



WOMEN'S "RIGHTS" V. UNBORN CHILD'S RIGHT TO LIFE

Proponents of abortion react to Court's upholding ban on partial birth abortion procedure

Recently the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of upholding the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban. While pro-lifers are rejoicing over this small victory in the battle against abortion, the abortion industry is in a panic because one of the most ghoulish procedures ever devised by the medical profession can no longer be performed. I wondered to myself how in the world they would come up with talking points to support a procedure that is literally infanticide. I would imagine it is pretty hard to come up with positive ways to uphold a process that delivers a baby except for its head and then crushes the head by suctioning out the brain. But of course the abortion industry is never without words to support the sacrosanct sacrament of abortion---the right to do whatever is right in your own eyes irregardless of innocent human life. In fact, the same day of the ruling Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-California) and Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-New York) introduced the Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA), an attempt to codify *Roe v. Wade* into law. If passed, FOCA would not only make the right to abortion the law of the land, but it would invalidate many pro-life laws enacted at the state level to reduce abortions. It seems incongruous that giving women the "freedom to choose" does not include female infants who are the object of their mother's choice to abort.

Revealing facts about the pro-abortion mentality from Justice Ruth Bader-Ginsburg

Justice Ginsburg wrote a passionate dissent to the decision upholding the ban on partial-birth abortion; she was joined by the three other justices who voted against upholding the ban. In her view, "equality" for women cannot be actualized unless women have "full" abortion rights even for a gruesome procedure like the partial birth abortion or "intact dilation and evacuation" as they like to call it. She wrote, women's right "to realize their full potential" and "a woman's autonomy to determine *her* life course, and thus enjoy equal citizenship' absolutely is dependent on their ability "to control their reproductive lives." [Emphasis Added] She went on to state in her dissent that "ancient notions about women's place in the family" have long since been "discredited" because they impede "women's progress toward full citizenship." As a woman who has a profession (Registered Pharmacist), but who decided raising a family and keeping a home was more important than that career and as a full-time volunteer, I am insulted by Justice Ginsburg's assessment of my role as a woman. Apparently she looks with disdain at any woman who does not seek a career; one who loves home and family more than success in the workplace.

How Justice Ginsburg sees Social Security benefits for women

Not content with cramming her idea of femininity down women's throats, she expresses her scorn concerning women receiving Social Security benefits from their husbands. She resents the Social Security classification that depends upon "archaic" attitudes "such as assumptions as to [women's] dependency." She believes this separate classification violates "equal rights." If her attitude is consistent, it is imperative that all women should examine the so-called Equal Rights Amendment very carefully for what it really says behind those high-sounding words. Women like Justice Ginsburg believe that all women should be treated just like men; that includes working to receive Social Security benefits. Now how many of you are wondering what keeping a house and raising children is if it is not work? There is no choice for women who "choose" to be homemakers according to Ginsburg.

The manifesto for women

Abortion is not only a right of choice for women like Ginsburg; it is about "privacy." Any restriction on abortion, therefore, is a violation not only of choice but privacy. She believes that having the "right to choose" and "the right to privacy" are essential to a woman being complete...the right to kill her own baby is the foundation of a woman's identity. A baby's right to life---even a baby girl's---is subordinate to the woman's right to choose death at any time, for any reason, using any method. Ginsburg's so-called manifesto for women is predicated on not allowing something like another human being whom she had a part in creating to interfere with "the destiny of the woman [to] be shaped---on her own conception of her spiritual imperatives and her place in society." That sounds a lot like "every man/woman did what was right in their own eyes," another way to describe anarchy. She further wrote that "the notion that the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act furthers any legitimate governmental interest is, quite simply irrational." She believes it is irrational to protect all life? She says this in spite of the fact that our nation was founded in part on the "right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"---in that order. Liberty cannot usurp life or it becomes licentiousness, which is exactly what this Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America is promoting in the guise of "rights" of one group of people.

Equal rights are not equal

We need to remember that those who promote a worldview other than a Biblical worldview will not stop until they achieve their goal - eradicating the notion that any plumb-line of morality and ethics for human behavior exists - that there is NO absolute truth; therefore, we CAN do whatever is right in our own eyes. We need to be wary of high-sounding words and look behind them for the worldview that is being represented, or we will lose our right to be free.

Reproduction of this newsletter in its entirety is highly encouraged!!!!