

## Governor Whitmer Says Abortion is Life Sustaining!

Michigan governor Gretchen Whitmer has joined with most other governors in restricting certain medical procedures and surgeries during this unparalleled health crisis and economic collapse. Most of these governors also have decided that performing abortions should continue, rejecting the cries of pro-lifers that abortion is non-essential. A few pro-life governors attempted to attach abortion to the “non-essential” list, only to be lambasted by pro-choice ideologues, and challenged in court. In general, state or federal courts have ruled against these brave governors.

Appearing on former Obama strategist David Axelrod’s podcast “The Axe Files,” on April 16, Governor Whitmer made a provocative statement and affirmed that abortion is a life sustaining procedure. “We stopped elective surgeries here in Michigan. Some people have tried to say that that [abortion] type of a procedure is considered the same and that’s ridiculous. A woman’s health care, her whole future, her ability to decide if and when she starts a family is not an election, it is a fundamental to her life. It is life sustaining and it’s something that government should not be getting in the middle of.”

With Orwellian double-speak, the dear governor believes that abortion sustains life while in fact abortion kills a baby in the womb. There is NOTHING in abortion that sustains life!

Let’s unpack her entire statement.

Elective procedures deemed non-essential include areas of cardiology, cosmetic or plastic surgery, hip and knee joint replacements, peripheral vein treatments, hand surgery, carpal tunnel, bariatric, hysterectomy for benign issues, and surgery for incontinence. In many instances, tests like colonoscopies have been postponed for a few months. Postponing all the above procedures, while potentially making patients’ conditions worse, are not life-threatening.

“A woman’s health care, her whole future, her ability to decide if and when she starts a family is not an election, it is a fundamental to her life.”

First of all, being pro-choice is all about “election.” A woman elects (chooses) to bring her baby to term or she elects to have an abortion. “Choice” is the bedrock of the movement. The very fact that a woman can decide implies that the procedure is elective. In the process of comprehending Whitmer’s logic she has defined the entire feminist worldview regarding “reproductive rights.” It’s all about the woman--her health care, her whole future, her decision who lives or dies--these are all fundamental. The baby has ZERO RIGHTS in the feminist mindset. The baby has no right to healthcare. The idea that a baby could have a future is irrelevant. For the purposes of exercising a woman’s autonomous right to end a pregnancy, the baby does not exist. It is a nothing, a growing mass of unwanted matter that needs to be removed ASAP.

Whitmer’s “abortion is life sustaining” remark is her most incomprehensible. Even if we were to disregard the life of the baby growing in the womb, a mother’s life is not in jeopardy. Pregnancy is not a life-threatening situation. Yes, there are rare situations in which a woman’s life is at very grave risk. But those extremely rare cases should not be employed to affect public policy. While maternal deaths were quite common in previous centuries, pregnancy was very safe in the second half of the 20th century and even more so in the 21st. I state the obvious. Women will not die if their pregnancies are allowed to continue. However, in Whitmer’s tortured thinking, a woman will die if not permitted to abort her baby. What she disregards so cavalierly is the FACT that in every abortion one person does die. Yes, it’s the baby who dies, not the mother. That’s the goal, the purpose, the aim of every abortion--to end the baby’s life.

## Justice Kavanaugh Cites *Roe* as an Example of an “Erroneous Precedent”

The following is condensed from an April 22, 2020 article from the *Christian Post* and a Fox News article from April 21.

On April 20 the Supreme Court overturned a 1972 decision dealing with unanimous jury decisions. While this had nothing to do with abortion, it was Justice Brett Kavanaugh’s concurring opinion that made headlines. Since this new ruling reversed a prior decision, the issue of *stare decisis* reared its head--the legal principle by which judges adhere to previous decisions and invoke as justification for not overturning past decisions. Kavanaugh took the opportunity of describing his interpretation of *stare decisis* that “promotes the evenhanded, predictable, and consistent development of legal principles, foster reliance on judicial decisions, and contributes to the actual and perceived integrity of the judicial process.”

What is important is what Kavanaugh wrote next. “The doctrine of stare decisis does not mean that the Court should never overrule erroneous precedents. All Justices now on this Court agree that it is sometimes appropriate for the Court to overrule erroneous decisions.”

As an example, he cited *Roe v. Wade* of 1973 and the 1992 *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* decision that reaffirmed *Roe*’s core holding but challenged other elements of the ruling. “In *Casey*, the Court reaffirmed what it described as the ‘central holding of *Roe v. Wade*...but expressly rejected *Roe*’s trimester framework, and the Court expressly overruled two other important abortion precedents.”

Kavanaugh further explained that while tradition to follow judicial precedent is “not an inexorable command...[that] to overrule a constitutional precedent, the Court requires something ‘over and above the belief that the precedent was wrongly decided.’”

Kavanaugh suggested that justices could ask three questions to decide whether a wrong decision warrants being overturned. The first is whether the original decision is “not just wrong, but grievously or egregiously wrong?” Justices can look at the quality of reasoning, consistency with other decisions, changed laws and facts, workability and more in answering that question.

The second question is whether the past decision “caused significant negative jurisprudential or real-world consequences caused by the erroneous decision and, therefore, whether the decision is worth overruling?” This includes “real-world effects on the citizenry, not just its effects on the law and the legal system.” The third question is whether overturning the case would “unduly upset reliance interests?” This would include looking at how the precedent is and how people have relied on it.

I am not neither a constitutional scholar nor an attorney. However, we can make some general conclusions about Kavanaugh’s remarks. First, we cannot read too much into his reference to *Roe* or *Casey*. What we can glean is that in his mind the Supreme Court

...Continued on page 3

### Focus on Life Dinner 2020

Just because our Focus on Life dinner has been postponed until September does not mean that you cannot purchase tickets now. Below is our dinner reservation form. Dr. Charmaine Yoest, a vice-president of the Heritage Foundation, will remain our guest speaker. Tentative date is September 10, 2020. Location: Kalamazoo First Assembly of God Ministry Center, 5550 Oakland Dr. Portage, MI 49024. Doors open at 5:30 pm, program begins at 6:30 pm.

#### Please Reserve My Place

Please return the completed form with payment by September 1, 2020

Reservations

Information

\_\_\_\_\_ \$10 children/students Name \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ \$30 individual Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ \$240 table of 8 City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Donation Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

I am unable to attend.

Enclosed is my contribution  
of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

All checks payable to **Kalamazoo Right to Life** (not tax-deductible) and mail to  
PO Box 2366, Kalamazoo, MI 49003.

## **Membership? Now more than ever!**

Believe it or not, this is an election year. Sometimes you would not know it with about 95 percent of the news dominated by COVID 19. This November we will be electing a president, senators and congressmen, and state lawmakers. Will our next president be pro-abortion Joe Biden or pro-life Donald Trump? With the Supreme Court on the line the stakes are too high.

**The 4 oldest justices are:**

**Ruth Bader Ginsburg turned 87 in March, 2020**

**Stephen Breyer will turn 82 in August.**

**Clarence Thomas will turn 72 in June.**

**Samuel Alito turned 70 this past April.**

Most likely the next president will replace Ginsburg, and possibly Breyer. Both are pro-choice. You may ask, what does this have to do with membership with KRTL? More members increases our visibility. More members increases our financial base so that we can contribute more money to Right to Life of Michigan Political Committee (PAC) for this year's campaign. More members means we stand united and speak with one voice. Now is definitely not the time to sit on the sidelines. We must all engage if we are to win.

A membership renewal form is below. If you have already renewed your membership then you deserve a big **THANK YOU**. For the rest, please use this form to renew. Thank you.

-----  
Kalamazoo Right to Life Annual Membership

Name \_\_\_\_\_  New  Renewal  
 Spouses Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_  \$20.20 Regular  \$100 Platinum  
 City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone \_\_\_\_\_  \$20 Senior  \$50 Gold  
 Email \_\_\_\_\_  
 Church \_\_\_\_\_  \$10 Student  Other  
 Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

### **How would you like to receive your Newsletter?**

Email  Website  US Postal Service

As a member, you will be sent the KRTL Newsletter, the RLM News, and special mailings from the Right to Life of Michigan Office. Your contributions and gifts to Right to Life are not tax deductible. Please make your check payable to Kalamazoo Right to Life. Mail to: Kalamazoo Right to Life, PO Box 2366, Kalamazoo, MI 49003.

*Continued from page 2...*

in Casey did not uphold all of *Roe* in making its decision. *Roe*'s trimester framework was totally and completely removed in favor of the "undue burden rule"--that a law that restricts abortion may be constitutional if it does not impose an "undue burden" on a woman's right to abortion.

To answer Kavanaugh's first question, the Court MUST look at new evidence that it did not have back in 1973. When Justice Harry Blackmun wrote the *Roe* opinion he relied very heavily on two articles written by abortion-rights advocate, law professor Cyril Means. However, Means's conclusions have been debunked and rejected based on new EVIDENCE, much of it supplied by law professor Joseph Dellapenna in his exhaustive 2006 book *Dispelling the Myths of Abortion History*. Then comes the issue of medical technology. Ultrasound, fetal surgeries, fetal heart monitoring, new DNA research--all advances that DID NOT EXIST in 1973 all prove the humanity of the unborn baby. It's well past time to review *Roe* and *Casey* and cut them loose.

### **Dismemberment Petition Drive Update**

COVID 19 has disrupted almost everything in our ordered world--from employment to health care, from closed restaurants and gyms to social distancing. As a result of this pandemic, officials with the Office of Elections have temporarily postponed or delayed the process of certifying our petition ballots. Since Governor Whitmer announced on April 23 that the "stay-at-home" order would be extended until May 15, we will have to wait a bit longer. Hopefully the signatures will be certified by June.

President's Corner*Rob Karrer*

Do not accuse me of heresy but I understand why Governor Whitmer believes that abortion is an essential medical procedure. In all comes down to time. Pro-choice advocates want early abortions in the first trimester when babies: A. are not viable and will not survive; B. infants at this stage (especially before the sixth week) are beginning to take more human shape, thus making pro-choice people more comfortable in eliminating life forms that they claim are not yet human or do not look human. Conversely, as pregnancy progress into the second trimester, the fetus looks and acts human. He sucks his thumb, begins to move his arms and legs, has a strong, vigorous heartbeat, and clearly defined brainwaves. In short, the second trimester (and even in the final weeks of the first trimester) fetus looks very human in every way and average common-sense people know that. Doctors and scientists who have been studying fetal development for the past few decades are not fooled by pro-choice group-think that the unborn is not a human being. He may not be “viable” yet, but he is as human as you or me. So, given Whitmer’s fractured state of mind, abortions must proceed according to plan to make sure these tiny infants don’t reach the level of development when they might become viable. They must be killed early on because if there is a delay they might reach that “danger zone”--the third trimester when abortion can be prohibited. Thus, it is essential to permit abortions to continue. It all comes down to time. The clock is ticking and these babies are growing, becoming more developed, looking more human by the day. A few weeks delay might put an abortion out of bounds. The pro-choice folk can’t let that happen. In the name of choice, these babies must die to preserve the governor’s edict. Sounds a little Herodian to me, when the ruler has the power to decide who will live and who will die.

Kalamazoo Right to Life  
PO Box 2366  
Kalamazoo, MI 49003

Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
KALAMAZOO, MI 49009  
PERMIT NO. 1309

*Address Service Requested*