

A culture of death

I never thought I'd see it, but I guess that's naive of me, isn't it. To think that the devil would never stoop so low as to _____ fill in the blank.

“What's this all about?”, you ask.

This week, the Supreme Court heard a case about abortion. It was a Louisiana case in which a judge had ruled that abortionists would be required in Louisiana to have “admitting privileges” at a local hospital, in order to be allowed by the state of Louisiana to continue to provide abortions (see my previous article on “Focusing on Distractions”).

Louisiana indeed allows abortion, but in a compromise with the devil, the abortionist must have admitting privileges to a local hospital. This means that if something goes wrong in the process of taking and ending the life of a child, and it is found that the mother's own life is threatened, the “doctor” performing the abortion must be able to have the mother admitted to a local hospital (admitting privileges), ostensibly to save her life.

In a similar case from Texas in 2016, The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Hon. John Roberts (the tie-breaking, deciding vote in today's decision), ruled that indeed the abortionist *must have* admitting privileges in a hospital. But that was a Texas case. Now, regarding this Louisiana case, Justice Roberts seems to have had a change of heart.

In this case, he along with 4 of his colleagues on the Supreme Court, decided that any requirement on the abortionist such as admitting privileges at a hospital, might interfere with a mother's reproductive rights to take and end the life of her child under the provisions of the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision, legalizing abortion on demand. That is what Justice Roberts wrote in his opinion.

What did Justice Roberts say and his colleagues say, in plain English? Here is what they said...

During the process of killing a child according to the wishes of the mother (medical reasoning notwithstanding, for this is a matter of *abortion on demand*, not abortion to save the life of the mother), the life of the mother is an issue secondary, to the death of the child. If the mother decides that her child should die, and she goes to see a “doctor” in order to make that happen, it is now against the law in Louisiana to put any restrictions on that abortionist doctor (like admitting privileges at a local hospital) such that he may not be able to carry out her wish to terminate the child's life. In some states, the abortionist need not even be a doctor at all, let alone a doctor with admitting privileges. But here in Louisiana, the requirement in order to be able to perform abortions *was* that an abortionist doctor had to have admitting privileges at a local hospital... until now.

There are those who, for reasons beyond their control, must agonize over whether or not to take a child's life in order to save the mother's life when a pregnancy “goes wrong”. The decision is a rending, gut-wrenching, tumultuous one for those who are forced to make it. Families sometimes split up over

the decision, and there are never any happy outcomes. In spite of those realities... in spite of the reality that the numbers of abortions that save a mother's life are infinitesimally small, the mother's life usually – not always – takes precedent over the baby's... or at the very least, it is an agonizing decision to have to make.

But agonize no more. Now, now, in order to make absolutely certain that *nothing* interferes with a mother's "constitutional right" to kill her child, even her life *must* take a backseat.

It has now become more important that we make law that ensures the death of the child, even if the one killing the child cannot prevent the death of the mother, nor admit the mother to a hospital for needed medical care in the event of complications during the abortion procedure. Oh, and need I mention to you citizens of this great nation, that this is not a piece of legislation? No, rather it is a Supreme Court decision. Nine individuals, not the elected representatives of the 300+ million of this nation's citizenry, but nine people have been/are being allowed to do what could never be done legislatively.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and four of his colleagues, have just ruled that the death of that child, is more important than the life of that mother.

Not only does the child not have the right to life, neither, in Louisiana, does the mother.

Right to death? Yes. Right to life? Not so much.

Pastor