

# SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS FEDERAL PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN

## Ruling Proves Importance of Voting Pro-Life First

by Jim Cole, General Counsel

Some who claim to be pro-life say that voting for or against political candidates on their pro-life stands is futile. Since abortion law is made largely by the federal courts, they argue, and elected officials cannot change abortion law, pro-lifers should assess candidates on all of the issues, not just pro-life concerns.

This argument was refuted in April by the Supreme Court's decision in *Gonzales v. Carhart*. By a 5-4 decision, the justices upheld the federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. Federal bans on partial birth abortion had been approved by Congress twice before, in 1996 and 1997, only to be vetoed by a pro-abortion President. The 2003 bill was signed by a pro-life President whose election in 2000 showed that every single vote counts. The constitutionality of the bill was upheld thanks to the opinions of new justices President Bush appointed and the U.S. Senate confirmed. The Act and the Carhart ruling would not have happened if voters had not elected a President and U.S. Senators who made them possible.

Not only did the Carhart ruling limit the scope of the abortion license established by *Roe v. Wade* by upholding a ban on one procedure, it may also mark a somewhat favorable change in the legal atmosphere in which future abortion regulations are reviewed by the courts.

In 1999, a Nebraska state law banning partial-birth abortion was held unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court on a 5-4 vote. The 2003 Act was drafted to cure the flaws that the Court's 1999 ruling had identified. The Act utilizes a far more detailed description of the forbidden procedure than the Nebraska law did, so the Court could find that it does not sweep into the scope other types of abortions. The Supreme Court held this

avoided the "overbreadth" problem of the Nebraska law and was not unduly burdensome on a woman's choice for abortion.

A second ground on which the Nebraska law had been struck down was its lack of a health exception. The federal Act does not have one, although it does contain a "life of the mother" exception. The Supreme Court found that the evidence in the case did not compel a conclusion that women's health was endangered without a health exception. The Court noted that other procedures to accomplish an abortion at the same stage were available. For these reasons, The Court allowed the Act to take effect. However, the Court left open the possibility that women who allege adverse health effects because of certain conditions they suffer can challenge the applicability of the law to them in a later lawsuit.

The holding that no health exception is required may represent a sea change in the attitudes of the federal courts toward pro-life laws. In the past, the courts have often appeared to presume that such laws are unconstitutional from the outset. The Carhart ruling contained language exhibiting a new attitude of neutrality. In its approach to the Act, the Court indicated that instead of showing suspicion of legislative attempts to promote respect for life, federal courts ought to give such laws the same measure of respect that other laws are given.

If this new direction is followed in future decisions, it may well result in additional success for pro-life laws. But it remains to be seen whether Carhart represents a lasting change in abortion jurisprudence. To ensure that the decision sticks, it is vitally necessary to continue to elect a President and Senators who will nominate and confirm open-minded judges to sit on federal courts. Only such judges will avoid the demagogic ideology of Justice Ginsberg's dissent, in which abortion was once again portrayed as an essential

requirement to keep women from being oppressed.

Carhart will be remembered as a wonderful pro-life victory only if we pro-lifers stick to our cause in the voting booth. The 5-4 majority in Carhart could well become a minority when the next vacancy on the Supreme Court is filled if a pro-life President and pro-life Senate are not elected in 2008.



### Impact on Missouri Ban

The 1999 Missouri partial-birth abortion ban has been enjoined by the federal courts since the day after the General Assembly overrode the Governor's veto, an event that many readers will remember from attending the pro-life rally at the Capitol in Jefferson City at the time of the override.

The law has been the subject of both federal court and state court challenges mounted by Planned Parenthood. The state courts ruled that the statute does not embrace any abortion procedures except partial-birth abortions. The federal courts ruled that without a health exception, the Missouri statute violated the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Supreme Court withheld a ruling on the Missouri law while it considered the federal law.

A few days after Carhart was handed down, the U.S. Supreme Court remanded the Missouri case to the Eighth Circuit for reconsideration in light of the ruling in Carhart. It is expected that the Eighth Circuit will now uphold the Missouri law. If it does, the effect will be to make partial-birth abortion the subject of state enforcement as well as federal enforcement, enabling county prosecutors as well as U.S. Attorneys to prosecute any violations.

## Missouri Supreme Court Upholds Parental Rights

On May 1, 2007, the Missouri Supreme Court upheld the parental rights portion of SB 1, enacted by the special session of the General Assembly in Fall 2005. Planned Parenthood had filed a lawsuit challenging section 188.250, RSMo., which provides for civil sanctions for anyone who "shall intentionally cause, aid, or assist a minor to obtain an abortion without the consent or consents required by sec. 188.028." In addition to the minor's own consent, the required consent consists either of the written consent of a parent or else an order of a juvenile court in lieu of parental consent.

One of the challenges to the law was that it would violate First Amendment rights by preventing counseling about the availability of abortion in other states. The Court ruled that if the statute would be interpreted to outlaw such counseling, then it would indeed violate the First Amendment. Therefore, the Court construed the term, "cause, aid, or assist a minor to obtain an abortion," not to include providing information or counseling about abortion rights. The law, therefore, prohibits acts, not speech.

Another Planned Parenthood argument was that the law purported to regulate the conduct of out-of-state abortion clinics, and Missouri could not exercise control outside of its

borders. The Court found that the statute did not, in fact, purport to regulate conduct that occurs "wholly outside of Missouri," but only conduct that occurs inside Missouri. As such, the statute was constitutional.

The effect of the Court's ruling can best be understood by examples. If a school counselor in Missouri tells a Missouri minor about the fact that abortions in Illinois do not require parental consent, that conduct is protected by the First Amendment, and he does not violate the law. If the counselor goes further and telephones another person to drive the minor to Illinois to obtain an abortion there without parental consent, then the counselor has performed an act to aid an abortion and does violate the law.

It is easy to think of additional hypothetical situations and ask whether or not the law imposes liability in them. Certainly there will be circumstances in which reasonable people differ on whether the law is violated or not. That is why we have courts, judges, and juries. Now that the statute has been upheld, it is to be hoped that Missouri parents and courts will not be shy about protecting the parents' rights not to have strangers arrange abortions for their minor daughters without parental knowledge and consent.

---

Letter from the President -

### Sweet Victories and Grim Realities

Yes . . . sweet victories and grim realities. That would best summarize the events of the last couple of months.

Sweet victories in the United States Supreme Court decision on partial-birth abortion, the certain favorable ruling of the Missouri ban, the Missouri Supreme Court's upholding of parental rights contained in the 2005 pro-life legislation, and passage by the Missouri Legislature of an omnibus pro-life bill.

But there are also grim realities. The U.S. Supreme Court's decision on the partial-birth abortion procedure left intact the right to kill an unborn baby at any point prior to birth. Additionally, the Missouri Legislature passed the MOHELA proposal which opens the doors for state funding of unethical research destroying human embryos. In this, as well as other legislation, many of our otherwise pro-life legislators were seemingly blind to the realities of our state constitution, post-Amendment 2. Jim Cole's and Susan Klein's articles give more details on the legislative session.

Most disappointing of all was the failure of the legislature to pass the Joint Resolutions (HJR 11 and SJR 20) to place the cloning issue on the next statewide ballot. With a pro-life majority in both houses, this legislation should have succeeded.

But there's no time to rest. Missouri Right to Life is part of a larger coalition already working to plan an Initiative Petition campaign. We will begin immediately to finalize the language, gather names of those who wish to volunteer in this effort, and to organize the campaign. We are determined to pass a constitutional amendment

that bans all human cloning and closes the loopholes to such a ban that now exist in our state constitution. I urge you to volunteer in this effort by completing the volunteer form in this MRL News and returning it with your most generous donation to help with these efforts.



Pam Fichter

Thanks to your past generosity, our office is now equipped with updated computers, and we will be hiring an additional staff member in the next few months.

I am tremendously grateful to Susan Klein, Legislative Liaison, Jim Cole, State Legislative Director and General Counsel, and Patty Skain, Executive Director. They were tireless in their efforts during the legislative session to uphold the sanctity of human life and to prevent taxpayer funding of unethical research. While we were profoundly disappointed in many events of this session, Missouri Right to Life members can be proud of those who represent us at the State Capitol. They are faithful witnesses to the truth and deserve our most sincere thanks. You can read more about Patty in the featured article spotlighting her tremendous contribution to MRL.

I hope to see many of you at the National Right to Life Convention which will be held in Kansas City June 14 - 16 and be hosted by Kansas Right to Life. Please stop by the Missouri Right to Life table and say hello.

# The Muddled 2007 Legislative Session

by Jim Cole, State Legislative Chair

On the last day of the 2007 session, the Missouri Legislature passed an important pro-life bill, HB 1055. It prohibits public school districts and charter schools from allowing a provider of abortion services to present materials or instruction in respect to sexuality. It establishes the alternatives to abortion program as a permanent program in state law. It mandates that any outpatient facility that performs second or third trimester abortions, or five or more first trimester abortions per year, must meet the health and safety standards of ambulatory surgical centers. While abortionists complained that this mandate could cause two abortion clinics in Missouri to shut down, the public must wonder how safe surgical abortions can actually be if abortion clinics cannot meet the standards that any other outpatient surgery center must meet.

At the end of the session, the pro-abortion side was handed a gift by a legislator who did not consider the pro-abortion ramifications of his words. There is a right way and a wrong way to do almost everything, and this legislator in haste did it the wrong way. He intended to amend HB 818 to allow nurse-midwives to practice their profession, a goal Missouri Right to Life does not oppose. The legislator provided that anyone with "tocological" certification could perform services related to pregnancy. Tocological is a 19th century word for midwifery, when midwives were the primary providers of illegal abortions. Unfortunately, the amendment also used the phrase, "notwithstanding any other law to the contrary." This superseded an existing law that forbids anyone but doctors from performing abortions. The legal effect of these lapses in language is to allow certified nurse-midwives to perform abortions, a result that all pro-lifers oppose.

In the area of cloning and unethical experiments on human embryos, the efforts to put a constitutional amendment on the ballot in 2008 to correct the obvious loopholes of Amendment 2 were stifled, snubbing the hundreds of pro-life citizens who visited the Capitol on Lobby Day. Moreover, the proponents of anti-life projects won state resources for their work. Funding was proposed from the sale of approximately half of MOHELA's loan portfolio for the Lewis & Clark Discovery Initiative (SB 389), from the Life Science Trust Fund (HB 7), and from direct appropriations to the Missouri Technology Corporation, a private non-profit company, whose board includes many of the individuals who led the campaign in favor of Amendment 2.

The opposition of Missouri Right to Life and other pro-life groups to all these resource requests could not overcome the pressure that the Governor and legislative leadership brought to bear in their favor. While the descriptions of the projects were narrowed considerably in an attempt to respond to pro-life concerns, there still remained monies that appeared open for use by the cloners. Even if none remained, however, Amendment 2 provides, "No state or local governmental body or official shall eliminate, reduce, deny, or withhold any public funds provided or eligible to be provided to a person that (i) lawfully conducts stem cell research or provides stem cell therapies and cures, . . ." The reduction or elimination of the funds to meet pro-life concerns was precisely what Amendment 2 prohibits. On the legislative floor, some otherwise pro-life legislators claimed that Amendment 2 really doesn't mean what it says, including some who gave speeches against Amendment 2 last fall highlighting precisely this problem. How Amendment 2 means something different now than it did during last year's campaign was never described.

## **Initiative Petition to Ban All Human Cloning**

Missouri Right to Life has joined with Missourians Against Human Cloning, Missouri Catholic Conference, Missouri Family Network and others in a coalition effort to organize an Initiative Petition to place on the next statewide ballot a constitutional amendment that would truly ban all human cloning. A 2005 McLaughlin poll showed that the majority of Missourians oppose human cloning. Passage of Amendment 2 has left huge loopholes to such a ban in our constitution. With the very passage of Amendment 2, Missouri citizens deserve an opportunity to close the loopholes and ban all human cloning.

Missouri Right to Life is working within the coalition to craft ballot language to submit to the Secretary of State and will begin collecting signatures as soon as possible. Volunteers will be needed from across the state to participate in this process.

Please consider helping. Clip out and send the volunteer form in this MRL News.

# Thought you'd like to know . . .

## NEW NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY BOOK "IN THE WOMB" HELPS PRO-LIFE CAUSE

The public discussion about the power of ultrasound and modern imaging technologies has revealed something fascinating — the pro-abortion movement does not want us peering into the womb. The view inside the womb transforms the moral debate over abortion. Once that image is seen, the vocabulary necessarily changes.

This gestating creature is a baby, a child, a person — and a wonder to behold. That wonder is beautifully depicted in a book released just recently by the National Geographic Society, *In the Womb*. Put simply — the book is one of the most amazing volumes my eyes have ever seen. The book's author is Peter Tallack, a geneticist and science writer who, along with scientific modeler David Barlow and ultrasound expert Professor Stuart Campbell, brings together absolutely incredible "four-dimensional" images and photographs of the developing baby.

As Tallack explains, "For obstetricians, the development of 3D and 4D scans has been the medical equivalent of the Hubble Space Telescope, allowing researchers to scrutinize fetal development and behavior in unprecedented detail."

The book starts at the very beginning, with an incredible photograph of a human sperm actually fertilizing a human egg. That one picture and film sequence has been described as "the greatest purely optical magnification in motion-picture history." From that point onward the book traces the development of a baby girl through the sequence of trimesters. Her physical development is breathtaking in its beauty. But the biggest surprise for most readers may well be the revelations about fetal behavior. Babies are learning to sleep, taste, smile, cry, and suck their thumbs — all while in the womb.

Albert Mohler [LifeNews.com 5/6/07](#)

---

## ROE V. WADE LOSES PUBLIC SUPPORT

**The more people understand about the court ruling,  
the more likely they are to be pro-life**

A national public opinion survey released this week shows that many people who know the facts about *Roe v. Wade* -- the 1973 Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion -- think it should be overturned.

The survey, commissioned by the Ethics and Public Policy Center and the Judicial Confirmation Network and conducted by Ayres, McHenry & Associates, Inc., was completed in early May.

"Public opinion on the Supreme Court overturning *Roe v. Wade* is significantly affected by a focus on the conditions under which abortion is allowed by the ruling," the survey report stated.

David O'Steen, executive director of the National Right to Life Committee, said the survey confirms what he's known for years.

"If you just ask about *Roe v. Wade*, there's majority support for it. Using the slogans of modern business, *Roe v. Wade* is a 'brand' that has been sold to the American people by the media," O'Steen said. "But if you describe what *Roe v. Wade* does, then a majority doesn't support it."

In response to the survey's first question -- "Would you like the Supreme Court to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, or not?" -- 55 percent said *Roe* should not be overturned; just 35 percent indicated it should.

Support for *Roe* varied depending on circumstances. Seventy-five percent of respondents said they supported abortion when the life of the mother is at risk, and 77 percent said it should be legal if the pregnancy poses a health risk or if it resulted from rape or incest. If the preborn child was diagnosed with a "serious physical or mental deformity," abortion support dropped to 55 percent.



Seventy-nine percent said abortion should not be legal if "the woman does not like the gender of the fetus"; 72 percent said it should be illegal if the woman believes the child would interfere with her life; and 65 percent said a lack of financial stability does not make it right.

Respondents were then told that *Roe v. Wade* allowed abortion in every circumstance presented -- and were again asked if it should be overturned. This time, 48 percent said it should not be overturned; 43 percent said it should be.

"While many Americans will say they support *Roe v. Wade*," said Carrie Gordon Earll, senior bioethics analyst at Focus on the Family Action, "most don't know it allows unrestricted abortion for any reason throughout pregnancy."

Wendy Cloyd [CitizenLink.org](#)

---

## ISRAELI WOMAN SAVED BY UMBILICAL CORD STEM CELLS

Umbilical cord blood stem cells donated by two different mothers saved the life of a woman with acute leukemia in the first procedure of its kind in Israel, according to the *Jerusalem Post*.

After doctors at Sheba hospital in Tel Hashomer gave the 27-year-old woman the stem cells, it took only two weeks for her condition to begin to improve, the *Post* reported. Bone marrow transplants usually take a month to work.

In addition, the umbilical cord cells do not have to be an exact match to the patient's tissue type, so cord blood donated from any newborn baby can be used. Because the woman's leukemia was so severe, doctors needed more cells than could be obtained from one umbilical cord, so they used cells from two unrelated donors, according to the *Post*.

"With the development of umbilical cord blood banks, we decided to try it," Prof. Arnon Nagler of Sheba Hospital told the *Post*. "This is a revolution on technical grounds because the stem cells in umbilical cords are available, and medically because it makes it easier to find suitable donors -- and the two doses made it effective much faster.

"It also saves the efforts required to find a perfect adult donor. Until now, we transplanted stem cells from umbilical cord blood only into children, and one dose at a time."

Liz Townsend [NRLC.org](#)

---

## HARVARD STUDY ON ABORTION-BREAST CANCER LINK SERIOUSLY FLAWED

A new survey conducted by Harvard researchers on the link between abortion and breast cancer concludes that there is no link. However, further analysis shows they did not allow enough time for the possible onset of breast cancer following the women's abortions, thus skewing their data. Published in the April 23 issue of *Archives of*

Internal Medicine, a JAMA journal, the researchers say that neither induced abortion nor spontaneous abortion (miscarriage) appears to be associated with breast cancer risk in premenopausal women.

Researchers at Brigham & Women's Hospital, Harvard medical School, and Harvard School of Public Health followed women over a period of ten years and asked them about whether they had abortions or miscarriages during that time. But critics say the results are flawed because the researchers did not allow enough time following the abortion for the potential cancer to develop.

Joel Brind, president of the Breast Cancer Prevention Institute, told LifeNews.com, "This isn't the first time that Harvard Nurses Study researchers have produced the wrong epidemiological results. They were wrong about combined hormone replacement therapy reducing the risk of heart attack and stroke, and they're wrong about abortion.

Brind, a professor at New York's Baruch College, pointed out that breast cancer cases have risen 40 percent since abortion was made virtually unlimited in the 1973 Supreme Court case *Roe v. Wade*.

In 1996, Brind and other researchers conducted analysis of all the major studies done in the field to that time. They concluded that women who had an abortion before their first term child had a 50% increased risk of developing breast cancer while women who had an abortion after their first child sustained a 30% increased risk.

A few years ago, the British Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists confirmed Brind's study and said it contained no major flaws or errors.

Meanwhile, Karen Malec of the Coalition on Abortion/Breast Cancer criticized the results as well.

"We call on journalists to challenge (the researchers) to conduct a proper study that allows sufficient follow-up time between exposure to abortion and the development of breast cancer," she said in a statement given to LifeNews.com.

Malec also criticized the study as political because it received funding from the National Cancer Institute, which has discounted the abortion breast cancer link because of the politics of abortion and convened one-sided panels to try to disprove it.

So why has the NCI continued to spend millions of dollars to fund studies on the abortion-cancer link?" asked Malec. "Clearly, its scientists must either suspect a link or know that it exists."

There are 17 statistically significant studies that show a link between abortion and breast cancer, eight of which were conducted in the United States. It is estimated that upwards of 10,000 cases of breast cancer each year presently, and up to over 25,000 per year in twenty or thirty years hence, are or will be attributable to induced abortion.

Eve Sanchez Silver, a former Susan G. Komen medical research analyst and Hispanic outreach director, confirms the abortion-breast cancer link. Silver explained that the breast is an organ that is not mature at birth and does not become fully mature until after 32 weeks of pregnancy. As a result of that state of development, interruption of pregnancy via an abortion before 32 weeks leaves breast cells exposed to estrogen, which is highly carcinogenic.

Related websites:

Eve Sanchez Silver at [stopabortionbreastcancer.org](http://stopabortionbreastcancer.org)

National Coalition on Abortion/Breast Cancer at [abortionbreastcancer.com](http://abortionbreastcancer.com)

Steven Ertelt LifeNews.com

MRL In Focus --

## Patty Skain



Many years ago, Missouri Right to Life received a special delivery package from "He who guides us and guards us." It contained a bundle of determination, organization, and tenacity -- all topped with a halo of red hair.

Patty Skain came fully equipped to fulfill the job description that the interview committee had before them. She had a degree in art history and an MBA in management, both from the University of Missouri. And, most importantly, a place in her heart for the pro-life cause. We at MRL should have known -- and have been discovering ever since then -- what a gift we received!

Before coming to MRL, Patty worked for the State of Missouri; but, following an extended maternity leave, made the decision not to return to that position.

In a talk that Patty gave at a retreat, she told what followed:

This time, however, my job search was a little different. This time, I prayed to God to show me what kind of work He wanted me to do.

During this time of prayer and job searching, something else happened to me. I began to think about the abortion issue and my pro-choice position. This was helped along by several things. First and foremost, I was now the mother of two small children. Also, when I worked at the State of Missouri, I had an office with a window that looked across at the Innocent's Cemetery that was displayed every January. In the office, we had several conversations about its significance.

Also, that summer of 1989, there was a U.S. Supreme Court decision that weakened the *Roe v. Wade* decision. As a consequence, there were many talk shows discussing abortion. A participant on one such show remarked, "I guess abortion is necessary but my faith tells me its wrong."

That is the conflict I was having in my own heart. One day as I was on my daily walk, I could not get the abortion question out of my head. During that walk, God, or Mary, or someone hit me over the head with a "spiritual 2x4" and by the time I returned home, I was pro-life. It happened so quickly and so completely that I have always looked upon it as an act of God.

Thus, in October 1989, Patty came to Missouri Right to Life with a deep recommitment to her faith, a conversion to the pro-life cause, and a burden to do all to restore respect for the sanctity of life. And we were -- and are -- the beneficiaries.

As Executive Director, Patty is involved in every facet of Missouri Right to Life's activities. She serves with kindness, determination, diplomacy, balance, and composure.

Patty, her husband, Mike, and their three sons, Patrick, 20, Chris, 18, and Matt, 15, make their home on several acres outside Jefferson City. Joining them are two dogs, four "dumped" puppies, two cats, and 27 goats (14 in various stages of motherhood!)

Patty and Mike are very active at their Catholic parish, Immaculate Conception, and are dedicated to each other and their sons.

Missouri Right to Life is blessed and thankful.

*I give thanks to my God always on your account for the grace of God bestowed on you in Christ Jesus, that in him you were enriched in every way, with all discourse and all knowledge, as the testimony to Christ was confirmed among you, so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift as you wait for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ. He will keep you firm to the end, irrefragable on the day of our Lord Jesus.*

- 1 Corinthians

## 2007 Missouri

### Right to Life

### Oratory

### Contest

### Winners



Joseph Kelly, winner of the Missouri Right to Life Oratory Contest, will be competing at the annual National Right to Life Oratory contest 2007 to be held during the National Right to Life convention in Kansas City, Missouri.

“We are very proud of Joseph and all of the participants in this year’s oratory contest,” stated Judy Ferguson, chairperson for the contest. “The students did a wonderful job, and we are looking forward to having Missouri represented at the National Right to Life Contest in June.”

Pictured above are Joseph Kelly, first place winner in the senior division, from Springfield High School in Springfield, MO, and Johanna Kelly (no relation to Joseph), first place winner in the junior division, from Christ the King Catholic School in Kansas City, MO.



### *In Memory & Honor*



*In memory of a loved one or to commemorate a special occasion, these gifts were made to Missouri Right to Life.*

*In Memory of:*

*Mary Margaret Phillips*

*Terry Boyle*

*Norma Lee*

*Given by:*

*Charles & Joyce Hunsel  
Virginia Mueller  
Ruth Rothermich  
Charles & Dot Gnade  
Frank & Carol Meier*

*Harry & Geri Graves*

*Patricia Collins*

*Missouri Right to Life encourages you to consider a commemoration for a family member or friend. Your gift will support pro-life work to restore respect for the sanctity of life.*

**Have questions about pro-life issues?**

**Wondering about pro-life legislation?**

**Want to take a more active role in your pro-life calling?**

**Then check the**

**Missouri Right to Life website at [www.missourilife.org](http://www.missourilife.org)**



### **Missouri Right to Life Statement on the Susan G. Komen Foundation and Race for the Cure**

Missouri Right to Life recognizes the contribution of Susan G. Komen and the “Race for the Cure” in support of breast cancer research. We also acknowledge their well-documented support of Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in the United States. A local Komen affiliate that makes no direct contribution to Planned Parenthood does so indirectly through support of Komen’s parent organization. While the Susan G. Komen Foundation works to protect human life on the one hand, it is subsidizing the destruction of human life on the other. The Komen Foundation denies the well-documented link between abortion and breast cancer. We urge all pro-life citizens to withhold support of Susan G. Komen and their activities until they end their association with Planned Parenthood.

### *Lunch For Life with the Sweeneys*

*June 13, 2007 10:30 am -- 1:15 pm*

*Carriage Club 5301 State Line Rd. Kansas City, MO*

The Mike & Shara Sweeney Family Foundation, together with the Rachel House Pregnancy Resource Centers, is hosting the second annual Lunch for Life -- a great opportunity to meet, learn, and discuss the passions of Mike and Shara Sweeney. This year you will also have the opportunity to meet Albert and DeeDee Pujols of the St. Louis Cardinals.

Lunch for Life helps further the cause of pro-life ministries, particularly pregnancy resource centers. One of the goals of this year’s event is to purchase an ultrasound machine for the Blue Springs Rachel House location.

To purchase tickets for the event, please call 913-402-1173 or go to [www.lunchforlife2007.com](http://www.lunchforlife2007.com)

# Witness to Roe

by Bob Landgraf

In March 1964, a young woman named Kitty Genovese came home from work at three in the morning. As she walked from her car to her apartment building, a man approached and stabbed her. She screamed. Someone in the 10-story building yelled out, "Let that girl alone." The attacker left, but came back twice to finish her off.

As it turned out, 38 people witnessed this assault, though none came to Kitty's aid. No one even called the police until the third attack, but by then it was too late. Imagine enduring the painful, burning sensations of multiple stab wounds and bleeding to death all alone on a dark night. It was a truly horrible fate.

An analysis by psychologists, supported by experiments, suggested two reasons why no one helped.

The first was a "state of pluralistic ignorance," meaning "each person decides that since nobody is concerned, nothing is wrong." For example, someone smelling smoke in a restaurant may wonder how serious it is. If no one rushes for an exit, he'll also be less inclined to leave.

The second reason was "diffusion of responsibility." The more witnesses there are, the less responsibility each individual feels. In Kitty's case, the tenants probably assumed others would help. Unfortunately, their assumption was wrong.

Fast forward to the present. We're familiar with Roe v Wade's legacy: an estimated 48 million unborn children killed, hundreds of their mothers dead due to complications, and tens of thousands suffering post-abortion syndrome.

This may sound like an Alfred Hitchcock horror movie, but it's not. It's real. So too is the pain these babies silently endure as their limbs are torn from their little bodies, their brains are sucked out, or their skin is burnt.

Contrary to popular belief, unborn children are capable of feeling pain much of the time they are in utero. Stick a baby in his palm ten weeks after conception, and he'll pull his hand away while opening his mouth to cry out. This baby has the sensory nerves needed to feel pain and send messages to the thalamus, a portion of the brain functioning by this time. Total brain development is not necessary to feel pain. Anencephalic infants are born without their cerebral cortex, yet react to pain stimuli just as infants having intact brains do.

As early as 18 weeks, an unborn child injected with a needle releases stress hormones, just as adults do when experiencing pain. Additionally, 22-week old preemies, who have the same pain-sensing system as unborn children that age, exhibit the ability to feel pain.

Not only do the unborn feel pain, recent developments suggest they feel it with even greater intensity than adults! The myelin sheath, which insulates nerves in adults, is not entirely formed by birth, thereby leaving portions of nerves exposed. Consequently, pain is not only felt at the point of impact, but also in body tissues surrounding exposed nerves from the point of impact to the brain.

The pain Roe has inflicted is incomprehensible. Regrettably, it is unnecessarily repeated year after year. Legalized abortion is not a disease awaiting a cure in the distant future, nor a natural phenomenon beyond our control.

Ending it does not require untold billions of dollars or risking lives in a military campaign.

The primary obstacle to ending Roe is simply a lack of votes for government officials that will seat pro-life Justices.

Are we doing our part to end this tragedy, or are we witnesses who look the other way? Have we fallen into the fallacy of "pluralistic ignorance" by tolerating abortion because many embrace it? Do we soothe our conscience through "diffusion of responsibility" by convincing ourselves others will solve the problem?

Granted, overturning Roe won't prevent every single abortion, just as laws against murder have not stopped all murders. However, such laws do provide a tremendous benefit by protecting the vast majority of the population and creating a framework for a civilized, compassionate society.

Countless unborn babies will face painful deaths, alone and in the dark, not unlike Kitty. They need our help to save their lives. Will we respond by coming to their aid, or will we close the window to our heart in an effort to dampen their silent screams?

---

*Bob Landgraf has been an active pro-life volunteer and a member of Missouri Right to Life for many years. This commentary was originally printed in the St. Louis Review, January 19, 2007.*

*Information for this article was obtained from Dr. John Willke's book, Love Them Both, and Christine Silk's article, Why Did Kitty Genovese Die?*

---

## Next Issue: 2007 Legislative Scorecard

# We Need You!



Missouri Right to Life has joined a coalition effort to organize an Initiative Petition to place on the ballot a constitutional amendment that would truly ban all human cloning.

There is important work to be done, and the coalition will need every available pro-life person to help with this task!

You can help by gathering signatures to place a proposed amendment on the ballot when the petitions become available, by staying informed via MRL's email updates, and by making your most generous donation possible to support the tremendous cost of this effort.

Please complete the form below and return it as soon as possible.

If you are accessible by email, please also provide your email address. It is the most effective and cost-efficient method to reach you.

Thank you so much for your help!

## Yes, I would like to help by:

- Making a donation     \$10                       \$25                       \$50  
                                   \$100                       Other
- Gathering signatures
- Staying informed

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

Return to: Missouri Right to Life, P. O. Box 651, Jefferson City MO 65102

NONPROFIT  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
JEFFERSON CITY, MO  
PERMIT NO. 206

Missouri Right to Life  
P. O. Box 651  
Jefferson City, MO 65102