Everyone Against Abortion, Raise Your Hand!
Fr. Frank Pavone
National Director, Priests for Life

In 1989, pro-life activists Debbie Huddall and Chad Traylor discovered the body of an aborted child at the Women’s Pavilion clinic in Houston, Texas. Baby David was aborted at 28 weeks gestation in a D&E abortion (dilation and evacuation), during which his arm and his head were ripped from his body. Debbie and Chad photographed Baby David in order to expose the violence he had suffered. When photo developers and police saw the photographs, they thought a terrible crime had been committed. Only after they searched the activists’ homes did they discover that the violence against Baby David was entirely legal. It was the violence of abortion.

Now, Priests for Life has produced a new brochure and video called “Everyone Against Abortion, Raise Your Hand!” The viewer sees a hand raised up, and as the brochure opens and the video continues, one sees that it is the hand of Baby David.

The video can be viewed at www.unborn.info and Priests for Life is receiving an amazing response from people who are strengthened, enlightened, and converted as a result of seeing it. You can help us to spread the impact, by sending others the link and publicizing it on your Facebook page, You Tube channel, and other social networking and video sharing sites. There are some people that only you can reach! We rely on you to do so.

Conscience Rights for Health Care Providers Under Threat

Although Congress has passed three laws to protect the rights of health care workers who object to participating in practices against their moral conscience, no regulation enforced these laws until the Bush administration on January 20, 2009 enacted a regulation to ensure that programs receiving federal funds do not discriminate against health care workers who will not participate in practices they consider immoral, such as abortion, contraception, sterilization, and abortion counseling. “Forced compliance,” according to the Obama administration has expressed the intent to rescind these regulations, leaving many doctors, nurses and other health care providers less protected from pressures coming from pro-abortion or pro-euthanasia advocates.

According to a Christian Medical Association statement (2/27/09), “An informal survey of our members showed that over 40% report being pressured to violate ethical standards. Physicians report losing positions and promotions because of their life-affirming views. Residents report losing training positions because they refused to do abortions. Medical students report changing career paths away from obstetrics and gynecology because they discovered that the violence against Baby David was entirely legal. It was the violence of abortion.”

Am I My Brother’s Keeper?
By Georgette Forney, President, Anglicans for Life

The first births recorded in the Bible are of Eve giving birth to Cain and then Abel. The first death recorded in the Bible is of Cain killing Abel. (Genesis 4:6-12)

Immediately following the story of God’s creation and the fall of man, we encounter life and death. Ironically, the first death isn’t natural but deliberate. Cain intentionally kills his brother Abel and when God calls him out on it, Abel cries out to the Lord by asking, “Am I my brother’s keeper?”

The Lord’s response is, “What have you done? Your brother’s blood cries out to me from the ground. Now you are under a curse. . . . when you work the ground, it will no longer yield crops for you. You will be a restless wanderer.” This makes it clear that deliberately ending another person’s life is wrong, it grieves God and Hecs His harsh judgment.

Now, we live in a world where certain types of killing are legal. Unborn babies, the elderly, the handicapped and the terminally ill can be condemned to death by legalized abortion, euthanasia and assisted suicide. (Citizens from the state of Washington just approved I-1000, a measure that makes physician-assisted suicide legal.) It seems there are a lot of people like Cain who want to be their brother’s [mother’s, father’s, sister’s, spouse’s, child’s, cousin’s, friend’s] keeper.

As Christians, we know that it is wrong to kill, and we don’t support abortion, euthanasia, or assisted suicide. So, do we realize that just being against these things is not enough? From Genesis to Revelation, Scripture teaches that God expects his people to be responsible for one another. It is clear that love and respect for our neighbor are foundational principles of Christian behavior.

In Genesis 9:5, God says, “I will demand an accounting for the life of his fellow man.” In Matthew 25:45, Jesus teaches, “I tell you the truth, whatever you did not do for one of the least of these, you did not do for me.” Jesus’ last teachings emphasize caring for his people (“feed my sheep” and “make disciples”), all of which starts with basic respect and protection of one another.

So, it seems obvious that from God’s perspective the answer to Cain’s question is yes, we are our brother’s keeper. Protecting, respecting, defending and caring for one another is what God expects from His people.

There are things we can do in the course of each day to protect life and care for one another. Here at Anglicans for Life, we are committed to helping people identify ways in their church and communities to be their brother’s keeper. Our plans for 2009 include developing an Adult Sunday School Sanctity of Life Curriculum and helping our brothers and sisters in African and Latin American countries stand against efforts to legalize abortion in their countries. For a list of practical pro-life activities, see page 4, and for more resources visit our website: www.anglicansforlife.org.

When we designed our new exhibit booth, we sought to highlight the concept of being our brother’s keeper. We celebrate the LIFE God creates in His image with a kaleidoscope of faces and then ask: condemned or protected? Our actions condemn or protect life in a variety of big and small ways. The challenge for us, as we begin a new year, is to look for ways to be our brother’s keeper.

Abel’s blood and the blood of 50 million aborted babies cry out to us. What will we do about it? 
Dubious Choice: Are Denominational Positions on Abortion Changing?
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The practice of terminating a pregnancy (or abortion), after diagnosis of a genetic abnormality, just might change the nature of the abortion debate in the United Methodist Church.

It has become commonplace for parents, who are told that their unborn child (after genetic testing) will be born with Down syndrome, to seek an abortion. This study also estimated that more prevalent genetic testing would result in annual savings to society of $95 million because of the reduced cost of caring for fewer children born with Down syndrome.

Mass terminations of Down syndrome children raise new ethical concerns. The babies are not simply a product of a genetic screening, because no records are kept on this data by abortion clinics. However, an Obstetrics and Gynecology article in 2000, “Cost-Benefit Analysis of Prenatal Diagnosis for Down Syndrome,” used an estimate that 90% of parents who receive this diagnosis in the first or second trimester of pregnancy will choose abortion.

By Dennis DiMauro, NPRC Secretary

What’s with President Barack Obama’s Rush to Kill the Unborn?

By Day Gardner, President of the National Black Pro-Life Union

In a time when America is spiraling down into an abyss of debt, joblessness and economic turmoil, President Barack Obama has been putting a great deal of his time into a big push to allow as many unborn children in the United States as possible to be legally killed. Obama has been President for less than two months and in that time he has overturned the Mexico City Policy which means American tax dollars will be used to support organizations that perform and promote abortion in foreign countries.

Obama’s administration is also seeking to repeal the conscience protection regulation that the Bush administration established to help protect physicians and other health care providers who choose not to participate in the killing of “unwanted children” or to refer their patients to other baby killers.

His latest effort is to ensure that even more children are killed by removing the ban from embryonic stem cell experiments. To date, current research on embryonic stem cells has resulted in no promising results. Our President is a learned man—he knows this.

He also knows that adult stem cells have proven to be extremely successful in finding cures to various ills. We all applaud the use of adult stem cells! Using adult stem cells is perfectly ethical. No one has to die and no one should. Yet, Barack Obama is persistent and deliberate in his actions to continue the killing of embryonic babies.

One must ask: Why?

Why would anyone be so bent on helping to grow industries that include gruesome dismemberment and experimentation on other human beings? Why would anyone be so bent on helping to grow industries that include gruesome dismemberment and experimentation on other human beings? Why would anyone be so bent on helping to grow industries that include gruesome dismemberment and experimentation on other human beings?

We are well aware that abortion and embryonic stem cell supporters lined the silk campaign pockets of our President. The money raised went back in (and) purportedly support the killing of these very small children.

My hope is that President Barack Obama will see embryonic stem cell research for what it really is.

Using human beings as guinea pigs is the type of experimentation that was horrifically wrong when Hitler’s Mengele did it and it is equally horrific when “America’s Mengeles” do it.

We must ask ourselves—has America become so dysfunctional, immoral and unethical that we will do everything possible and necessary to protect laboratory animals—all the while giving a victorious thumbs-up when human beings are used as such?
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The consistent efforts of Presbyterians Pro-Life and other pro-life organizations in the United States have typically crafted written policy statements regarding the morality of the procedure, which have been approved at their denominational conferences (usually held every three or four years). The only exceptions to this pattern—seemingly in the case of those denominations with a non-centralized or congregation structure. These church bodies are able to leave the question of whether abortion is ethical or not up to each local church and the public discussions of the gruesome nature of this type of abortion have raised society’s consciousness on the issue and have renewed a national discussion on the sanctity of life in the womb.

For instance, a denomination with a pro-life statement that had been quite conservative in its pro-life position, the Presbyterian Church (USA) has probably made the greatest strides towards a pro-life position since the late 1970s. The reversal of the Southern Baptist Convention’s (SBC) position on abortion is the most radical reversal of abortion views of any major US church body. The SBC originally approved of the 1973 Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion in all fifty states, calling it an advancement for “religious liberty.”

In the 1990s, however, that denomination had essentially abandoned it.

But the only exceptions to this pattern are those denominations in the United States that have no written position on abortion.

The denominations of the Southern Baptist Convention, the United Methodist Church (UMC) has probably made the greatest strides towards regaining a pro-life position. For instance, at its recent 2008 conference, the church added to its statement on abortion a clause concerning the “understanding that all life comes from God.”

The only denominations to respect...the sanctity of life of the “life and well-being” of the unborn child, where previously it had only mentioned the “life and being” of the mother. It also added the following sentence: “We support parental, guardian, or other responsible adult notification and consent before abortions can be performed on girls who have not yet reached the age of majority.”

...The denomination also stated that it “affirm[s] and encourage[s] the Church to assist the ministry of crisis pregnancy centers and pregnancy resource centers that counsel people about the alternatives to abortion.” It also reduced previous caustic language that described some crisis pregnancies as “unacceptable” to the mother.

The consistent efforts of Presbyterians Pro-Life to promote pro-life, long-term work of Lifespeak, also known as the Taskforce of United Methodists on Abortion and Sexuality (TUMAS) this organization has consistently preached about the sanctity of human life to a denomination that had essentially abandoned it.

The consistent efforts of Presbyterians Pro-Life and other pro-life activities within the Presbyterian Church (USA) have for some time moved toward the pro-life position. For instance, at its General Assembly in 1997, the denomination included the following statement about the gruesome practice of partial-birth abortion: “The 2002 convention of the PCUSA also noted that the practice of partial-birth abortion has been attacked by the church and the public and added that it offers a word of counsel to the church and our culture that the practice would be on the wrong side of history if it is ever decided to resume the practice of partial birth abortion.”

The clergies in these denominations have begun to question whether the legalization of abortion, which was touted in the 1970s as a humane way to handle crisis pregnancies (those resulting from rape or incest, or involving fetal deformities or threats to the mother’s life), has become instead a vastly overspent means of dealing with an unwanted pregnancy. These church bodies are able to leave the question of whether abortion is ethical or not up to each local church and the public discussions of the gruesome nature of this type of abortion have raised society’s consciousness on the issue and have renewed a national discussion on the sanctity of life in the womb.

The high incidence of abortion in the United States, with an estimated 1.2 million being performed every year, has also raised concerns as to the wisdom of our current national policy of abortion on demand for all nine months of pregnancy. Even many social moderates have begun to question whether the legalization of abortion, which was touted in the 1970s as a humane way to handle crisis pregnancies, was effective in raising出生 rates or in involving fetal deformities or threats to the mother’s life, has become instead a vastly overspent means of dealing with an unwanted pregnancy.

Theological questions on controversial issues have traditionally come within the purview of the church, so the question of abortion is one that has been hotly debated among the leaders of nearly all Christian denominations in the United States. These denominations have typically crafted written policy statements regarding the morality of the procedure, which have been approved at their denominational conferences (usually held every three or four years). The only exceptions to this pattern are those denominations with a non-centralized or congregation structure. These church bodies are able to leave the question of whether abortion is ethical or not up to each local church and the public discussions of the gruesome nature of this type of abortion have raised society’s consciousness on the issue and have renewed a national discussion on the sanctity of life in the womb.
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