On April 7, 2015, Pro-life Kansas Governor Sam Brownback (R) signed into law the groundbreaking Unborn Child Protection from Dismemberment Abortion Act. The bill received overwhelming support in the state legislature earlier this year. In signing the bill, Governor Brownback makes Kansas the first state in the nation to enact the National Right to Life model legislation that will prohibit the use of dismemberment abortions. The law will go into effect on July 1, 2015.

The next day, Oklahoma State Senate passed the Unborn Child Protection from Dismemberment Abortion Act (HB 1721). Gov. Mary Fallin, signed the measure into law on April 13, and it will go into effect on November 1, 2015.

“The Unborn Child Protection from Dismemberment Abortion Act is the first of what we hope will be many state laws banning dismemberment abortions,” said Carol Tobias, president of National Right to Life. “This law has the power to transform the landscape of abortion policy in the United States.”

Dismemberment abortions are as brutal as the partial-birth abortion method, which is now illegal in the United States. In his dissent to the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2000 Stenberg v. Carhart decision, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that in dismemberment abortions, “The fetus, in many cases, dies just as a human adult or child would: It bleeds to death as it is torn limb from limb. The fetus can be alive at the beginning of the dismemberment process and can survive for a time while its limbs are being torn off.”

Justice Kennedy added in the Court’s 2007 opinion, Gonzales v. Carhart, which upheld the ban on partial-birth abortion, that D&E abortions are “laden with the power to devalue human life…” “Dismemberment abortion kills a baby by tearing her apart limb from limb,” said Mary Spaulding Balch, J.D., National Right to Life director of state legislation. “The unborn child has a beating heart, brain waves, and every organ system in place. Dismemberment abortions occur after the baby has reached these milestones.”
In April, the Silent No More Awareness Campaign focused on sibling survivors of abortion as part of its Healing the Shockwaves of Abortion initiative.

During the March for Life in D.C. in January, several speakers at the Silent No More gathering talked about the brother or sister they lost to abortion, and how that has impacted their lives.

Fourteen-year-old Zoe Griffin from North Carolina said the discovery that her pro-life mom, Brice, had aborted her first child was shocking, but ultimately strengthened Zoe’s activism.

Nick Kraft from North Dakota began praying outside an abortion clinic when he was 12 and was looking forward to attending the March with his entire school when he learned he had lost two siblings to abortion. His long trip to D.C. became fueled with new purpose.

Kelli Sparrow, a woman in her 40s, read a letter she had written to her aborted younger sister that alluded to the multi-generational impact of the Shockwaves of abortion.

“I mourn the loss of knowing you, my sister, and also the loss of possible nieces and nephews, a lifelong friendship and the hole that is at every family gathering.”

Parents who have experienced abortion often keep it a secret and fear telling others, especially their children. But many parents have found sharing the truth draws the family closer and heals wounds, and can spare the next generation from repeating painful choices.

With an estimated 56 million children lost to abortion since 1973, millions of families have someone missing from their family portrait. Healing the Shockwaves of Abortion aims to help these families confront and heal from those losses.

Testimonies, prayers and healing resources can be found at the Shockwaves website, www.abortionshockwaves.com Media interested in interviewing sibling survivors should get in touch with Leslie Palma, communications director for Priests for Life, at leslie@priestsforlife.org or 347-286-7277.

On February 20, 2015, In Defense of Christians, a Washington D.C.–based advocacy group for Christians in the Middle East, gathered religious leaders and government officials around a table to discuss the impact of and response to the tragic murder of 21 Coptic Christians in Libya by ISIS.

Cardinal Wuerl opened the event with a pledge of solidarity from the Catholic community to their Coptic brothers and sisters. “If one person is killed because of his or her faith,” the Cardinal said, “all of us suffer. I am here to say to Bishop Angaelos, ‘We are raising our voice with you.’”

Bishop Angaelos responded: “This is not just a crime against Coptic Christians. It is a crime against Christianity. It is a crime against people of all faiths. It is a crime against humanity. We do stand together, and we do stand as people of faith—but also as humans, valuing and dignifying the sanctity of life.”

Highlighting the radical Christian response of forgiveness, the Bishop continued, “We cannot let these acts change our hearts, we cannot hate, because that would be the ultimate defeat.”

Joining Dr. Lantos Swett for the roundtable were Professor Robert Destro, Director of the Interdisciplinary Program in Law & Religion at The Catholic University of America’s Columbus School of Law and Nermien Riad, founder of Coptic Orphans, among others. Destro and Riad sit on IDC’s Board of Advisors.
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Assisted suicide kills the patient, not the pain.

This simple but profound truth eludes the assisted suicide lobby. Now led by “Compassion & Choices” (C&C), that lobby is planning to introduce assisted suicide bills in as many states as they can. They already have tried to do so in 22 states and the District of Columbia in 2015. Though they failed, they are chipping away at the political and cultural resistance. They are especially paving the way in California.

The highly publicized death of 29 year-old Brittany Maynard, who killed herself on November 1, 2014, has been used to establish the prominence of the assisted suicide lobby.

Maynard’s narrative could have been different. She could have focused on pain management for her terminal brain cancer. Instead, she chose assisted suicide and decided to be a spokeswoman for C&C. They eagerly accepted her offer.

However, Maynard’s much-publicized decision to end her life stands in stark contrast to others who, despite their terminal illnesses, work from an understanding that it goes against the Hippocratic Oath for doctors to assist in a suicide and that it betrays human dignity to intentionally take one’s own life. Philip Johnson and Maggie Karner are two examples of people with the same terminal brain cancer as Maynard, but who chose pain management over suicide and continue to do so.

It is unacceptable to say that the elimination of a person is ever a solution to any health problem. This philosophy stacks the value of vulnerable persons against their desire for “quality of life” and pain-free end-of-life. And it exalts one’s “utility” and the expenses of their medical care above their unique value as persons. It is rife with potential for elder abuse by family members with ulterior motives, compromises the trust-based doctor-patient relationship, and creates a loophole for health care institutions and insurance companies to make decisions based on cost-saving instead of life-saving.

In 2008, Oregon resident Barbara Wagner had lung cancer and was denied $4,000 a month chemotherapy drugs by her insurance company. Incentivized, perhaps, by the legality of assisted suicide in Oregon, the company did agree to cover $50 drugs to kill herself in an assisted suicide. Wagner refused.

This story illustrates how assisted suicide laws will be leveraged against vulnerable people. If we do not firmly stand against assisted suicide, stories like this one will become common.

As a society, we must do all we can to protect the lives of the most vulnerable people. Those who are most at risk of falling victim to the pressures of assisted suicide are elderly, sick, mentally ill, depressed, and poor people who cannot afford healthcare. They need advocates for their lives, not proponents of their deaths.

The value of human life doesn’t come from health or utility, but from something essential to every person: humanness. The value of human life does not depend on a cost-benefit analysis or convenience to the caregivers. Treatment that has a reasonable hope for a benefit, whether in saving or prolonging life or simply making pain more bearable, is a moral obligation, regardless of the cost.

That’s why we must support palliative care and hospice care where the aim is to comfort, not to kill, the patient.

To be pro-life is to be pro-whole life, from conception until natural death. Pro-life leaders must join efforts of disability rights groups, family policy councils, and others as they fight the onslaught of pro-assisted suicide bills being introduced in their states.
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The Becket Fund is defending the Little Sisters of the Poor against the government’s contraception and abortion mandate.

What is the status of the case against the Little Sisters of the Poor?

It’s still going on. There is a court case currently in the 10th Circuit Court in Denver (where the Little Sisters’ main house is). It is a nationwide class action case. During that case, the Little Sisters are protected by an order stopping the mandate. That’s why they’re not getting crushed with fines right now.

How does this affect the bigger fight against the HHS mandate?

This case is part of a big stack of similar cases: Hobby Lobby, Wheaton College, Notre Dame, and now several dioceses in Pennsylvania. The Sisters’ case started the string of cases.

This is a big, unnecessary mandate. The government can distribute contraceptives without crushing the Little Sisters for their religion.

What are the next steps in this battle?

What I would sure like to see is the Supreme Court to get the picture and back off. The government has been so aggressive in its pursuit of the Little Sisters. Only when they take the case as a “full merits case,” like Hobby Lobby, will it apply to every case. Hobby Lobby applies to all businesses, not to nonprofits.

This interview was conducted on April 17, 2015 by Evelyn Gardett, outreach assistant at National Right to Life

I remember in my seminary days right after high school that we had a prayer service one night in which our rector said, “The clergy of the 21st Century are going to have to be people of extraordinary holiness.” I believed him then as much as ever, but now I understand him more than ever. And it’s because our religious freedom is under attack.

Along with scores of other organizations, my ministry “Priests for Life” is battling the Obama Administration in federal court, to defend our simple right to conduct our business affairs according to our faith. We refuse to participate in the government’s plan to expand access to abortion, and therefore are insisting that we be exempt from any requirement to do so through the insurance plans we offer our employees.

Not only is the government trying to deny us this right, but they are doing so while claiming that they are not denying it. Rather than openly admit that they oppose religious freedom, they try to make our cooperation with their immoral plans seem as innocuous as possible, and then accuse us of making mountains out of mole hills and being silly in our objections to, for instance, the simple act of signing a form.

When the Roman Empire persecuted the early Christians, they tried to force them to do what seems like a small, simple act: take a pinch of incense, throw it on the fire, and say “Caesar is Lord.” The Christians objected, even at the cost of their lives, because this small act was actually a big betrayal of their only Lord, Jesus.

History is repeating itself now in America.

President Obama understands what is going on here. When asked in his February 2, 2014 interview by Bill O’Reilly about the objections of religious groups to the mandate, the President stated, “Here’s the way this thing works. All they have to do is sign a form saying they don’t — they are a religious institution — And — and they get what they want. The problem is they don’t want to sign the form — Because they think that somehow makes them complicit.”

Exactly right. And Mr. President, that’s not only what we and the other religious plaintiffs think; that’s precisely what our religion teaches. And the freedom to follow that teaching is precisely what you, the law, and the Courts need to respect.

~ Luke 24:32 ~

On the Road to Emmaus, by Duccio, 1308-1311
Museo dell’Opera del Duomo, Siena.
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