For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord.

Luke 2:11

Merry Christmas, from all of us at National Right to Life!
Won’t you Help Us Fight for LIFE?

In the hustle and bustle of the Christmas season, when our thoughts turn to loved ones near and far, may I ask you to think about someone else who needs not only our love but our protection?

She is floating in a darkened womb. She hears her mother’s every heartbeat. At 22 weeks old, her own heart beats strong. Full of promise and hope she is as alive as you and I.

And with your help, National Right to Life fights to protect her right to life even though she will never know it. Made possible by your generosity, NRLC also battles for the mother who is looking down at her son who is quietly brushing the hair back from his forehead. The soft, rhythmic sound of the ventilator interrupts her thoughts. She glances away from his face long enough to look up at the cardiac monitor and she smiles – his heart also beats strong. He is alive and a mother hopes.

We fight for his right to life even though he may never know what was done on his behalf.

And then there is that precious great-grandmother. The flowers on her nightstand

See “Giving,” page 24

“If it wasn’t for adoption”: The Ghost of Christmas that Would Have Been

By Joleigh Little Bass, WRTL Region Coordinator and Teens for Life Director

Christmas season is here and it is full of the usual activities – hustling everywhere, shopping, wrapping, baking, singing, eating and so much more. It is a time of year where we can all pause (in between checking things off our massive to-do lists) and reflect on the many gifts we have. For those of us who live in America, the blessings are so bountiful that, even on our worst days, we have more than so many others around the globe.

If you’re the parent of small children, like I am, one of the highlights of this season is the Christmas concerts in which your dazzlingly talented and beautiful children will perform. I love my girls’ concerts both at our church and at their school.

See “Adoption,” page 6
Editorials

The amazing things you make possible when you donate to National Right to Life

So it was, that while they were there, the days were completed for Mary to be delivered. "And she brought forth her firstborn Son, and wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger, because there was no room for Him in the inn."

A week before Christmas, the celebration of the birth of the Christ child, and Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Wolf extends to unborn children not gold, frankincense and myrrh but dismemberment, destruction, and death. With a heart of stone he vetoes a bill that offers the little ones protection from an abortion “technique” so vicious King Herod would have thought twice.

In his veto message, Wolf amazingly describes SB 3 as “the anti-choice legislation that would severely limit women’s reproductive rights and health care options.” Really?

Under SB3 abortionist would no longer be free to employ sharp metal tools to tear a living unborn child apart, piece by piece, until she bleeds to death. Only in the upside world of a former Planned Parenthood “escort” could this possibly be construed a “severe” limit.

In the turning point of The Christmas Carol, Scrooge asks the Ghost of Christmas Yet-to-Come “tell me if Tiny Tim will live.” “I see a vacant seat,” replied the Ghost, “in the poor chimney-corner, and a crutch without an owner, carefully preserved. If these shadows remain unaltered by the Future, the child will die.”

Through your unfailing generosity, altering the shadows of ignorance is what National Right to Life is all about. We firmly believe, and have since 1968, in win-win. NRLC believes you can and you must love them both—the unborn child and the abortion-inclined mother who sustains her baby’s life.

“A Thing I’ll Never Understand”: the tragedy of an unborn life cut short

When a character on a television program (almost always unmarried) becomes pregnant, the writers can either allow the baby to be born, abort him or her, or have the mother suffer a miscarriage. Often critics, especially pro-abortion critics, get bent out of shape. To them a miscarriage is an evasion—that is, she should have aborted and would have if the writers were more “realistic.”

But in real life there is an entirely new sensitivity to the tragedy of miscarriage. We have carried many stories about very, very wanted babies who died in utero or within hours of their premature births. That awareness appears in the fourth episode of the final season of Longmire. No one who witnessed this keenly attuned portrayal would ever suggest the program copped out. My wife and I were both moved, with me close to tears. [Spoiler alert. I spell out in detail what happened.]

For those who don’t know Longmire, the series is in its sixth season. It started on A&E and migrated to Netflix where it has gathered a determined and loyal following. The show is described as “Based on the Walt Longmire mystery novels by best-selling author Craig Johnson, this contemporary crime drama stars Australian actor Robert Taylor in the title role, the charismatic and dedicated sheriff of Absaroka County, Wyoming.”

Walt Longmire is a man of very few words who is fiercely loyal to his daughter, his best friend since childhood, Henry Standing Bear, and his deputies. Walt’s integrity is impeccable and he’s the kind of man dads want their sons to grow up to be like.

His late wife was murdered (something we didn’t know when the series began in 2012) and there has long been an undertow of possible romance (someday) between Walt and his deputy, Victoria “Vic” Moretti [Katee Sackhoff].

See “Amazing,” page 8

See “Spirit,” page 31
In his literary masterpiece, *A Christmas Carol*, Charles Dickens writes, “...It is good to be children sometimes, and never better than at Christmas, when its mighty founder was a child himself.”

Christmas does seem to be extra special for children. There is excitement in the air; they get parts in school and church programs; they wonder what special gifts will be under the Christmas tree for them.

But, as every pro-lifer knows, not every child gets to experience those delights.

The outlines of Dickens’ classic are known to almost everyone. The miserly Scrooge is shown his past, present, and future by various spirits on Christmas Eve.

The spirit of Christmas present shows Scrooge and the home and family of his clerk Bob Cratchit. The reader is introduced to Cratchit’s son, Tim, who is sick and uses a crutch. The family can’t afford to get him the help he needs.

As the spirit of Christmas future shows Scrooge what will happen if nothing changes, we find out that Tiny Tim doesn’t survive.

I was reminded of this story when I read news articles about Alfie Evans, an 18-month-old boy in the United Kingdom (UK).

Alfie is not terminally ill but has been unconscious for a year with a mysterious brain condition. A hospital in Italy is willing to take Alfie as a patient to continue seeking treatment. A hospital in Italy is willing to take Alfie as a patient to continue seeking treatment.

On New Year's Eve 2016, doctors told the family Alfie only had a couple of hours to live, but he proved them wrong. Alfie’s parents say they are in a living nightmare; that the hospital has applied to the High Court to remove parental rights and withdraw ventilation to end Alfie’s life.

There have been many comparisons to Charlie Gard, a baby who was in the Great Ormond Street Hospital, another UK hospital. Charlie’s parents wanted to take him to the United States to another medical provider willing to care for him. However, tragically, the Great Ormond Street Hospital prevailed and Charlie died.

We’ve had similar cases right here in the U.S where “quality of life” issues surfaced. In 2010, Simon Crosier was born with a bilateral cleft lip. Although a serious condition, such cases can and have been successfully addressed with surgery and treatment.

However, because Simon was also diagnosed with Full Trisomy 18, his medical providers refused to treat him and, without parental approval, gave him comfort food (to keep him comfortable while starving him), placed a DNR order on his chart, and turned off his monitor. Simon died just before his three-month birthday.

One of the “feel good” results of Scrooge making a drastic turnaround in his life is that he helped Tiny Tim get the care he needed. The two became very close and Dickens writes that Scrooge became “a second father.”

I don’t know what treatment and medical care Tiny Tim presumably received in the story but medical advancements have made it possible for boys (and girls) like Tiny Tim to get the kind of health care Charles Dickens could maybe not even have imagined in 1843.

Unfortunately, in today’s culture, that treatment is readily withheld based on someone’s perception that the person involved has no value and, in fact, would be better off dead.

When I think of the 60 million unborn babies aborted in our country; when I reflect on the decisions made to end the lives of babies like Charlie and Simon, and now maybe Alfie, I wonder why so many in society are afraid of babies, born and unborn. How did they become the enemy?

Then I think of all the amazing effort being put into changing our culture by you and millions of pro-lifers working on behalf of these innocent little ones. Through education and legislation, you seek to raise awareness on behalf of those with different challenges, whether it be a cleft lip/palate or a trisomy difference.

You work tirelessly to elect candidates and pass legislation to protect unborn children. You work to educate your communities about how precious are the lives of the vulnerable ones. You work with abortion-minded pregnant mothers to recognize the gift of life. You desire no less to safeguard the elderly and those with disabilities from euthanasia and assisted suicide.

I can honestly say I have never met in the right-to-life movement an example of the Scrooge who existed before he was visited by the three spirits. I have, however, met innumerable pro-lifers who embody the renewed Scrooge-- people whose lives are filled with joy; people who love those around them and who are determined to reflect an attitude of respect for other human beings.

The center of Christmas was a child Himself. We recognize the precious gift of life and, to Christians, His gift of salvation. I thank God every time I think of you and how you use your time and talents to defend Life.

After his transformation, it was said of Scrooge that he knew how to keep Christmas well. As Dickens ends the story, “May that be truly said of us, and all of us! And so, as Tiny Tim observed, God bless Us, Every One!”
have wilted in the week since her 86th birthday. She doesn’t always remember specifics and sometimes she gets confused, but she knows enough to refuse the Do Not Resuscitate order the nurses at her assisted living facility are insisting she sign. She’s healthy, she’s alive – and we fight for her right to life even though she likely will never know what was done on her behalf.

Finally there is that remarkable young man. The accident robbed him of his ability to walk but his drive burns undiminished. He pushed himself across a wooden stage to accept his college diploma, he “danced” at his daughter’s wedding in a light-weight aluminum wheelchair, and at his retirement party his family gifted him the latest motorized version.

But now he worries about insurance denying needed surgery because of his disability. He has a beautiful retirement ahead, he’s alive – and we fight for his right to life, because often, if not NRLC, who?

For decades, NRLC has worked quietly, faithfully, and effectively to make a difference, not a statement. It is wonderful that pro-life champion Rep. Chris Smith calls NRLC “the hub, the nerve center, of the pro-life movement,” but it is what we are able to do with that hard-earned reputation that matters. And that is to defend the powerless, to be a voice for a voiceless, to stand up when the odds seem overwhelming and prevail.

Unlike Planned Parenthood, we have no government pipeline pouring tens of millions of dollars into our coffers. We have only you. But that is all we need.

Please as we approach the season of giving, remembering when the world received the ultimate gift, consider a generous gift to the NRL Committee or the NRL Educational Foundation.
Fetal organ harvesting investigation bursts into the open

By Right to Life of Michigan

Following the release of undercover videos from David Daleiden and the Center for Medical Progress, Planned Parenthood went into public relations overdrive to put a lid on the revelation that they profit by selling the organs of aborted babies.

In the last two weeks several news stories have undone Planned Parenthood’s narrative that these “heavily edited” videos are entirely untrue. On December 7, the Daily Beast broke the news that the Department of Justice is in the process of investigating Planned Parenthood for their fetal organ harvesting schemes. Congress held numerous hearings about the matter and the DOJ has asked them to turn over documents for their investigation.

On December 9, news broke that two California companies are being forced to shut down for their role in fetal organ harvesting. DaVinci Biosciences and DV Biologics were successfully investigated in Orange County, and the terms of their settlement with the district attorney include a $7.7 million fine and admitting to breaking state and federal organ harvesting prohibitions. Daleiden’s undercover videos are the only reason these companies were caught, and it was the Center for Medical Progress itself that filed the complaints. Unfortunately for those two companies, they don’t hold the political or media sway of Planned Parenthood.

On December 11, it was announced that the FBI is investigating the University of New Mexico and an infamous abortion clinic in Albuquerque for fetal organ harvesting. That’s two successful prosecutions and two open federal investigations based on these so-called “heavily edited” videos.

Planned Parenthood’s spin was a sham from the beginning. Daleiden’s videos were not heavily edited and the full footage and transcripts were released for each step in their investigation. They are publicly accessible to anyone honestly interested in the truth.

Planned Parenthood used these investigations to claim they have been “cleared.” In Michigan, for example, Planned Parenthood had ceased harvesting eyeballs in the state in the past. There’s nothing to clear.

In California, where the bulk of Planned Parenthood’s fetal organ harvesting took place, most public officials including their current and former attorneys general are de facto staff members of Planned Parenthood. Right now they are occupied with forcing prolife pregnancy centers to advertise free tax-funded abortions and targeting the Little Sisters of the Poor again. How does any honest person expect them to sincerely investigate potential violations?

In Texas, the prosecutors investigating their case took it upon themselves to manipulate a grand jury into a legally-baseless attack on David Daleiden on behalf of Planned Parenthood. The case was thrown out, but not before Planned Parenthood used it to frame Daleiden as a crook in the news media.

Planned Parenthood’s public relations strategy is never to confront an issue head-on, but to deceive even their own supporters into peddling lies or half-truths. They count on a friendly media to never call them on it, even when knowing lies are caught on camera for everyone to see.

The Achilles heel of these investigations will be the personnel responsible for it. As this case has demonstrated—and numerous cases over time—pro-choice public officials can never be trusted to hold the abortion industry accountable. We hope those investigating Planned Parenthood will keep an open mind as they view the evidence for themselves.

Even more undercover footage from Daleiden is currently being blocked by a pro-abortion judge. We hope those videos will soon be released. After all, the public is forced to fund Planned Parenthood with their tax dollars: they have the right to know the truth.
“If it wasn’t for adoption”: The Ghost of Christmas that Would Have Been

From page 1

As they prepare excitedly for each event, I find myself in a state of mind that may or may not be unique to mamas whose kids come from far off places – locations often decidedly less advantaged than where we live, and often lacking some of the basic freedoms we take for granted.

You would think by now, year six of being a mom at Christmas time, I would be prepared for the overwhelming tide of “the feels” that grab me somewhere in the second week of December. But somehow, every year, I’m surprised anew at just how strong the emotions are.

Call it, perhaps, the Ghost of Christmas that Would Have Been.

I’m almost always sitting in the back of our quiet little church watching a rehearsal for the girls’ big program, or in the hushed auditorium of their school awaiting the first note at their concert. (Yes, I am fully aware that this is the best time for the Christmas Feels, because it is… well, QUIET, something that our tiny home is not with two busy little humans high on Christmas cheer. And cocoa.)

It’s always the exact same realization that lodges in my throat and threatens to trickle out my eyes, one tear at a time. My girls are up there on the stage, singing, signing something in American Sign Language, reciting beloved passages from Luke 2, and generally glowing, when it hits me.

If it wasn’t for adoption, they wouldn’t be here in a warm church or school, dressed in waves of red tulle and bows, waving excitedly out at their mom and dad from the stage. Because Clara and Annelise weren’t always those comfortable and confident daughters, the joy that radiates from both of them is absolutely unique to children who are safely ensconced in a family that loves them. This glow that is almost palpable nearly takes my breath away, at bay most of the rest of the year (except on birthdays, at family gatherings and spring concerts) – isn’t enough, The Ghost of Christmas Yet to Come reminds me that our little community of faith and tiny village in northwestern Wisconsin are still missing one: Anna Joy. She is a child whose picture still shows sad eyes and an emptiness that is hard to describe unless you’ve sat in a room with it – something I have done on more than one occasion, and will never forget.

She is the daughter of our dearest friends – the people with whom I leave my girls when I travel – but as of yet, she has no idea that she belongs halfway around the world. Her life is still bleak in the way only an orphan’s life can be. Without adoption she would never have a family to tuck her in at night, or comfort her when she is sick.

But, oh the life that awaits her here! As I watch my beautiful, happy, funny girls dance their way (quite literally) through this holiday season, I pray that many others like them will find their place in a family by next Christmas. And I pray that we who are SO far beyond blessed will continue to take stock of what we have and, therefore, what we can afford to give.

We have so much. Let’s not keep it to ourselves.
Ohio Senate approves Down Syndrome Non-Discrimination Act, bill sent to Gov. Kasich

By Dave Andrusko

“On December 13, by a vote of 20-12, the Ohio Senate approved the Down Syndrome Non-Discrimination Act which prohibits abortions for the sole reason of a Down syndrome diagnosis. As NRL News Today reported previously, on November 1, the House overwhelmingly passed the measure, 63-30.

The legislation was sponsored by State Reps. Sarah LaTourette and Derek Merrin and by State Sen. Frank LaRose.

Under SB 164 it would be illegal for abortionists to commit or attempt to commit an abortion based on a diagnosis of Down syndrome. Currently Indiana and North Dakota also ban abortions based on genetic anomalies.

Gov. Kasich has previously said he would sign such a bill into law. As the Cincinnati Enquirer reported

Kasich, responding to a question from former vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin, whose son has Down syndrome.

The Columbus Dispatch’s Megan Henry previously quoted Sen. LaRose, the bill’s sponsor, who said, “To me, this a matter of medical ethics,” adding “It’s a matter of what kind of society do we want to have here in the state of Ohio.”

As the bill was working its way through the House last month, Rep. LaTourette told the Toledo Blade the bill ends the lethal discrimination against Down syndrome children in the womb.

“I continue to say that this bill is about so much more than abortion,” Rep. LaTourette told Jim Provance. “I truly believe that it’s about discriminating against some of our most vulnerable, discriminating against an unborn child simply because they might have a Down Syndrome diagnosis. That’s something that I find absolutely unacceptable.”
A Christmas Carol for our times

By Maria Gallagher, Legislative Director, Pennsylvania Pro-Life Federation

He sought to tell the story of a miserly old man whose hatred of all things Christmas had reduced him to a shadow. The writer chose to educate his disagreeable main character by having him encounter the ghosts of past, present, and future.

Much of the author’s prose centered on regret, with lines such as “No rest, no peace. Incessant torture of remorse.” A ghost informs the protagonist, “I wear the chain I forged in life. I made it link by link, and yard by yard; I girded it on of my own free will, and of my own free will I wore it.” If Charles Dickens’ classic *A Christmas Carol* were to be revised for our times, Ebenezer’s greed and selfishness might have led him to be a participant in the culture of death—making his money from the misery of abortion, even coercing the love of his life to have one.

And this line from the classic work might have taken on new meaning, “No space of regret can make amends for one life’s opportunity missed.” And so too would this one: “For it is good to be children sometimes, and never better than at Christmas, when its mighty Founder was a child himself.” Haunted by his past, burdened by his present, and fearful of his future, Scrooge might repent of his past involvement in abortion and dedicate himself to rebuilding a culture of life.

Healed of his desperation, he would recognize that, “There is nothing in the world so irresistibly contagious as laughter and good humor.” And he would come to understand that nothing is more worthy of protection and reverence than the life of a child and his mother.

May God indeed bless tiny Tim, and all other preborn babies, this Christmas.

The amazing things you make possible when you donate to National Right to Life

From page 2

With your assistance, we fight for freedom of speech and religion so that pregnancy help centers can provide a room at the inn for pregnant mothers without pro-abortionists hounding them at every step.

In collaboration with you, our financial partners, we’ve passed legislation stopping dismemberment abortions in eight states.

With the backing of people just like you, we are continuing to move forward at both the federal and the state level to ban the abortions of pain-capable unborn children and to pass the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This is a bill that would codify the principles of the Hyde Amendment on a permanent, government-wide basis.

But all of this—and much more such as the confirmation of a superb Supreme Court justice such as Neil Gorsuch and many, many federal judgships—is only possible because of your support of the largest and most productive single-issue pro-life organization in the world.

Please consider a generous gift to the NRL Committee or the NRL Educational Foundation. NRLC promises that every dollar will be put to maximum use to advance the cause of life.

Merry Christmas to you and your loved ones.
Gov. Dayton fails people of Minnesota with appointment of Tina Smith to U.S. Senate

Editor’s note. On December 13, Minnesota Gov. Mark Dayton announced that pro-abortion Lt. Gov. Tina Smith will replace the disgraced Al Franken as senator from Minnesota.

“Gov. Mark Dayton’s appointment of Tina Smith to represent Minnesota in the U.S. Senate is overwhelmingly disappointing to the state’s pro-life majority,” said Leo LaLonde, President of Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life (MCCL). “An abortion industry insider, Ms. Smith is a former vice president of Planned Parenthood in Minnesota, the state’s leading performer of abortion. The choice of Ms. Smith is particularly egregious to Minnesota’s pro-life citizens, who will have no representation in the Senate.”

LaLonde added, “Most Minnesotans are pro-life. They support greater protection for unborn human beings. Minnesotans need someone who will fight for justice for the most vulnerable among us, the unborn.”

[MCCL provided the following additional background on Tina Smith.]

Sadly for unborn children and their mothers, Tina Smith has been named Minnesota’s next U.S. senator, replacing Al Franken after his resignation. Many know Smith as the state’s lieutenant governor, but not her long history as an advocate of abortion on demand.

Most significantly, Smith is a former vice president at Planned Parenthood in Minnesota. As a leader in the state’s abortion industry, she put her marketing background to work for Planned Parenthood from January 2003 to February 2006. The organization performed 9,717 abortions in Minnesota during that period, and increased its abortions by 22 percent. It was also reimbursed $458,574.74 by Minnesota taxpayers for performing 1,892 abortions on low-income women. Planned Parenthood became the largest abortion provider in the state in 2004—and has held that position ever since. It received legislation such as the Positive Alternatives Act of 2005, which provides pregnant women in need with practical assistance and life-affirming alternatives to abortion. She argued that pregnancy care centers that don’t refer women for abortions like Planned Parenthood. During Smith’s three years as lieutenant governor, Dayton again dutifully vetoed bills to ban taxpayer funded abortions and to require licensing and inspection of abortion facilities, including Planned Parenthood.

The Planned Parenthood Action Fund honored Smith in 2012 “for her passion and commitment to Planned Parenthood.” It’s clear what Tina Smith fights for: no-limits abortion, subsidized by taxpayers. And she fights against any funding of alternatives to abortion.

Tina Smith is, without a doubt, the Abortion Senator.
Pro-lifers of all religious denominations and none were absolutely delighted last month when the United State Conference of Catholic Bishops chose Archbishop Joseph Naumann of Kansas City to succeed another pro-life champion, Cardinal Timothy Dolan of New York, as chair of the conference’s Committee on Pro-Life Activities.

As many people said, Archbishop Naumann is “one of us,” with a long history of pro-life involvement and an unflinching willingness to speak truth to power—including to pro-abortion Catholic politicians who hide behind the “personally opposed” fig leaf.

I ran across an interview he gave recently to Catholic World and I was encouraged all over again. You can read the interview in its entirety here, so let me highlight just some of the fascinating quotes he gave to Jim Graves.

Regarding the work of the committee, the pro-life issue has been, and remains, one of the paramount moral issues that the Church tries to give some guidance on to our own people, as well as society at large. Many years ago, the bishop’s conference developed a pastoral plan for pro-life activities. There are four dimensions:

1) prayer, 2) education (which includes informing people about the issue, working to change minds and hearts), 3) pastoral care (we in the Church providing alternatives to abortion, and post-abortion ministries), and 4) advocacy (supporting public policy to protect human life, helping the Church to have a voice before Congress).

I also learned something about Archbishop Naumann’s background which helps explain why the abortion issue is so important to him personally:

My own father was murdered before I was born. It was in December 1948, and I was just three months along inside my mother’s womb. So, I was part of a crisis pregnancy, in a sense, even though it was a different culture at the time. As the issue evolved, and became an issue in our culture today, my personal background gave me a greater sensitivity to women facing a pregnancy under traumatic circumstances.

Graves then asked him when he preaches on the pro-life issue, “how do you present the topic?”

If I’m preaching a homily focused in this area, I begin with the acknowledgement that there are likely people in the pews who have had a direct experience with abortion. I say to such people that they know better than anyone else what a tragedy abortion is, and ask them to pray for me in my work that I can help others to know about the pain they’re experiencing.

I bring up the Project Rachel ministry, which helps women to heal from abortion. I tell them that that help is there, if they need it. I then talk about why the

See "Church,” page 11
“A Child’s future is worth every sacrifice”

By Dave Andrusko

Originally when I first wrote this story, my intention was that it would be a short post. But the more I thought about “My dad’s story: Dream for My Child,” which is also dubbed “My Dad’s A Liar! (A Child’s Future Is Worth Every Sacrifice),” the longer it became.

I understand this YouTube video is a shamelessly heart-tugging ad for MetLife Hong Kong. But as I hope to demonstrate, it is well worth a few words—and most certainly worth the 3:26 it takes to watch the ad. (Alert: you don’t have to be a particularly sentimental dad, like me, to choke up.)

The ad starts with the little girl’s note, praising her dad unconditionally: he is the most clever, the kindest—“he is my Superman” — who wants “me to do well at school.”

“Dad is just great….but….he lies… He lies
About having a job
About having money
That he’s not tired
That he’s not hungry…”

Her dad is bound and determined to provide his daughter with the best — and if that requires working monster hours at the lowest of low-paying jobs so that he can provide for her, so be it.

The ad shows those simple moments that make it all worthwhile, everything from doing homework together to hoisting his daughter up on his shoulders.

At the end, when he is taking her to school and she turns around, I think we are to understand that it might be dawning on her dad that his daughter knows what he’s been doing. Either way, when they embrace, well…

A couple of people who posted trashed the ad for not showing a mom, as if there aren’t already many, many videos rightly trumpeting the invaluable contributions of mothers. (We’ve written about these touching ads in this space often.)

The ad is making a different point that resonates with pro-lifers in a profound way: that “A Child’s future is worth every sacrifice.”

When a woman (or teenager) is facing a crisis pregnancy, the men in her life—whether it be a husband, boyfriend, or the baby’s grandfather — need to appreciate what the mom is going through and stand by her in every way possible.

After all, sacrificing for our children — in this case for our unborn children — is not only a mom thing. It’s an obligation the rest of those involved in her life ought to gladly assume.

Take 3:26 and watch this video—www.youtube.com/watch?v=3bdm4NBYxII
You’ll be glad you did!

“If the Church is silent on the destruction of life, we’re being negligent…”

From page 10

issue is so important, and that the rhetoric of “choice” is deceptive. People don’t talk about “choice” in other areas when the taking of a human life is involved.

And, I like to point out that what makes abortion so particularly destructive is that it not only takes the life of a child, but scars the family, because the abortion occurs in the womb, the one place where life should be most protected.

I challenge people to become involved, to pray, to become more knowledgeable, and to have conversations with others one-on-one. And, we can vote and share our views with our legislators.

There is so much more in the exchanges, but let me conclude with this. Graves then asked, “How do people respond to these homilies?”

I’ve had a few walk out, but such people are few and far between. I pray for those who walk away, as I’ve obviously hit a difficult chord with them. But most people who hear me are supportive.

I’d also like to say to our priests: we can’t fail to talk to our people about these real sins that affect the lives of our people. If we talk about sins they don’t commit, of what good is that?

Certainly we want to preach about the topic in a sensitive way, and be supportive of those who chose abortion but now regret it. But if the Church is silent on the destruction of life, we’re being negligent, and leaving our young people vulnerable to making this tragic decision.
Brooke Shields reveals her mother was pressured to kill her in an abortion but refused

By Texas Right to Life

Actress and model Brooke Shields began an iconic modeling career at just 11-months-old. From that bright start she weathered controversy and made a name as an actress and model, with much of her career directed by her mother. Today, Shields has two daughters of her own. In her 2014 autobiography, There Was a Little Girl, Shields reveals that her life almost ended before she was born.

Brooke’s mother, Teri, was from a working-class family in Newark, New Jersey. By the time Teri met Brooke’s father, she worked in New York City and did some modeling. Brooke’s father, Frank Shields, a wealthy Ivy League graduate from a society family, was seven years younger than her mother and just beginning his career when they met. An unexpected pregnancy was not greeted well by Shields’ family.

Brooke writes, “Dad really did not know how to handle this. He must have told his dad, who took it upon himself to try to persuade my mother to terminate the pregnancy.”

Brooke’s grandfather met with Teri and made clear that he wanted her to end her preborn baby’s life by abortion.

Brooke says, “He requested that mom terminate the pregnancy, explaining that having a child out of wedlock would risk my father getting kicked off the Social Register.” He handed her an envelope of using the money to end her daughter’s life, she bought a piece of antique furniture.

The story appears to have had great impact on Brooke’s perspective. She was quoted in a 1991 magazine article [Redbook Magazine, 8/1991] saying, “Too many people use abortion as a form of birth control. And that’s very wrong. I could never, ever have an abortion.”

Unfortunately, Brooke’s story is not unique. Like Teri, many women face pressure to choose abortion, whether from boyfriends, friends, family, or employers. As many as 64% of abortions involve some form of coercion.

Certain industries, like elite athletics and the entertainment industry, are especially prone to coerced abortion, because the gift of a child is seen as a potentially career-ending setback. While there are many stories of women courageously choosing Life in these difficult circumstances, there are many women who fall victim to the pressure of others and the predatory abortion industry.

As more women speak out against coerced abortion, hopefully women facing crisis pregnancies will know that they do have a choice. The abortion industry brands abortion businesses as “pro-choice,” but as these stories and statistics illustrate, often nothing could be further from the truth. If abortion is the only option presented to a woman in crisis, she is not free to choose. Offering love and support for both the mother and child gives women real options in a crisis.
CDC State Abortion Figures for 2014 Show Depth and Breadth of Abortion’s Decline

Laws and Local Factors Have Major Impact

By Randall K. O’Bannon, Ph.D. NRL Director of Education & Research

Earlier this year, we were all delighted to find out that abortions, abortion rates, and abortion ratios had dropped to levels not seen since the early 1970s. The good news meant a drop of 2% in just one year.

Before we go further, here is the caveat that we offer every time. Unlike the CDC, Guttmacher has data from all fifty states and access to more abortionists, so numbers are more complete and its abortion totals are always significantly higher. The CDC’s reports, though, the latest being “Abortion Surveillance — United States, 2014,” are published more frequently and provide more information on the details and demographics of these trends, thus giving us some better idea of some of the factors that may end or extend the decline.

In addition to the fewer abortions, the CDC’s abortion rate for 2014 was 12.1 abortions/1,000 women of reproductive age (15-44 years). That is lower than any other rate the CDC has recorded since the Supreme Court legalized abortion.

The CDC abortion ratio, which measures the number of abortions for every 1,000 live births, was 186, again, lower than any ratio the CDC has found since 1973. Both long and short term statistics show not only are fewer women becoming pregnant but among those women who did become pregnant there are fewer abortions.

To reiterate, over the long term, the numbers of abortions, the abortion rates and the abortion ratio are down in virtually every state. Most states showed drops in most years going back over the past two decades or more. While most of the decreases were modest a few states had profound declines.

It is also true some states saw increases over the numbers in the CDC’s report for 2013, but these were generally only a few dozen or at the most a couple of hundred more.

States with Significant Single Year Shifts

CDC figures for 2014 show declines in 28 reporting areas, and another 20 showing increases. For the most part, the number of abortions rose or fell by modest amounts. However a handful of states saw big drops or increases. Unless noted otherwise, all increases/decreases are from 2013 to 2014.

Big Drops

The number of abortions in Texas dropped by a whopping 9,020. Abortions fell by 2,278 in Illinois and 2,030 in Ohio. In New York, there were 1,335 fewer abortions while in Tennessee there were 1,843 fewer abortions.

Some of this is simply a function of being a large state with a large volume of abortions from the beginning. But there are other reasons. It is also important to note that a few smaller states, such as Montana and Rhode Island, saw diminishing numbers that were significant for them.

A look at the abortion rates and ratios shows that declines in some of the bigger states drops were for reasons more than just their size. New York’s rate drop was just 0.4, a hair over the national 0.3 drop. However their abortion ratio (as noted the number of abortions for every 1,000 live births) dropped by a huge 143 abortions.

Illinois’ abortion rate drop (0.9 fewer abortions/1,000 women of reproductive age) was three times the national rate drop. Its abortion ratio fell 17. Ohio’s abortion rate drop (-0.9) was also three times the national rate drop and its abortion ratio fell 15.

Tennessee and Texas saw huge drops in their abortion rates (drops of 1.5 in the abortion rate for TN, and 1.8 for TX) as well as significant drops in the abortion ratio (a decline in the abortion ratio of 26 for TN and 28 for TX).

As noted, a few states moved the other direction.

Why are some up and others down?

Given the mixed numbers and wide geographic variations, it’s difficult to determine any single broad explanation for all states.

The overall trend, thankfully, is down, as it has continued to be for nearly all these states for the last couple of dozen CDC reports. That should never be forgotten when we look at any one year.

The mixed results from 2013 to 2014 are likely explained by unique local factors that came into play.

The case of Texas

While abortions were down significantly in Tennessee, Illinois, and Ohio, much of the national attention focused on Texas. The abortion industry raised a ruckus when the state passed safety regulations on clinics in 2014, claiming these were going to close clinics across the state. Clinics did indeed close in Texas, and abortions dropped considerably. But as NRL News Today explained in a number of

See “CDC,” page 20
The story of Christmas is about the arrival of Jesus Christ. It’s an event that offers important insights regarding human life and dignity. Here are three.

(1) Each of us was once an unborn child.

The incarnation—the coming into the world of Christ as a human being—did not actually happen in a Bethlehem manger. It happened some nine months earlier in Nazareth. We know this because that’s how human development works according to the science of embryology and developmental biology. We also know it because that’s what the scriptural accounts affirm.

Mary was “with child” (Matthew 1:18) after Jesus was conceived ... from the Holy Spirit” (Matthew 1:20). Earlier, Gabriel told Mary she would “conceive in [her] womb ... a son, [to be named] Jesus” (Luke 1:31). Luke 1:41-44 recounts that the “baby” John the Baptist (who was in his sixth month post-conception) “leaped for joy” in his mother’s womb when he entered the presence of the unborn Jesus (who was probably a several-days-old embryo).

“The incarnation was effected in Nazareth [at Jesus’s conception] but manifested in Bethlehem [at his birth],” concludes Christian scholar John Saward. “The adventure of being human began for the eternal Son at the moment of his conception.”

Jesus, then, began his earthly existence as an embryo and fetus. So did all of us.

(2) Human dignity transcends age, size, ability, and circumstance.

According to the Christmas story, God entered the world as the child of an unmarried teenager. He entered the world in obscurity and poverty. And he entered the world in the weakest and most vulnerable condition possible. He was a tiny embryo, and then a fetus, and then a newborn baby lying in a manger.

This suggests that the worth and dignity of a human being cannot be determined by age, size, ability, or circumstance. After all, God himself was young and small and dependent. God himself lacked sophisticated mental and physical abilities. God himself was an unborn child conceived in less-than-ideal circumstances.

None of those characteristics have anything to do with value. We have value, rather, because of who and what we are.

(3) Human life is extraordinarily valuable.

Christmas is part of God’s larger plan to rescue humanity because he loves us (John 3:16). Jesus came so that we might live. According to this Christian perspective, God considers human life, which he made in his own image (Genesis 1:27), immensely precious and worth saving at tremendous cost. “Christian belief in the incarnation is thus inseparable from belief in the objective, and even transcendent, value of the human race as a whole, and of each human person as an individual,” writes University of Nebraska professor Carson Holloway.

Christmas, then, shows that human beings are really, really important. Not just some human beings, but all human beings, at all stages of their lives and in all circumstances, including the youngest and most vulnerable—those who have not yet been born.
Roe v. Wade Is Showing Its Age
Flawed from the beginning, seams are now frayed

Maria Gallagher, Legislative Director, Pennsylvania Pro-Life Federation

As the nation marks the 45th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, it appears that the tragic U.S. Supreme Court ruling is showing its age.

An article published in the Washington Times newspaper cited a 2016 study showing the majority of Millennials—young adults born in the ’80s and ’90s—oppose most abortions. Even those who support legal abortion admit that the vast majority of people who participate in the annual March for Life in Washington, D.C. are under the age of 30. The Huffington Post website concedes that pro-life pregnancy resource centers vastly outnumber abortion facilities in the U.S.

And then there is the testimony of the women of the Silent No More Awareness campaign, who had abortions, but who now regret them. Consider Wendy from Pennsylvania, who had an abortion when she was 19 years old.

“It took 35 years of my life to reconcile that one foolish mistake,” Wendy wrote. “Remember the abortion lie that promised to help me ‘forget about my baby and go on with my life like nothing happened’? Now, after 35 gut wrenching years, I can go on only because I found forgiveness and peace in the truth - not the lie.”

Or consider this plea from a post-abortive woman named Jill from Missouri: “If I could help just one person change their mind and not follow through with the abortion then it would have all been worth it, and that’s why I am silent no more.”

Even some advocates of legal abortion have suggested that Roe’s days are numbered. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg has called the decision, “heavy-handed judicial activism,” according to the Washington Examiner newspaper. Legal scholar Laurence Tribe noted, “behind its own verbal smokescreen, the substantive judgment on which it rests is nowhere to be found.” Estimates based on figures provided by the Guttmacher Institute, the former research arm of Planned Parenthood, indicate 60 million unborn children have died from abortion since the 1973 Supreme Court ruling.

The advent of 4D Ultrasound has provided a window to the womb, showing the humanity of the unborn child. It is hard to argue against a right to life to a baby who is smiling or giving a thumbs up in an Ultrasound video.

The facts are clear—Roe v. Wade was a terribly ill-conceived ruling which has ended an immense number of innocent lives...harmed women...and devastated families.

It is long past time for Roe to be tossed on the ash heap of history, and for women and children to be freed from the negative effects of legalized abortion.
Self-sacrificial love in the bioethics-sphere

By Wesley J. Smith

Kiss today goodbye
And point me toward tomorrow.
Wedidwhatwehadtodo.
Wont'forget,cant'tregret
What I did for love.
—A Chorus Line

Imagine the pain. Imagine the sleepless nights. One minute you are leading an ordinary life. Then something awful happens to someone you love—a heart attack, an accident, or a disease. Suddenly, not only are you coping with that tragedy, but you find yourself in a dispute with doctors or other family members over your loved one’s care, a literal matter of life and death.

You take a stand. You sue and are sued. Lawyers attack you. Bioethicists accuse you of acting irrationally. In the worst case, you find yourself in the Klieg lights of media-sensationalized controversy. You are mocked. Your motives are impugned. Your personal life is dissected. Your bank account is drained. I call this crucible the “bioethics-sphere.”

I have never been in the bioethics-sphere, but I have worked with—or reported on—many who have. Three cases that made international headlines stand out vividly in my mind, circumstances in which ordinary people acted in extraordinary self-sacrificial love.

Gerald Klooster’s Son

In 1995, when Gerald (Chip) Klooster II learned that his mother Ruth was taking steps to euthanasia activist Jack Kevorkian for an assisted suicide, he knew he had to act. Chip flew to Florida—where his parents were visiting friends—and quickly whisked his father to his own home in Michigan. There he petitioned for guardianship and was granted temporary custody.

A bitter interstate struggle between Chip and his siblings and mother followed, and given Kevorkian’s then-notoriety, the dispute soon became a media circus. (I was a spokesman for Chip.) A California judge soon issued a contrary order, granting custody to Chip’s sister and ordering Chip to bring Gerald home to California—or face jail and a $500-per-day fine. Meanwhile, Chip was ordered by the court in Michigan to keep Gerald there!

The battle ended in federal court, where a mediator helped the family reach a settlement. Gerald was returned to California under the care of his daughter, and Chip’s family agreed in writing that Gerald would not be assisted with suicide.

But the battle was soon renewed. Over Chip’s strenuous objections, the California judge allowed Gerald to live again with his wife, Ruth. A few months later, Gerald lay in a hospital, close to death from an overdose of alcohol and sleeping pills. The police treated the case as an “attempted suicide with suspicious circumstances,” in part because Ruth had attempted to prevent resuscitation by paramedics after she called 911, and also because of the family history. (The police investigation was unable to determine whether there was wrongdoing involved in Gerald’s near-fatal overdose.)

Gerald recovered and eventually was returned to Ruth’s care. He died in 1999 of natural causes. Chip succeeded in preventing his father’s hastened death, but at great cost to himself, as he suffered both financial loss and, worse, permanent estrangement from his family.

Terri Schiavo’s Parents and Siblings

When Terri Schiavo’s heart stopped beating on the evening of February 25, 1990—cause unknown—no one could have predicted that, over a decade later, the legal and public relations fight over her life or death between her family and husband would transfix the world and even attract the concern of a dying Pope John Paul II.

Terri was resuscitated, but her cardiac arrest left her profoundly cognitively impaired. In the following years, Terri’s husband, Michael, fell in love with another woman, eventually fathering two children by her—all while still married to Terri.

In 1998, he obtained court permission to remove Terri’s feeding tube, claiming that she would not want to live in such a devastated condition. But Terri’s family—father Bob and mother Mary Schindler, along with siblings Bobby and Suzanne—were determined to thwart his plan. They appealed in court and reached out to the public for support. When they posted a video online of Terri appearing to smile at her mother, the case became one of the highest profile bioethics disputes in history. Terri was ultimately dehydrated to death by court order. She died on March 31, 2005.

As a writer, I was intimately involved in advocating for Terri’s life, and during that intense time I became good friends with the Schindler family. Even now, more than ten years later, I remain awed by their valiant struggle, mounted...
Another UK Hospital:
NO to Baby Transfer + End Life Support
By Wesley J. Smith

Readers here may recall the infamous Charlie Gard case earlier this year. Charlie was a terminally ill baby with a progressive and terminal genetic disease. Charlie’s parents wanted to take their boy to a specialist in the US, but was refused permission by the hospital, later supported by a judge. Further, the hospital obtained a ruling that Charlie should be taken off life support, an imposition to which the parents eventually agreed after the US doctor said that with the passage of time, he could no longer help.

Well, it is happening again – except in this case the baby isn’t terminally ill but has been unconscious for a year. Moreover, as I wrote here previously, there isn’t even a diagnosis as to the cause.

An Italian children’s hospital has offered to take the child as a patient for further inquiries and treatment. But the UK hospital administration and doctors are not only saying NO, but as in the Charlie Gard case, also seeking a court order allowing them to withdraw life-sustaining treatment. From the Echo story:

Ader Hey Children’s Hospital has applied to the High Court to switch off life support for a baby in a coma, the ECHO understands.

Alfie Evans’s family said they were now in a “living nightmare” after the hospital said they had exhausted all options in trying to diagnose and treat his mystery brain condition.

It comes shortly after his parents Thomas Evans and Kate James, both 20, said that months of searching they had finally found a hospital abroad that was willing to take him.

But a letter to them, seen by the ECHO, shows Alder Hey are opposing the move to an Italian children’s hospital – and are stepping up the battle over Alfie’s life by taking the matter to court.

Let us focus on the wrongness of this.
• Alfie has not been diagnosed;
• The baby is not terminally ill in the sense that Charlie Gard was, but in a coma;
• The family has found another hospital willing to continue care, or at least continue to seek a diagnosis;

From Alfie’s Army Facebook page
• If Alfie is unconscious, he is not suffering;
• The hospital, in essence, wants a court to declare that dying now is better than being severely cognitively disabled for an indeterminate period.
• By resisting the transfer, the hospital administration and doctors are essentially declaring that they do not want the child to have any chance of surviving.

The UK’s laws are different than here in the USA. The technocracy there has greater power, and parents have fewer rights over their children.

In fact, I think power is what this and the Charlie Gard case are ultimately all about. Otherwise, why not allow the parents to try other potential avenues of care? Why not give Alfie a shot?

The fact that refusal of transfer would probably not happen here, should not make us complacent. We have our own medical technocrats who want greater power over patient care or withdrawal thereof.

P.S. Alfie’s parents have established “Alfie’s Army” Facebook Page for those who may be interested.

Editor’s note. Wesley’s column is posted at National Review Online and is reposted with permission.
Editor’s note. This is excerpted from a post at Newsbusters and is reposted with permission.

Making his latest appearance last week on the Fox Business Network’s *Varney & Company*, Media Research Center president Brent Bozell highlighted the bombshell study by Rich Noyes that found the network evening news coverage of President Trump has been 90 percent negative from September to November.

The appearance came just a few hours after the President himself tweeted about the study on the “Fake News Media” after hearing about it on FNC’s *Fox and Friends*. Trump’s tweet also occurred a day after Press Secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders alluded to it in Tuesday’s press briefing.

Here’s the President’s full tweet:

![President Trump's tweet](image)

After being introduced by Varney, Bozell explained how the numbers are crunched “month after month” dating back to the 2016 presidential campaign with “[t]he best month for President Trump was the honeymoon in January when it was only 89 percent negative and since then, every month, like clockwork it is either 90, 91 or 92 percent negative.”

“I’ll tell you, it is even worse than 90 percent negative, Stuart, because that 90, and if you look at that 90 percent what it doesn’t include the number of fake stories, false stories that have been done like the Brian Ross story that actually affected stock market. So, you’ve got fake stories within the negative coverage,” Bozell added.

Bozell then made a strong statement about how unusual the stories from *ABC*, *CBS*, and *NBC* have been (even for the liberal media):

“There’s no positive coverage of things like the economy, so it’s not just 90 percent negative. It is lack of anything that is positive about this President. We’ve never seen anything like it in the history of this organization.”
11 Attorneys General back Trump Administration in dispute over undocumented teenager’s abortion

By Dave Andrusko

Tip of the hat goes out to Heather Clark, a fine reporter for Christian News, who alerted her readers that “A coalition of 11 states have filed an amicus brief backing the Trump administration’s appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court after an illegal immigrant teenager was allowed by a federal appeals court to obtain an abortion.”

As NRL News Today readers are well aware, the undocumented, unaccompanied 17-year-old from Central America secured an abortion, thanks to the ACLU and the DC Court of Appeals. Our last few stories about this human tragedy focused on the Trump administration’s insistence that the ACLU had not been straight about what would happen (and how quickly) once the full DC Court of Appeals decided

undocumented, unaccompanied 17-year-old from Central America had a constitutional right to an abortion. For this and other reasons, the Department of Justice filed a petition, asking the Supreme Court to vacate the decision and punish the ACLU.

Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton took the lead, as he has throughout the controversy. Joining the brief were the attorneys general of Arkansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina and West Virginia, as well the general counsel for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The brief from the 11 states reads, “This court should vacate the court of appeals’ order because the Constitution does not confer the right to an elective abortion on unlawfully-present aliens with virtually no ties to the country.” Moreover, it continues, “The States also have ‘a legitimate and substantial interest in preserving and promoting fetal life,’ as well as an ‘interest in promoting respect for human life at all stages in the pregnancy.’”

In its 29-page petition which the state attorneys general are supporting, the Department of Justice argued that “the ACLU misled the United States as to the timing of Jane Doe’s abortion,” according to Justice Department spokesman Devin O’Malley. “After informing Justice Department attorney the procedure would occur on October 26th, Jane Doe’s attorneys scheduled the abortion for the early morning hours of October 25th, thereby thwarting Supreme Court review. In light of that, the Justice Department believes the judgment under review should be vacated, and discipline may be warranted against Jane Doe’s attorneys.”

The ACLU’s response not only denied it did anything wrong, it laid out its agenda—securing the “right” to abort for similarly situated undocumented young women. “That government lawyers failed to seek judicial review quickly enough is their fault, not ours,” ACLU Legal Director David Cole said in a statement.

“We won’t let this distract us from the real issue here, which is that there are many more young women like Jane Doe out there who are still unable to get the care they need because of the Trump administration’s unconstitutional policies. We will not stop fighting until we have justice for every young woman like Jane.”

Attorney General Paxton responded, “It seems very clear to me that ACLU lawyers misled the United States as to the timing of Jane Doe’s abortion,” according to Justice Department spokesman Devin O’Malley. “After informing Justice Department attorney the procedure would occur on October 26th, Jane Doe’s attorneys scheduled the abortion for the early morning hours of October 25th, thereby thwarting Supreme Court review. In light of that, the Justice Department believes the judgment under review should be vacated, and discipline may be warranted against Jane Doe’s attorneys.”

The ACLU’s response not only denied it did anything wrong, it laid out its agenda—securing the “right” to abort for similarly situated undocumented young women. “That government lawyers failed to seek judicial review quickly enough is their fault, not ours,” ACLU Legal Director David Cole said in a statement.

“We won’t let this distract us from the real issue here, which is that there are many more young women like Jane Doe out there who are still unable to get the care they need because of the Trump administration’s unconstitutional policies. We will not stop fighting until we have justice for every young woman like Jane.”

Attorney General Paxton responded, “It seems very clear to me that ACLU lawyers misled the United States as to the timing of Jane Doe’s abortion,” according to Justice Department spokesman Devin O’Malley. “After informing Justice Department attorney the procedure would occur on October 26th, Jane Doe’s attorneys scheduled the abortion for the early morning hours of October 25th, thereby thwarting Supreme Court review. In light of that, the Justice Department believes the judgment under review should be vacated, and discipline may be warranted against Jane Doe’s attorneys.”
posts, abortion clinics in Texas were closing not just before the 2014 law took effect but before the law was even passed!

To be sure the portion of the law dealing with safety regulations may have been responsible for some closures. But the closer analysis we provided showed that a different part of the law addressing the chemical abortion drug protocol probably had a greater impact on state abortion numbers. Once that passed, many clinics stopped offering the method. That portion of the law was not challenged at the Supreme Court, nor, by the way, was Texas banning the abortions of pain-capable unborn children.

If anything, an earlier law passed by Texas in 2011 that disqualified abortion business affiliates from participating in the state’s Women’s Health Program may have been a bigger factor in there being both fewer clinics and fewer abortions than the 2014 law.

**Up in Michigan and New Jersey**

The case of Michigan highlights the significance of the role that abortion performing and promoting groups like Planned Parenthood play. Though the number of abortion clinics in Michigan fell from 41 in 2011 to 29 in 2014, Planned Parenthood’s affiliates from participating in the state’s Women’s Health Program may have been a bigger factor in there being both fewer clinics and fewer abortions than the 2014 law.

In North Carolina there was a recorded increase of 1,785 abortions in just one year’s time. Sometimes such things can happen if the abortion industry opens up big new shiny abortion clinic or a good piece of protective legislation gets bottled up in court, but the explanation here appears to have been, in large part, just better reporting.

If you go to the state’s vital statistics page for “Reported Pregnancies,” (http://www.schs.state.nc.us/data/vital/pregnancies/2014/), you will read the following message: ‘The number of induced termination of pregnancy [abortion] forms submitted to the State Center for Health Statistics (SCHS) was underreported from 2011-2014. Please use caution when interpreting abortion and pregnancy numbers and rates from 2011 to 2014.’

When the new assistant secretary took office at North Carolina’s Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in 2015, he noticed there were some clinics reporting abortions to department’s licensing regulators but not to the state’s center for health statistics., giving the state conflicting official counts.

Beginning that year, a more concerted effort was made by the statistics department to obtain these counts, with more intensive follow-up for the stragglers.

**Learning Something from North Carolina’s “Increase”**

Though the new policy officially kicked off in 2015, it actually affected the last few months of 2014 as the state was still processing data from the previous year. The state’s heightened scrutiny thus appears to have resulted in the counting of several hundred abortions in the last part of 2014 that probably would not have been recorded in 2013.

On paper, this looks like a big increase for 2014, but that may be somewhat of an illusion created by improved reporting.

**What does it all mean?**

Nailing down all the factors that contributed to the rise or fall of abortions in any particular state can be very difficult. Many factors, large and small, can cause abortions, abortion rates, and abortion ratios to tick up or down. Again, we need to remember the overall trend is downward.

In its own analysis, the CDC declared

“Multiple factors influence the incidence of abortion, including access to health care services and contraception; the availability of abortion providers; state regulations, such as mandatory waiting periods, parental involvement laws, and legal restrictions on abortion providers; increasing acceptance of non-marital childbearing; shifts in racial/ethnic composition of the U.S. population; and changes in the economy and the resulting impact on fertility preferences and access to health care services.”

Some of these we have definitely seen come into play. Parental involvement laws apparently prompted teens to discuss their unintended pregnancies with their parents rather than to try to cover them up with clandestine abortions. Safety regulations closed some clinics while others states saw abortion expand when they added clinics with chemical abortions. Efforts to prevent state funding from going to organizations that perform abortion led to some closures.

But above all else, the megatrend is that fewer women are becoming pregnant and fewer among those who do are choosing to abort.

How much of the drop in demand is due to legislative efforts by pro-lifers passing laws make abortion’s risks and reality plain, how much is due to education which makes knowledge of the humanity of the unborn child common, how much is due to outreach which makes realistic alternatives to abortion accessible, is hard to quantify precisely.

But abortions and abortion rates and ratios are down across the board, and more pregnant moms are choosing life for themselves and their unborn children.

And that is very good news, indeed.

The CDC obtains data from 47 states and separate reports from the District of Columbia and New York City. There was no data from California, Maryland or New Hampshire. These together are collectively referred to as “reporting areas.” Because data from New York City is also included in data for the state, we will generally only refer to data from DC and the remaining 47 states.
Adorable Babysizer website a delight to expectant parents

Editor’s note. This comes from our British friends at the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children—SPUC.

An adorable website can help expectant parents track the size of their unborn babies by comparing them to real (or not so real) objects.

Babysizer lets the user input how many weeks gestation their baby is at, and choose from several different categories of objects to compare them to. As the creator explains:

“Babysizer was created in the spring of 2015 during my wife’s first trimester. On the first day of each pregnancy week, we would check the size of our baby in multiple pregnancy apps and sites to compare our baby to a fruit.”

But this didn’t cut it.

“With a ruler in one hand, and a bit of time in the other, I compiled a list of iconic food items that would better reflect the average size of a baby each pregnancy week. The list was meant to entertain myself during the pregnancy, but it quickly became apparent that Babysizer was helpful to other expectant parents.”

One category parents can choose is still food, for instance at 6 weeks…

Perhaps the most fun is the geeky category, whether you’re a Harry Potter fan… …or a Lego movie enthusiast.

Or if the dad is struggling to visualise his baby’s growth, the manly category provides endless fun.

Think all this is silly, and just want to know how big your baby is in normal terms? Not to worry, the facts category has you covered.

Babysizer uses crown to rump measurements, which the creator says makes it easier to imagine the baby curled up inside the womb. As he also says, this shouldn’t be used in place of medical advice, but it’s a great way to relate to your growing baby!
European Union Warns Poland Not to Pass Pro-Life Legislation

The move marks an unprecedented intervention into the democratic process of a Member State

By Jonathan Abbamonte

Editor’s note. This is a slightly edited version of a post that appeared at the Population Research Institute and is reposted with permission.

The European Union (EU) has warned Poland not to pass any legislation banning abortion in cases where unborn children are living with severe congenital disabilities.

On November 15, the European Parliament (EP) adopted a resolution initiating the formal process for rebuking an EU Member State found to be in “serious breach” of their obligations under the Treaty on European Union (TEU).

The EP alleges that Poland may be in violation of core EU principles with respect to human rights and democratic values. While the EP’s resolution primarily addresses the independence of the judiciary, it also condemns Poland for considering pro-life legislation that would protect the unborn children living with disabilities.

The resolution also calls on Poland to repeal a recent law signed by Polish President Andrzej Duda prohibiting the over-the-counter sale of the morning-after pill without a prescription.

The EP further criticized the decision of the Polish Government to cut funding for liberal “women’s rights” organizations, such as the pro-abortion organization BABA Lubuskie Center for Women’s Rights. Left-wing observers have noted with alarm that funds that, under previous administrations, would have been given to pro-abortion groups have instead been awarded to Catholic organizations more in line with Polish traditional and family values.

Over 90 percent of Poland is Catholic and an overwhelming majority of Poles are opposed to legalized abortion.

The EP’s resolution instructs the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs to produce a report detailing Poland’s alleged violations of the TEU. It is anticipated that the report commissioned by the European Parliament will serve as the basis for a “reasoned proposal” which will likely be used as justification to invoke Article 7(1) procedures under the TEU.

Under Article 7(1), the European Union may vote to declare Poland in “serious breach” of EU democratic values and its human rights obligations under the treaty.

A formal rebuke of Poland under Article 7 would further pressure the European Council to consider taking formal corrective measures against Poland, including indefinitely suspending Poland’s voting rights in the European Council. A suspension of a voting rights, however, would require the unanimous consent of all other Council members, a perhaps unlikely outcome given Hungary President Viktor Orban’s proclivity to resist EU overreach.

The EP’s resolution against Poland is only the second time in the European Union’s history that an Article 7 procedure has been initiated against a Member State.

The EP’s move against Poland, however, represents the first time Article 7 is being used to condemn a Member State for pro-life legislation.

The EP resolution on Poland preemptively condemns any proposal to ban abortion of the unborn living with disabilities, despite the fact that no such bill has yet been introduced in the Polish parliament. The resolution “Strongly criticises any legislative proposal that
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North Korea defector describes forced abortion

Describes horrific scene of women starved to death, bodies fed to guard dogs

By Dave Andrusko

Over the decades we have run dozens of stories about grotesque human rights abuses in China as it enforced its “One Child” policy built around coerced abortion and forced sterilization. But a story coming from a defector from North Korea is almost unimaginably brutal.

The Fox News headline is enough to want to make you stop right there: “North Korean defector describes forced abortion, said bodies fed to dogs in prison.”

The setting, according to Ben Evansky, was an event titled “The Terrifying experience of forcibly Repatriated North Korean women.” The sponsors were the U.S. France, Japan, South Korea, Canada and the U.K.

Ji Hyeon-A “was repatriated three times to North Korea after she was caught in China,” Evansky explained. “The third time Ji Hyeon-A got caught and sent back to North Korea she was three months pregnant,” Evansky wrote.

“Tearfully describing how she was forced to have an abortion without medication at a local police station, she added: “My first child passed away without ever seeing the world, without any time for me to apologise,” according to Vickkie Oliphant of The Daily Express.

North Korean women who became pregnant in China were forced to have abortions, Ji Hyeon-A said, because North Korea does not allow for mixed-race babies.

“She finally escaped to South Korea and spoke of her horrifying experiences, describes a harrowing scene of prison dogs eating dead bodies at her prison camp. She pleaded for the world to act.”

“Pregnant women were forced into harsh labor all day,” she said. “At night, we heard pregnant mothers screaming and babies died without ever being able to see their mothers.”

At one detention center, she described how inmates starved to death. Their dead bodies, she said, were given to the guard dogs for food.

Ji-Hyeon-A criticized the Chinese government for sending North Koreans back to the regime, saying they know what will happen to them when they get there. “Ji-Hyeon-A urged the U.N. and world leaders to fight for North Korean defectors and especially those who are repatriated,” Evansky wrote.
Dept. of Justice investigating Planned Parenthood and others’ involvement in the sale of fetal tissue

By Dave Andrusko

There we were watching Fox News when Tucker Carlson informed us that Fox News had obtained a letter sent by Justice Department Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs Stephen Boyd to the Senate Judiciary Committee formally requesting unredacted documents from the Committee supporting a December 2016 report titled “Human Fetal Tissue Research.”

As NRL News Today reported in 2016, following an exhaustive investigation Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley [R.-Iowa] referred Planned Parenthood and other providers to the FBI for investigation. As Fox News’ Brooke Singman and Jake Gibson wrote:

Grassley said at the time that the committee has discovered enough evidence that shows how abortion providers had transferred fetal tissue and body parts from aborted fetuses for research by charging amounts higher than they actually cost.

“The report documents the failure of the Department of Justice, across multiple administrations, to enforce the law that bans the buying and selling of human fetal tissue,” Grassley wrote last December urging the Justice Department and FBI to investigate. “It also documents substantial evidence suggesting that the specific entities involved in the recent controversy, and/or individuals employed by those entities, may have violated that law.”

In the letter, sent to Grassley and Ranking Member Dianne Feinstein [D-Ca.] Boyd noted that Grassley had volunteered to provide unredacted documents from the investigation if they were needed “in order to further investigate these matters.”

“The Department of Justice appreciates the offer of assistance in obtaining these materials, and would like to request the Committee provide unredacted copies of records contained in the report, in order to further the Department’s ability to conduct a thorough and comprehensive assessment of that report based on the full range of information available.

“At this point, the records are intended for investigative use only—we understand that a resolution from the Senate may be required if the Department were to use any of the unredacted materials in a formal legal proceeding, such as a grand jury.”

Sources told Fox News that in order to release unredacted materials, Grassley and Feinstein said they needed to receive a letter and be assured the documents would be used for investigative purposes.

Investigations in both the House and Senate were spurred by undercover videos taken by the Center for Medical Progress. The CMP responded to the news about the Justice Department request with this statement:

Over two years ago, citizen journalists at The Center for Medical Progress first caught Planned Parenthood’s top abortion doctors in a series of undercover videos callously and flippanity negotiating the sale of tiny baby hearts, lungs, livers, and brains.

...It is time for public officials to finally hold Planned Parenthood and their criminal abortion enterprise accountable under the law.

Also see the story on Page 5.
‘Hercules’ actor Kevin Sorbo is unashamedly pro-life: ‘Never forget the babies slaughtered’ by abortion’

By Becky Yeh

As one of the boldest pro-life voices in Hollywood, actor Kevin Sorbo is not afraid to speak out against abortion.

Sorbo, known primarily for his role as the title character in Hercules and as Captain Dylan Hunt in Andromeda, has been a longtime pro-life advocate and speaker. Sorbo, who also starred as the atheist philosophy professor opposite Christian student Josh Wheaton, played by Shane Harper, in the film God's Not Dead, just released his latest film Let There Be Light.

After the release of undercover videos showing Planned Parenthood executives discussing harvesting the body parts of aborted children, Sorbo wrote that the tapes “ought to make you sick.”

“Watching that horrible woman sell aborted baby parts like she was working in an auto store,” Sorbo said. In another post, he added: “How is this not disgusting to the vast majority out there that value human life?!!”

In 2014, Sorbo promoted a campaign to raise funds for the film Gosnell, which reveals the gruesome chop shop practices inside abortionist Kermit Gosnell’s Philadelphia “House of Horrors.” Sorbo’s campaign was covered by mainstream media outlets and pro-life groups alike.

“Even the pro-choicers would look at this and say, ‘No, this isn’t right,’” Sorbo said. “This is something that my wife and I are behind because we believe in this project. It’s long overdue for this story to be told, and it wasn’t covered by the media nearly as much as some of the other murder cases were.”

Sorbo said Hollywood and the media’s blackout on the Gosnell case has kept these crimes hidden from the public eye, which is why Americans must see the film.

“Kermit Gosnell is America’s most prolific serial killer,” Sorbo said. “For more than three decades he was an abortion doctor in Philadelphia, where he delivered live, viable babies, who cried and fought for their life before he murdered them by severing their spinal cords with a scissors. He called it snipping. It’s the crime of the century, but most of the media and Hollywood have ignored the story.”

Editor’s note. This appeared at LiveActionNews and is reposted with permission.

European Union Warns Poland Not to Pass Pro-Life Legislation

From page 22

would prohibit abortion in cases of severe or fatal foetal impairment.”

Earlier this year, the Polish grassroots organization the Stop Abortion Committee launched a citizen’s petition to ban abortion in cases of fetal disability. According to the Stop Abortion Committee, the petition has received 830,000 signatures, more than eight times the number of signatures required by Polish law for submitting a legislative proposal to parliament and nearly twice as many as signatories as last year’s failed initiative to ban all abortion.

Both Polish President Duda and Prime Minister Beata Szydło have declared their support for the initiative.

The European Parliament’s attempt to censure Poland for considering legislation to protect the lives of the unborn with disabilities represents an unprecedented attempt by the EU to intervene in the democratic process of a Member State. The motion further transgresses on the right for states to protect the inherent and fundamental right to life through law as guaranteed by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

According to a CBOS poll from last year, as cited by the The Catholic World Report, 66 percent of Poles believe that human life should be protected “regardless of the circumstances” from “conception to natural death.” A separate 2014 poll found that 65 percent of Poles consider abortion ‘morally inappropriate.’

Since 2012, the number of Poles who support legislation restricting abortion has increased by 7 percent. Pro-life sentiment in Poland is likely to increase further in the coming years. A full 80 percent of young adults (18-24 years of age) support a complete abortion ban compared to only 50% of adults over 65.

“Two and a half centuries after being carved up by Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, Poland again faces a threat to its future as an independent nation,” says Population Research Institute President Steven Mosher, “Only this time the danger is not only that its territory would be incorporated into a larger European state, but also that it might be forced to deny its own religious culture as a nation of faithful, practicing Catholics.”
Why Does the *New York Times* Choose Abortion Over Free Speech?

By Jay Hobbs

In an op-ed published in the *New York Times*, Yale Law professor and Planned Parenthood donor Linda Greenhouse unleashed a borderline illiterate vindication of California’s attempt to force pro-lifers into parroting a state-approved message in favor of abortion.

Greenhouse won a Pulitzer Prize in 1998 for her coverage of the Supreme Court. But she gave monthly to Planned Parenthood during her three decades as a *New York Times* beat writer—when she wrote well over 100 stories that mentioned the abortion giant.

In “When the Truth Is Unconstitutional,” Greenhouse makes a full-throated defense of a 2015 California law that is now being challenged before the Supreme Court on grounds that it violates the First Amendment’s free speech guarantee.

Dubbed the “Bully Bill” by the 200 pro-life pregnancy centers and medical clinics it targets, the so-called “Reproductive FACT Act” forces the organizations to post notices in waiting rooms and online at their own expense, telling their clients where and how they can receive a taxpayer-funded abortion through the Medi-Cal program.

Most alarmingly, the law forces pro-life medical clinics offering free ultrasounds to display a phone number for a county social services agency who will help women obtain an abortion. Established as alternatives to abortion, pregnancy centers do not refer their clients for abortion in any way, a fact well-known by the law’s author, San Francisco assemblyman David Chiu.

Aren’t You Missing Something, Linda?

Although it was upheld by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals last October, the law was halted in part by a preliminary injunction granted by a California superior court justice Oct. 30, 2017.

In the decision — which Greenhouse ignores entirely in her piece — Justice Gloria C. Trask ruled that the law violates California’s guarantee of its citizens’ “individual freedom of mind” by forcing pro-life persons to speak a government-mandated message that favors abortion.

Elsewhere in her decision, Trask wrote that if the state’s primary goal is to raise awareness as to the availability of its programs, it has several ways to do so, including public service announcements and even purchasing billboard space, “directly in front of [the pro-life] clinic.”

Along the lines of Trask’s reasoning, the State of California — though manifestly inept when it comes to basic governance such as water management, infrastructure and basic accounting — has plenty of avenues to make its citizens aware of taxpayer-funded abortions.

In addition to billboards and PSAs, California’s government could get really creative and put a decal on Gov. Jerry Brown’s imaginary “Bullet Train” that, though still nonexistent and certainly unnecessary, will cost taxpayers $1.7 billion and counting.

Don’t try telling that to Greenhouse, however.

Establishing the “Ministry of Truth”

Give George Orwell credit for predicting the future. In his classic dystopian 1984, Orwell identifies several government agencies established to keep the proletariat in check, one of which, “The Ministry of Truth,” is charged with the sacred duty of disseminating propaganda and rewriting history.

It’s a wonder Greenhouse and others don’t see the irony in calling upon the government to be the final arbiter of truth — especially considering their rabid opposition to the majority party on Capitol Hill and in the White House.

Even though she’s spent her career as a journalist, enjoying all the protections of the First Amendment — her colleague at the *Times*, James Risen, wasn’t nearly as lucky under the Obama Administration — Greenhouse is fully on-board with a governmental attempt to force unconscionable speech out of citizens who aren’t as A-Okay as she is when it comes to abortion.

No, to Greenhouse, the government should have the unfettered right to force citizens to speak whatever message it deems appropriate — provided she deems the message itself to be accurate.

As Greenhouse writes:

… this case transcends the subject of abortion. The First Amendment question it presents is doctrinally complex but can fairly be boiled down to this: when is it unconstitutional to require an entity that deals with the public to tell its customers the truth?

See “Free Speech,” page 30
Arkansas AG appeals decision enjoining four pro-life laws

By Dave Andrusko

Back at the end of July, NRL News Today reported on an order handed down by activist U.S. District Judge Kristine Baker blocking four pro-life Arkansas laws. The most prominent is Arkansas’s Unborn Child Protection from Dismemberment Abortion Act [Act 45] which bans the grotesque practice of dismemberment abortions.

Subsequently Linda Satter reported that the state filed a 59-page brief with the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis in which attorneys for the state called the laws “four commonsense Arkansas abortion regulations,” and chastised U.S. District Judge Kristine Baker’s conclusion that they are likely unconstitutional.

“In addition to its groundless assertion that abortion is safer than pregnancy, the district court’s opinion is riddled with error,” the brief asserts. “It applies the wrong legal standards, confuses legal and factual conclusions, misconstrues statutory language, and fails to determine whether the challenged provisions would impose substantial obstacles on a large fraction of patients.”

As we reported, in her 140-page decision, Judge Baker defended issuing a preliminary injunction on the grounds that “The threatened harm to Dr. [Frederick] Hopkins and the fraction of women for whom the mandate is relevant clearly outweighs whatever damage or harm a proposed injunction may cause the State of Arkansas.”

Eight states—Kansas, Oklahoma, West Virginia, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas and Arkansas—currently forbid an abortion “technique” that uses sharp metal clamps and scissors to crush, tear and pulverize living unborn human beings, to rip heads and legs off of tiny torsos until the defenseless child bleeds to death.

Judge Baker’s preliminary injunction also affected, according to Satter

• Act 603, “which also would have taken effect July 30 and governs the disposal of fetal remains after surgical abortions”;

• Act 1018, “which also faced a July 30 effective date and requires doctors to notify local law enforcement agencies when an abortion has been performed on a girl who is 16 or younger.” And

• Act 733, “which was to go into effect Jan. 1. It requires doctors to seek a woman’s previous medical records if she knows the sex of her fetus, to ensure the woman isn’t using abortion as a means of sex selection.

“Judge Baker never considered the societal degradation that accompanies ‘normalizing’ this horrific abortion procedure,” said Ingrid Duran, director of state legislation for National Right to Life. “NRLC believes that this is a temporary setback and we appreciate the hardworking effort from the Attorney General’s office to appeal and defend this constitutional law.”
Self-sacrificial love in the bioethics-sphere

From page 16

at great personal cost: drained finances, lost privacy, media scorn, impugned motives, death threats—and eventually Bob’s death, which the family believes was caused by the stress of watching helplessly as his daughter died by court order.

The Schindler family was determined that Terri’s tragic death would not be in vain. They founded the Terri Schiavo Life and Hope Network, which supports and assists other families caught in the bioethics-sphere. (Full disclosure: I was recently named to the Network’s Board of Directors.)

Jahi McMath’s Mother

In 2013, Jahi McMath, then thirteen years old, suffered a cardiac arrest after undergoing throat surgery. She was resuscitated, but doctors declared her brain dead and pushed to have all life-sustaining medical treatment terminated.

Jahi’s mother, Latasha “Nailah” Winkfield, would have none of it. She sued to keep her daughter’s life support maintained. After a court-appointed physician from Stanford University confirmed the diagnosis, Jahi was ruled to be legally deceased and a death certificate was issued. But a legal settlement allowed Nailah to take possession of her daughter, still attached to medical machinery. She moved Jahi to New Jersey—which allows a religious exemption to brain death decrees—where she received further treatment and was eventually released to home care.

When the case first broke in the news, I wrote here that I believed Jahi was dead. Now, I have doubts. Contrary to doctors’ expectations, Jahi’s body has not broken down. Her skin remains smooth. There are no foul odors in her room as would be expected when a brain-dead person’s body deteriorates. I know—I visited Jahi’s family a few months ago at their apartment in New Jersey. Moreover, the respected neurologist Dr. Alan Shewmon, professor emeritus in pediatrics and neurology at UCLA, has testified that Jahi’s condition does not currently satisfy the criteria for brain death. As a result, Nailah has been allowed by a California judge to present evidence that Jahi is alive as part of an ongoing medical malpractice suit, a case that could make bioethical and medical history.

Despite Nailah’s success at reopening the legal question of Jahi’s death, some observers have accused her of exploiting her daughter for the money that could be obtained in the lawsuit. That is a canard. It is clear to me that Nailah absolutely believes that Jahi is alive. Moreover, she is fiercely dedicated to Jahi’s care—an exhausting round-the-clock task.

Over nearly twenty-five years of public advocacy involving sanctity-of-life issues, I have met many people who, like those mentioned above, struggled in the bioethics-sphere. There were the mother and sister of Robert Wendland, a Terri Schiavo-like case before Terri Schiavo. I’ll never forget the wife of an Alzheimer’s patient who fought a daunting but ultimately successful battle to prevent a doctor from removing her husband’s feeding tube. I most vividly recall the Canadian mother who, after hearing me speak, sobbed at the prospect of doctors pushing her catastrophically ill daughter off life support. Ten years later, at another speech, that mother brought her daughter—then a healthy teenager—to shake my hand. It was one of the most moving moments in my many years as an activist.

These self-sacrificing people humble me. Their courage inspires me. And to a person, whether they succeeded or failed, regardless of the difficulties they experienced or the personal consequences they faced, not one I ever met regretted what they “did for love.”

Editor’s note. This appeared at First Things [www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2017/12/self-sacrificial-love-in-the-bioethics-sphere] and is reposted with the author’s permission.
The Story of a Life

By Melissa Ohden

Editor’s note. Melissa is the survivor of a “failed” saline abortion in 1977. She speaks all over the world including at many National Right to Life Conventions. She has often written for NRL News Today. This appeared on her blog.

“Your current circumstances are part of your redemption story He is writing”—Evinda Lepins.

I don’t believe God originally wrote abortion into my life, as God is the Creator of life, but when it was introduced by man, or in my case, a woman, He rewrote the story of my life around it, to create the story of a life that is more intricate, more redemptive, more grace-filled, than anything anyone else could have planned or written.

“How do you know that you are not part of a book? That someone’s not reading your story right now?”—Jodi Picoult.

Everyone has a story. Everyone. But every story is different, and how we are called to use our story is also different. We are not all called to share our stories publicly; we are not all called to write a book. What we are each called to do, however, is live out the story of our life as God has written it, and believe it or not, as we live out the story of our lives, others are reading it, right along with us. What are they reading in the story of your life? The story that you’ve worked to edit or even create for yourself, or the story that God wrote for you?

Facing our youngest daughter’s medical issues has been one of the most defining moments of our lives. I did not expect for her to face so much in her first year of life, and although it was hard, it was an unexpected blessing. She taught us so much more than we even knew before about God’s presence in the midst of suffering. His healing power, His purpose and plans for every life.

“The life of every man is a diary in which he means to write one story, and writes another; and his humblest hour is when he compares the volume as it is with what he vowed to make it”—J. M. Barrie, The Little Minister.

The little girl who was supposed to die in an abortion—me—grows up to be a woman that brings life and restoration to others. While encouraging others to pray for the mothers, the fathers, the children who are being impacted by abortion, the baby who was prayed for, (along with all of the babies at risk of being aborted), over thirty years later comes face to face with a number of the very people who had prayed outside of St. Luke’s Hospital in Sioux City, Iowa, in 1977—the very year, the very hospital where she survived the failed abortion.

The very hospital where her life was supposed to end in the abortion, a place that signified death and suffering to her, is transformed thirty years later into a place that holds the most beautiful memories of her life, when she gives birth to her first daughter there, herself.

There are no coincidences. This is the story of my life.

 Doing So Will Not Only Change Your Life, But It Will Change The Lives Of Others.
Why Does the *New York Times* Choose Abortion Over Free Speech?

*From page 26*

Apparently missing the point of her own argument, Greenhouse equates a government-mandated signage requirement with mere truth-telling, as if that’s truly what’s at stake. If the truth were really the issue, as Greenhouse argues, California could make use of its false advertising law and its citizens could file criminal and civil complaints against pregnancy centers accused of lying to women.

While Greenhouse is busy cherry-picking from the original bill’s rationalization — which relied solely upon unfounded allegations from pro-abortion group NARAL Pro-Choice America — she again omits a key piece of information: There’s no evidence to support NARAL’s decades-long charges, as an investigation by the City of Los Angeles discovered last year.

On the contrary, it’s precisely because pregnancy centers tell women the truth that well over nine in 10 clients report an overwhelmingly positive experience at one of the nation’s 2,600-plus independent, community-funded centers.

That’s probably why previous attempts to establish state and local chapters of the pro-abortion “Ministry of Truth” have failed so miserably — and at taxpayer expense — in Baltimore, Austin (TX), New York City, and Washington State. Current efforts in Illinois, Hawaii, San Francisco, Oakland and Hartford, Conn., are hanging in the balance based on the Supreme Court’s decision.

Just as Orwell’s prophetic “Ministry of Truth” dealt only with propaganda and the advancement of the state’s clout, these attacks have zero to do with the truth, and everything to do with forcing political opponents to get in line.

**A Weaponized Warning**

Before ending her piece with an off-handed slight against — who else? — President Donald J. Trump, Greenhouse recites the warning many abortion fans have made since the Supreme Court decided to take up pro-lifers’ challenge last month.

A victory in *NIFLA v. Bercerra*, Greenhouse blissfully cautions, could undercut a series of state-level pro-life victories that require abortion businesses to give informed consent prior to executing their procedures.

The argument put forward by Greenhouse and others is bogus right out of the gate, however, since the entire concept of “informed consent” assumes there is a relevant medical procedure to follow. At an abortion clinic, that procedure is an abortion. But what relevant medical procedure are we talking about at a pregnancy center?

Should every woman seeing her baby via ultrasound, taking a pregnancy test, or receiving free peer consulting, free material aid and post-abortive help be greeted at the door with an advertisement for abortions, plus a handy-dandy phone number she can call right away to get one?

How much information does a woman need before she gets a free ultrasound? My wife and I met our firstborn via ultrasound at a mall by our house, then in California. The whole process was pretty self-explanatory, I can assure you.

Applied in the opposite direction, a motivated city or state government could force every abortion clinic — all of which thrive on withholding the truth from their unsuspecting clients — to post prominent signage directing women to local churches, pregnancy centers, or Right to Life groups.

Using Greenhouse’s logic, what’s to stop a red state from doing just that? Are those churches, pregnancy centers and Right to Life groups nonexistent, or just disadvantageous to an abortion mill’s stated mission?

As Greenhouse illustrates perfectly, the government has no business converting its citizens into puppets who speak whatever message the state decides.

It’ll be interesting to see where the Supreme Court lands this spring on *NIFLA v. Bercerra*, but in the meantime, at least we’ll learn something about what Greenhouse and her friends on the Left really think of the First Amendment.

The more abortion fans find themselves losing the argument out in public, the more fragile free speech will become.

Just as George Orwell predicted.

*Editor’s note. This appeared at Pregnancy Help News and is reposted with permission.*
“A Thing I’ll Never Understand”:
the tragedy of an unborn life cut short

From page 2

Which brings us to the fourth episode. (Of course we could have bing-watched the entire series, but Lisa and I are rationing the last season’s episodes.)

Victoria is pregnant; we know only that it is early in her pregnancy. When Walt learns this from another source he tries every way he knows to keep Victoria out of harm’s way. (He is not the father, by the way.) This is the absolutely last thing the fiery independent, passionately self-sufficient Victoria wants.

In the finest tradition of climatic western shoot-outs, Vic exchanges gunfire with Chance Gilbert, the psychopathic head of a clan who had previously captured and tortured her. She kills Gilbert in the hail of bullets but suffers a gravely serious wound to her right thigh.

The next 20 minutes are some of the best television you will ever see. When Victoria awakes, Walt gently, gradually tells her “the baby didn’t make it.” Victoria’s early response is, “I just feel terrible that I don’t feel more terrible.” But we know from her face and her history there is a lot more going on in her heart.

Walt tells her that the baby actually saved her life—that someone who had lost as much blood as Victoria had usually doesn’t make it. But she had an extra source of blood the maternal and fetal side.) As the remainder of the episode unfolds, we see how utterly devastated Victoria is because of the baby. (Walt doesn’t use the word but he is talking about the placenta which is a huge reservoir of spare blood volume, on both the maternal and fetal side.)

I cannot convey in words how tenderly Walt talked about the baby, or how devastated was the man who believes he was the father. What came through like a siren in the night was that this baby’s life—brief as it was—mattered. A human being died that night.

After the episode, “A Thing I’ll Never Understand,” ended, I couldn’t helping thinking about all the pro-death television shows which treated the life of an unborn child as a nothing—as “something” to be gotten rid of without a moment’s sorrow or regret or hesitation.

They can’t hold a candle to the truth Katee Sackhoff conveyed with great passion and even greater realism.
Texas Dismemberment Abortion Ban trial spotlights humanity of the preborn

By Texas Right to Life

Federal District Judge Lee Yeakel recently ruled against Texas’s Dismemberment Abortion Ban, a law that prevents a brutal abortion procedure that rips apart living children in the womb to cause their death. In Yeakel’s ruling, he stated that abortion in the second trimester was an “absolute right” and said that prohibiting this brutal practice placed too much interference on that “right.”

Judge Yeakel’s ruling is disappointing but expected, given his long and consistent record of ruling against Life. However, his court is only the first to hear this case, and the Texas Office of the Attorney General has already appealed the ruling to the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, which has historically reversed lower courts’ anti-Life rulings.

Texas Right to Life championed the Dismemberment Abortion Ban during the regular session of the 85th Texas legislature to prompt judicial debate, publicly underscore the humanity of the preborn child, and, most importantly, to immediately save lives. The Dismemberment Abortion Ban holds tremendous potential for a substantial and historic Supreme Court victory.

Meanwhile, anti-Life advocates are forced to admit the brutality and inhumanity of abortion in court and before the public in mainstream media. Discussing and banning the gruesome procedure by which a living preborn baby is torn limb from limb refocuses society’s conversation about abortion to the humanity and value of the preborn child.

Normally, abortionists carefully shroud their victims from the public eye, using euphemisms to hide the baby’s humanity or avoiding their mention altogether. However, the abortion businesses that brought this lawsuit and an unprecedented five-day trial unknowingly spotlighted the preborn and revealed their callous indifference to these children’s suffering.

Former abortionist and now pro-Life advocate Anthony Levatino, M.D., described the brutality of committing the dismemberment abortion procedure on a living human being. He explained how an abortionist must take inventory of the baby’s body parts during the procedure to ensure nothing is left inside the woman, and that taking inventory could sometimes include seeing the baby’s face looking back at him. Another state witness, Dr. David Berry, also described the sickening process of reassembling the baby, recalling children’s hearts still beating after he dismembered them.

Dr. Farr Curlin, an expert witness on bioethics, provided a more philosophical defense of protecting the preborn from death by dismemberment. He argued that the practice of live dismemberment is egregiously disrespectful to a human being and contradicts basic principles of medical ethics. He discussed how banning the dismemberment abortion procedure would actually safeguard the integrity of the medical profession overall. Dr. Curlin explained the Pro-Life implications of the medical profession’s core value, “do no harm.”

Another expert the state called was Dr. Colleen Malloy, a neonatologist who testified on fetal pain. She discussed how the pain experience for babies is different from adults but is pain nonetheless, and that because babies are unable to describe their pain, doctors must use indirect evidence such as hormonal responses, changes in blood pressure, and behavioral patterns. From her medical experience, she told of seeing babies in utero crying, grimacing, kicking, and moving away from noxious stimuli.

She explained how, as a doctor, managing the pain of all her patients (born or preborn) and providing comfort care is her professional obligation. She concluded her testimony by explaining how one cannot objectively select a point during embryonic development to treat a fetus different from a born human being.

Finally, during the state’s closing arguments, the attorney general’s legal team explained how Texas has a compelling state interest in regulating the medical profession, prohibiting the dismemberment procedure, and protecting preborn Life. …

solemn and horrifying moment in the courtroom, and several of the abortion lobby’s lawyers and advocates refused to look at the victims of the practice they fought so doggedly to maintain.

Though he ultimately ruled against the Pro-Life law, Judge Yeakel did allow the state to build a robust official record with powerful evidence like medical textbook illustrations, 3D models of fetal development, and various types of medical instruments used in dismemberment procedures. The five-day trial and the case overall is unique and historic, serving as a powerful opportunity to build an insightful record to prove to the higher courts why they should recognize the gruesome nature of live dismemberment and Texas’s compelling state interest in protecting preborn Life.

This law and the subsequent lawsuit advance the cultural conversation about the dignity and humanity of the preborn one step further.
Denmark aborted all but 4 babies diagnosed with Down syndrome last year

By Claire Chretien

December 6, 2017 – A Danish official is using the four children with Down syndrome who weren’t aborted in Denmark last year to argue that his country’s policy is not to kill everyone with an extra chromosome.

Ireland may repeal its Eighth amendment, which protects the human right to life. Pro-life activist Liz McDermott pointed out to the committee on the Eighth Amendment in the House of the Oireachtas [Parliament] that Denmark has an extraordinarily high rate of abortions on Down Syndrome babies.

It seems her comments were based on a 2013 article in the Danish newspaper Berlingske titled Plans to make Denmark a Down syndrome-free perfect society.

That article doesn’t appear to be available on the newspaper’s website, but a number of others about the country’s high Down syndrome abortion rate are.

“In 2016, there were four children born in Denmark with Down’s syndrome after prenatal diagnosis and there were 20 children born with Down’s syndrome diagnosed after birth,” Danish Ambassador to Ireland Carsten Søndergaard wrote to the Irish government.

“In general it should be noted that it is not the policy of the Danish health authorities to eradicate Down’s syndrome, but it is their duty to provide the pregnant woman with the best possible basis for her to make her own decision about her pregnancy,” he asserted.

Nearly 100 percent of babies diagnosed with Down syndrome prenatai in Iceland are aborted.

In 2009, only three babies with Down syndrome were born in Iceland. Only one mother in the entire country has two children with Down syndrome.

Babies with Down syndrome are aborted at similarly overwhelming rates in many other Western countries.

Overcome with emotion, woman apologizes to aborted fetus

By Sarah Terzo

From a woman who had an abortion:

The waiting room was “filled with a true cross-section of the community. No one looked happy. No one was chatting with anyone but their partners. This was not a day to make friends.”

The woman says:

“I tried to concentrate on the physical feelings, not on what was happening. It was over in minutes, and I was overcome with sadness. “I’m so sorry I didn’t want you,” I told the fetus. “I’m so sorry.”


Editor’s note. This appeared at Clinic Quotes and is reprinted with permission.
Abortion Doulas: a labor induced abortion is not very “natural” at all

By Sarah Terzo

One way of doing abortions is by induction, or inducing labor. The baby is usually first injected with poison, such as digoxin or potassium chloride, killing him or her. Labor is induced, usually with prostaglandins or Cytotec. The woman goes through labor and “gives birth” to her dead child. All third trimester and many late second trimester abortions are done this way.

Often when the mother is aborting due to fetal anomaly (a disability or illness in the baby) she chooses to do it by induction because she wants to hold, photograph, or see the baby afterwards.

In their book, abortion doula Mary Mahoney and Lauren Mitchell, who have seen many abortions, describe abortion by induction:

“Some clients are under the impression that labor inductions would be more “natural” or easier or safer than the surgical abortion. Many think of their own birth experiences with other children, and they feel more comfortable doing that than they do dealing with the drama of having a surgical abortion. It’s a rude awakening when they realize that a labor induction is not very natural at all. Clients are given medications to start labor and IV’s with fluids. They are strapped to monitors – they can’t move, they can’t eat, and their contractions are often so bad that they choose an epidural. According to physician David Grimes, the uterus is not evolved to deliver a pregnancy during the second trimester. It’s a rude awakening when they realize that a labor induction is not very natural at all. Clients are given medications to start labor and IV’s with fluids. They are strapped to monitors – they can’t move, they can’t eat, and their contractions are often so bad that they choose an epidural. According to physician David Grimes, the uterus is not evolved to deliver a pregnancy during the second trimester."


Editor’s note. This appeared at Clinic Quotes and is reposted with permission.
Soros’s money runs up against Irish laws barring foreign donations

By Dave Andrusko

It’s been sometime since we learned that pro-abortion billionaire George Soros, through his Open Society Foundation, has poured massive amounts of money into Ireland to undermine the country’s staunchly pro-life environment. But the Open Society Foundation’s generosity has stoked the curiosity of Ireland’s Standards in Public Office Commission which is charged with overseeing Ireland’s electoral funding law.

In separate stories, two sources, one pro-life and one pro-abortion, are reporting that “Soros money means legal trouble for Amnesty’s Ireland abortion campaign” (as the Catholic News Agency headlined their story) and “Irish Family Planning Association contacted about George Soros money” (the headline in the Irish Times).

Referring to Amnesty International, Kevin Jones reports

The Republic of Ireland’s Standards in Public Office Commission has told the human rights and pro-abortion legalization group to return about $160,000 in funds to the Soros foundations. According to the commission, the money violated Irish law barring foreign donations to third party groups seeking to influence the outcome of a referendum campaign.

No dice, says Amnesty International. In a December 8th statement, Colm O’Gorman, Amnesty International’s executive director, said that it would oppose the election funding law. “Amnesty International will not be complying with the instruction from the SIPOC and they also argue that preborn children should not have the most basic human right of all – the right to life.”

Colm O’Gorman called Amnesty International’s “human rights work” is the repeal of the Eighth Amendment to the Republic of Ireland’s constitution which acknowledges “the right to life of the unborn and, with due regard to the equal right to life of the mother.”

Pro-lifers complained about “The arrogance they have shown in the past few days on this issue is staggering,” as Niamh Ui Bhriain, a spokesperson for the Irish-based Life Institute, told CNA December 11. “They are now trying to argue that they have a ‘human right’ to take money from billionaires to push to have abortion legalization in Ireland, while campaigners on foreign funding. Millions of dollars in overseas funding have targeted Ireland’s pro-life laws for decades, as have other U.S. groups like the Center for Reproductive Rights.

“It’s made for a very un-level playing field in the abortion debate in Ireland,” she said.

Meanwhile the Irish Family Planning Association has some explaining of its own to do. The relentlessly pro-abortion Irish Times recently ran a story whose subhead was “Sipo expresses concerns that the grant contravenes Ireland’s rules on political funding.”

“Both organisations [Amnesty International and the Irish Family Planning Association] received funding from Open Society in early 2016,” reports Colm Keena. “A third organisation that also got funding, Abortion Rights Campaign Ireland, received €25,000 [about $29,500] but returned it later in 2016, having been contacted by Sipo and having taken advice.”

According to Keena

It is understood Sipo contacted all three groups in the months after its attention was drawn to a hacked Open Society strategy report that said the foundation funded the three Irish organisations in the context of the pending abortion referendum.

“With one of the most restrictive abortion laws in the world, a win there [Ireland] could impact other strongly Catholic countries in Europe, such as Poland, and provide much needed proof that change is possible, even in highly conservative places,” the leaked strategy document said.

Amnesty International was trying to “sell itself as being above the law and that is very wrong,” Cora Sherlock, spokeswoman for the Pro-Life Campaign, told the Irish Times. If the money was not returned it would “set a dangerous precedent,” she said.
Women furious as Planned Parenthood equates miscarriage and abortion

By Kelli

Planned Parenthood shared an article last week that has drawn the ire of many on social media. It likened miscarriage to abortion, calling the two “sisters.”

Pro-Life Libertarians shared a screen shot of the posting, commenting with a quip of their own, showing how nonsensical they felt the comparison was:

The Daily Wire shared excerpts of the original article at Romper, in which (clearly) pro-abortion writer Danielle Campoamor wrote:

Miscarriage and abortion are sisters. Just like my body knew what to do when an abnormal embryo implanted itself in my uterus, my mind knew what to do when a healthy embryo found its way to the soft lining of my uterine wall back when I was 23 years old, in an unhealthy relationship, living paycheck-to-paycheck, unwilling and unable to be a mother.

These illogical claims are deeply insulting to the sensibilities and infuriating to women who’ve had their own painful experiences with miscarriage. Countless women took to the Pro-Life Libertarians and The Daily Wire’s Facebook pages to say so. Facebook users wrote: “Incredibly disrespectful,” “Incredibly painful and false,” “Incredibly hurtful.”

“Slap in the face”

“In no way the same”

“Negates the absolute heartbreak of millions”

Bottom line: Planned Parenthood again appears to be completely tone-deaf and clueless when discussing the issue of children in the womb.

Editor’s note. This appeared at LiveAction and is reposted with permission.
Jaelyn Barnes had a miscarriage at eleven weeks. Baby Nielson, as you can see in this family photo, was a human being.

This being Jaelyn’s fifth child, she was an experienced mother and their entire family was ecstatic for the newest addition. Jaelyn’s husband was serving their community as police officer when they first discovered there wasn’t a heartbeat. They were urged not to worry and the midwife advised rechecking in a few days; however, her husband was injured badly on the job and the fetal heartbeat check was put on hold another few days. Nearly a week later, the heartbeat still could not be found. After an ultrasound, it was confirmed that the baby they looked forward to meeting had passed away a week prior.

At this gestation, many people believe that babies are a clump of cells and nothing more. Jaelyn bravely shared this photo of her miscarried baby to spread awareness about how human these children truly are, even at only eleven weeks.

In addition, there is a common misconception that because these precious lives are “just a clump of cells,” they feel zero pain during abortion.

Dr. Maureen Condic is a professor of neurology at the University of Utah. She testified before Congress that a person’s experience of pain evolves over time, beginning in the first trimester:

The neural circuitry responsible for the most primitive response to pain, the spinal reflex, is in place by 8 weeks of development. ... This is the earliest point at which the fetus experiences pain in any capacity.

... A fetus responds just as humans at later stages of development respond; by withdrawing from the painful stimulus.

By 8 to 10 weeks, Dr. Condic says many of the neural connections are formed. How can any person who has the knowledge that a baby can feel the pain of abortion and see this beautiful and perfectly formed child, still think abortion is humane?

Editor’s note. This appeared at Secular Pro-life and is reposted with permission.