This was something which, on more than one occasion, we informed the producer for 20/20 and the House Commerce Committee staffers. In fact, we repeatedly warned Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta that the hearing would blow up in their faces if they allowed it to revolve around Alberty and what he might do or say.

More importantly, there was no practical reason to make Alberty the focal point of the hearing. Long before this hearing was even contemplated, we could back up every claim we were making with solid unimpeachable documentation.

Since we didn't need Alberty to make the case, using him was simply a risk not worth taking. That is why, on numerous occasions, we strongly advised Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta to relate to Alberty in the same way we always had.

Over the years, we have learned to look upon spies and infiltrators like bird dogs. They tell us

what we're looking for and where to dig, but we never assume that what they are saying is valid until we uncover the necessary documentation, corroboration or verification.

In the case of Alberty, we never went public with any of the things he told us until after we acquired a substantial body of documentation to back them up. In fact, he told us some things regarding this issue that we are fully confident are true, but we have never made them public because we couldn't get independent validation.

Unfortunately, all of our warnings about Alberty fell on deaf ears. Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta steadfastly dismissed the possibility that we might know more about him than they did, despite the fact that they had never met him and we had been working with him for almost three years. Their attitude was that Alberty was going to be the star of the hearing and there was nothing to discuss. It seems that in the grimy world of Washington politics, the opportunity to grandstand in front of a packed hearing room with a real, live, flesh and blood spy is just too seductive to resist.

As the date for the hearing approached, we learned that three Republicans, Bilirakis, Upton,

and Jim Greenwood (R-PA) had joined with Committee Democrats in calling for a closed hearing. When it started to leak out that the hearing may be held in secret, the Democrats began to fear that this could backfire and create a public relations problem. At that point, they quietly dropped the plan. However, just the fact they seriously contemplated barring both the media and the public from the hearing suggested to us that an organized cover-up was underway. We later saw that this was also a preview of just how nasty and underhanded the Committee's pro-aborts – both Republicans and Democrats – were prepared to be in order to protect the abortion industry.

This was further confirmed when an even more sinister plot surfaced in the days immediately preceding the hearing. Alberty, and another witness who had agreed to testify, called us and said that they had received threatening phone calls from lawyers associated with the Commerce Committee's Democrats. In one call, Alberty said he was even told that if he showed up for the hearing he would be arrested for murder!

When we informed the Committee's Republican staff about this development they agreed to look into it. Later, we received a call back saying that

an attorney for the Committee had contacted the Democrat attorney whose name Alberty had given us. They said that this attorney openly admitted that she had indeed made the calls. Even more shocking was that, even though she was warned that these actions might constitute illegal witness tampering and obstruction of justice, the calls continued. In fact, the last one was made the day before the hearing began.

We were told that the Republican members of the Committee were outraged and considered this an extremely serious matter that could result in arrest warrants and criminal charges for those responsible. We were also told that these Committee members had vowed that this incident would be the first order of business to be addressed at the hearing.

Regarding the subpoena issue, we were asked by Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta to supply the names of people we thought should be called as witnesses. A few days later, we provided a list of about 10 or 12 people. After that, however, we began to notice that these guys started tap-dancing anytime we asked questions about the status of the subpoenas. At one point, they even tried to downplay the subpoena issue by telling us that it wasn't necessary to

subpoena some of the names on our list because these people had agreed to come in voluntarily. As an example, they said they had talked to Jim and Brenda Bardsley who ran the Anatomic Gift Foundation – one of the most prolific baby parts dealers in America – and the Bardsleys had promised to voluntarily appear on their own.

So now, we were being asked to believe that the Bardsleys were going to just stroll into a hearing in front of the United States Congress and – with no legal requirement that they do so – start detailing their role in the baby-killing / grave-robbing business.

Obviously, we were not stupid enough to buy that nonsense, nor were we stupid enough to think that Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta were buying it either. This was nothing more than some half-baked plan they dreamed up to divert attention away from the “*subpoenas-are-no-problem*” sales pitch they used to trick us into choosing them over the Senate. In fact, we always felt it was highly unlikely that these guys ever talked to either the Bardsleys or any of the other witnesses they said would voluntarily appear.

Of course, we will never know for certain whether that’s true or not, but what we do know is that, in the end, the House only issued one subpoena. It was served by federal marshals on Dr. Miles Jones – Alberty’s former employer, one of the main players in the securing and marketing of baby parts, and the primary target of the 20/20 program.

All of these facts, combined with the failure of Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta to even marginally prepare the pro-life members of the Committee, convinced us that the hearing was destined to be a nightmare and that, at the end of the day, Alberty was going to end up slowly twisting in the wind with a rope around his neck.

And that is precisely what happened. To begin with, the assurances we were given that the first order of business at the hearing was going to be about the possibility of illegal witness tampering and obstruction of justice by the Democrats was a lie. It didn’t happen. For whatever reason, this was not the first issue addressed, or the second one, or even the third one. In fact, it was never brought up.

As for Miles Jones – the only person subpoenaed to appear at the hearing – he

chose not to show up. However, the House apparently decided to just let it slide since no warrant or other legal action was ever taken against him for defying the subpoena. Of course, this meant that the only subpoena issued by the House was meaningless. Beyond that – and to no one’s surprise – Jones wasn’t the only no-show. Neither the Bardsleys nor any of the other “voluntary” witnesses from the baby parts industry made an appearance.

Given these realities, the Democrats knew they could dominate the hearing and by the time it began they were practically foaming at the mouth. Their strategy was immediately obvious. Having recognized that the trafficking of baby parts by their buddies in the abortion industry could be neither denied nor defended, their only option was to head off any discussion of it. In order to create such a diversion, this pack of moral hyenas unleashed a personal attack on Alberty that was nasty, deceptive and well orchestrated.

Throughout the afternoon and into the night, Alberty was badgered, bullied and beaten without mercy. The inquisition conducted by rabid pro-aborts Anna Eshoo (D-CA) and Diana DeGette (D-CO) was nothing less than hysterical ranting. We also saw that our instincts about Fred Upton – the pro-abort Republican who

Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta wanted to chair the hearing – were correct. When the Democrats began to savage Alberty, Upton immediately joined the feeding frenzy along with fellow pro-abortion Republican, Jim Greenwood.

Eventually, Alberty admitted that he had told Life Dynamics some things that were not true. That was no surprise to us since we had caught him in several lies over the years – a fact which we had repeated to Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta on several occasions. Of course, Alberty’s admissions dovetailed perfectly with the strategy designed by the Committee pro-aborts. They were going to see to it that this hearing was not about the trafficking of dead baby parts but about the sins of Dean Alberty – regardless of how insignificant and/or irrelevant they might be. Playing into this strategy was the fact that Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta had completely ignored our warnings about Alberty. That left the Committee’s pro-life members completely unprepared to deal with these issues.

A perfect example of this was when Alberty admitted that he had never actually seen money change hands for the purchase of baby parts. He was then asked why he told Life Dynamics that he had seen this when, in fact, he hadn’t.

There was an audible gasp in the room when he said that he was simply telling us what he thought we wanted to hear. Naturally, the Committee pro-aborts knew they had struck oil and they immediately went into their phony “shocked and outraged” mode. Needless to say, they quickly recovered and started hammering away on Alberty even more viciously.

The reality about this particular issue is that Alberty never told us he had seen money change hands and we never told anyone that Alberty claimed to have seen money change hands. In fact, at no time was this issue ever raised since there is no reason to expect that Alberty would have been a witness to these payments. He was simply a technician employed by a “wholesaler” to retrieve parts from inside the clinic. The wholesaler paid the clinic owner a “*site fee*” for giving him a space to work and access to the dead babies. The wholesaler then sold the parts to the end user. In short, all financial transactions took place between the wholesaler, the clinic and the end users. There was no reason for Alberty to be involved and, consequently, he wasn’t involved. He was simply an employee who received a paycheck.

In effect, Alberty was no different than a man

who works on a General Motors assembly line. This employee doesn’t personally witness GM paying its suppliers for steel and he doesn’t personally witness GM receiving payment for the cars it sells to dealers. Nonetheless, he is certainly aware that this is how the system works. If such an employee described this arrangement to others, no one would suggest that he was lying simply because he had never actually seen any money change hands.

Of course, the most important consideration regarding this subject is that it is completely irrelevant whether Alberty witnessed or did not witness the payments. We provided independent and irrefutable documentation that they were made. For a significant part of the time we spent in our investigation, we had infiltrators other than Alberty giving us information and one of those operatives provided financial records for the same clinic where Alberty worked. Those records give detailed accounts of payments made between Alberty’s employer and the clinic. In addition, the price lists provided by the wholesaler to the end users, combined with the orders received from the buyers and the tissue logs of parts shipped, clearly document the money trail. We also had undercover-recorded conversations with wholesalers in

which they described the financial arrangements in unambiguous detail. All of this material was turned over to Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta.

The point is, if the pro-aborts on the Committee had been interested in finding out whether the parts of dead babies were being sold for profit, they could have easily done so without asking Alberty one single question. However, getting to the truth was not their goal. Their goal was to get to Alberty and when he used the line about telling us what he thought we wanted to hear, they knew they could use it as a way to keep from talking about the trafficking in baby parts. And this is just one of many examples of how the Committee's pro-abortion Democrats used diversion and deception to manipulate the hearing.

Meanwhile, pro-life Republicans Tom Coburn (R-OK), Barbara Cubin (R-WY), Charles Norwood (R-GA), Nathan Deal (R-GA) and Ed Bryant (R-TN) did the best they could, but they were simply outgunned. Throughout the day, they were repeatedly blindsided by issues that we had told Wheat, Delmonte and Paoletta were coming.

The most frustrating aspect of all this was that we had spent almost three years investigating

this issue, had gathered a substantial body of documentation, knew more about the baby parts trade than anyone else in the country, and were sitting in the second row. Yet, even after it was clear that the hearing was spiraling toward the ground, and despite the fact that these shell-shocked Commerce Committee staffers were frozen in place with no clue about what to do next, we were never asked for our input or advise. We had to quietly sit there knowing that every distortion, every innuendo and every lie the pro-aborts were using to sabotage the hearing could have been easily defeated and turned into a positive.

In the final analysis, a Congressional hearing created to investigate the marketing of baby parts lasted all day and into the night without spending one single moment in legitimate discussion about the marketing of baby parts. This sorry episode serves as irrefutable proof of two things. First, the pro-life movement must not only be vigilant against the enemy who would stab us in the chest, but also against the ally who would stab us in the back. And second, in the world of those who defend legal abortion, the supply of truth will always exceed the demand for it.

Today, we are routinely asked whether aborted baby parts are still being bought and sold. When we respond that they are, we are inevitably asked why the federal laws that prohibit it are not being enforced. The short answer is that there is no political will to enforce these laws. In a roundabout way, that was the theme of a meeting we had in DC with two pro-life political operatives who had direct ties to the Republican leadership in Congress. Well before the hearing had even been scheduled, we had furnished them copies of the baby parts orders as well as a body of other materials which, at that time, we had not made public.

During that meeting, they told us that they had looked at our materials and concluded that our biggest obstacle in trying to stop the trafficking of baby parts was the fact that the Democrats were in bed with the sellers and the Republicans were in bed with the buyers. Regrettably, that turned out to be the most significant insight we ever received as to why nothing will ever be done about this issue.

We had always expected that the Democrats on the committee would be a problem. After all, like the national leadership of their party, these people are nothing more than amoral toadies

for the abortion lobby and that was clearly evident at the hearing.

What we had not factored in was that Republicans in Congress routinely get enormous financial contributions from the pharmaceutical corporations and biotech companies that buy the baby parts. And while this is not what doomed the hearing, what it did do is make certain the baby parts inquiry went no further. By the time the hearing was over, the Republicans who take contributions from these pharmaceutical and biotech companies had come to see that, for them, the baby parts issue is a sleeping dog that is better left unkicked.

That's where the issue stands today and that's where it will remain.

Having said all this, it would be unfair and inaccurate for me to imply that every member of Congress we encountered during this process was a spineless political hack. As I indicated earlier, during our association with Senator Smith there was never a moment when he put personal ambition or party loyalty ahead of principle. In addition, at the hearing it was clear that Commerce Committee Representatives Tom Coburn, Barbara Cubin, Charles Norwood,

Nathan Deal and Ed Bryant were more than willing to fight. Unfortunately, they had been emasculated by the arrogance and incompetence of the Committee's staff. I should also add that we received unwavering support from Congressmen Tom Tancredo of Colorado and Chris Smith of New Jersey, neither of whom were members of this particular committee.

Looking back on it now, I wish I had let the pro-life members of the Committee know what was going on with their staffers during the run-up to the hearing. I remain convinced that had they been made aware of how poorly they were being served by these people, the changes necessary to produce a different outcome would have been made.

The frightening thing is, people who are knowledgeable about the day-to-day workings of our nation's capital have assured me that the political gamesmanship and abysmal dishonesty demonstrated in the baby parts hearing is standard operating procedure. It seems that the only goal of a Congressional hearing is to score political points and the credit for any truth that oozes out is owed to the law of unintended consequences.

Whenever I think about the phony hearing into the trafficking of aborted baby parts, I recall an observation made by William F. Buckley many years ago. He said that the country could not be run any worse by the first 535 people in his city's phone book than it is by the 535 members of Congress. I have now seen for myself the genius of that statement.

Fact Check

Following the 20/20 broadcast and the House hearing, the abortion lobby has made many false, misleading and outlandish claims related to the issues raised during these events. We have addressed a few of the ones we know about.

MYTH: Dean Alberty was paid \$20,000 by Life Dynamics for the "Kelly" interview.

FACT: At the hearing, Alberty testified under oath that he was actually paid \$400 to compensate him for the time he spent traveling to the Life Dynamics office in Texas, conducting the interview, and returning home.

The \$20,000 figure being thrown about represents the entire amount paid to Alberty over the two-and-a-half years he worked for us.

The actual amount was \$21,426.04 and less than half of it was compensation. The majority was dollar-for-dollar reimbursement for expenses he incurred while attending abortion industry conferences and seminars on our behalf. This included, airline tickets, hotels, food, registration fees, association dues, tapes and books, etc.

From the beginning of this project until its end, Alberty's personal earnings from Life Dynamics averaged less than \$310 per month, and those payments were primarily to compensate him for salary he lost when he took time off from his regular employment to work for us.

We provided this financial information, as well as the documentation supporting it, to the Democrats on the Commerce Committee prior to the hearing. However, when they introduced it into the hearing they carefully chose their words to focus solely on the entire amount and were clearly avoiding the breakdown of what the money actually paid for. The result of their dishonesty has been that, to this day, the media and the abortion lobby continue to lie about the financial relationship between Alberty and Life Dynamics.

MYTH: Alberty now says that Life Dynamics altered the "Kelly" interview.

FACT: Alberty has done no such thing. He had never seen the tape until being shown it by attorneys representing the Anatomic Gift Foundation almost a year after it was recorded. Due to the time that had elapsed, Alberty stated that he did not remember the entire interview verbatim and, therefore, could not state for certain whether Life Dynamics had altered it or not. Since he made that statement, Life Dynamics has released the raw unedited footage of the original interview showing that no alterations were made.

MYTH: Alberty has recanted his testimony in the "Kelly" interview.

FACT: Again, Alberty has done no such thing. He only admitted that he had no personal knowledge of, and therefore could not prove, some of the things he told us.

For example, on the "Kelly" tape Alberty said that his employer was profiting from the marketing of baby parts. When pressed by the pro-aborts at the hearing, he admitted that he had never actually seen money change hands

and, therefore, had no proof of this. However, he did not “recant” as some have claimed and say that his employer was not profiting from the marketing of baby parts. More importantly, Life Dynamics has provided documentation from a source other than Alberty showing that his employer was indeed profiting from the marketing of baby parts. So while some might reasonably argue that Alberty’s admission undermines his credibility, the independent documentation we provided proves that his claim was accurate whether he had personal knowledge of it or not.

This is a typical example of what the abortion industry is calling a recantation. In no case was it a matter of Alberty saying that something he told us wasn’t true but that, in some instances, he told us things that he could not prove. An analogy would be a situation in which the body of a murder victim has been found and someone steps forward to say they witnessed the crime. If it is later determined that this person didn’t actually witness the murder, that doesn’t change the fact that a murder was committed. Moreover, if details provided by this person are supported by other evidence, the authorities would not ignore what he is saying simply because he lied about seeing the crime take place.

That is, however, precisely what apologists for the abortion industry expect the American people to do regarding Alberty and the marketing of baby parts. Since the hearing, their strategy has been to suggest that because Alberty misled Life Dynamics about certain, at times inconsequential, aspects of the baby parts marketing scandal, then the scandal is not occurring. As illogical as it sounds, they have convinced themselves that because Alberty lied to us they can lie to the public.

The reality is that Alberty has never backed away from his charge that some people within the abortion industry are trafficking in the dead bodies and body parts of aborted babies. Furthermore, every significant allegation he has ever made regarding this issue has been confirmed by other witnesses, evidence or documentation.

MYTH: The baby parts story turned out to be a hoax fabricated by Life Dynamics.

FACT: When we began releasing documentation about the trafficking in baby parts, we revealed by name the individuals, corporations and organizations involved. If we had fabricated this story, or if our documentation had been

inaccurate or manufactured, within hours of going public with it our parking lot would have been swarming with lawyers and process servers. The only thing that kept them from burying us in an avalanche of litigation, is the fact that in any libel, slander or defamation lawsuit, truth is an absolute defense. And every person, corporation and organization we named knew that our information was accurate. To this day, not one of them has even so much as threatened us with litigation.

MYTH: The documents used to support the claim that baby parts are being marketed were illegally stolen by burglars working for Life Dynamics.

FACT: Life Dynamics has never participated in nor encouraged anyone else to participate in a burglary. Every single document in question was legally provided to Life Dynamics by Alberty or other whistle-blowers employed in the abortion industry.

MYTH: Miles Jones, the baby parts broker who was featured in the 20/20 piece and who then ignored the Congressional subpoena, is actually just an actor hired by Life Dynamics.

FACT: The lunacy of this claim makes it difficult

to address. On one hand, those of us at Life Dynamics are so stupid that we hired an actor to impersonate a living person who is not only well-known in the abortion industry but also has a high-profile history which is easily researched on the internet. At the same time, however, we are so brilliant that we were able to (a) trick the United States Congress into issuing a subpoena for someone who doesn't exist, and (b) convince the unabashedly pro-abortion ABC News to give us 20 minutes of free airtime on national television to promote our pro-life agenda.



Copyright 2000

Life Dynamics Incorporated

Post Office Box 2226

Denton, Texas 76202

940 | 380-8800

*This report was funded by the supporters
of Life Dynamics Incorporated.*

*Life Dynamics Incorporated is a
501(c)(3) corporation and
donations may be
tax deductible.*

