

New York Reveals Its Blood Lust for Baby Killing

New York was already doing a fine job of slaughtering its unborn, especially its black babies. Why, then, did it need to pass a new, more extreme abortion law? And why did New York do this on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade? There's one simple answer: blood lust.

Secular media outlets are reporting that New York just updated its "archaic" abortion law.

Yet somehow, even with that "archaic" law, New York was already the abortion capital of America, aborting babies at twice the national average.

Somehow, New York was still managing to kill one baby for every two babies born.

And, despite that "archaic" law, New York City was able to kill more black babies in the womb than bring them to birth.

But no, that was not enough. The law must be expanded.

Today, a perfectly viable baby of nine months, ready to be born at any minute, can be slaughtered by the will of the mother.

That is blood lust.

That is the spirit of baby killing.

There is nothing humanitarian or compassionate about it.

It is cruel. It is unwarranted. It is murderous.

And it utterly Orwellian to refer to it as the "Reproductive Health Act." Why not call it for what it is?

The moral bankruptcy of New York's new law—the pride of “Christian” governor Andrew Cuomo—is fully exposed in the last phrase of this sentence: “an abortion may be performed by a licensed, certified, or authorized practitioner within 24 weeks from the commencement of pregnancy, or [if] there is an absence of fetal viability, or at any time when necessary to protect a patient's life or health.”

Yes, the baby may be terminated “at any time when necessary to protect a patient's life or health.”

And what, exactly, does that mean? What if the mother's mental health needed to be protected? What if she felt, the day before her due date, that she just couldn't take the stress of having a child. Would that merit abortion?

But that is to beg the question, since the baby could easily be delivered and adopted. We're talking about a totally viable baby! A baby that, under normal circumstances, would soon be crying and nursing outside the womb.

Today, however, that baby's well-being is at risk until the moment of the birth.

This is madness. This is murderous. Shades of Kermit Gosnell on steroids!

Princeton professor Robert P. George expressed it so well. He wrote:

A huge irony: The NY law authorizing the killing of babies in the third trimester proves that the aim of the abortion lobby is not the protection of maternal health in circumstances of hazardous pregnancy, but is rather the right to destroy an unwanted child whose existence poses no risk to maternal health (in any sense of the term “health” that amounts to anything other than a rationalization for killing unwanted babies). The only reason to kill rather than deliver a child in the third trimester of pregnancy and gestation is that the

*woman (or someone who is pressuring her to abort) wants the child to be dead rather than alive. It's the child's *existence,* not the pregnancy, which poses the alleged "health" risk. The pregnancy can be ended ("terminated") by delivering the baby alive, rather than killing him or her. So do you see the see the sophistry in the argument for abortion here? It's glaring.*

Yes, why not simply deliver the baby? If the mother's health is allegedly at risk and the baby is viable outside the womb, why not deliver it?

Plenty of parents would love to adopt the child.

Plenty of parents would gladly open the doors of their home to this precious little one.

Why kill it?

And let's not have some romanticized view of how a third-trimester baby is terminated. As noted by Steven Ertelt (with reference to a former abortionist):

The baby is injected with a poison directly into his skull or torso. He then suffers a hideously painful death, which he will certainly feel because of his developed nervous system. The mother carries the corpse around in her womb for a day. The next day, there is an ultrasound to check if the baby is dead. If he isn't—if he has been writhing and suffering in agony for the past 24 hours, clinging onto life—then he will be injected again. The following day, the mother delivers her dead child. Sometimes she delivers him at the clinic, but if she can't make it on time, the clinic is perfectly happy to recommend that she give birth into her toilet.

How can this possibly be for the good of the mother? And under what moral code is this not barbarous and inhuman? Or should we mention the grisly details of "partial-birth abortion,"

where the child is delivered feet first, then the skull is pierced with scissors and its brains sucked out—while still alive?

And if a baby somehow survived the murderous attempts of the abortionist, who does not even have to be a doctor? What if it was still born alive? Under previous New York law, efforts would be made to care for the child. But no longer. Under this new law, those provisions have been removed. The baby must die!

Yet New Yorkers were celebrating this moral madness. They were shouting for joy!

And in a final statement of depravity, the 400-foot spire of One World Trade Center was lit up in pink, as if to honor the women of New York.

It should have been lit up blood-red.