

Planned Parenthood Confirms Its Baby-Killer Status

In a testimony that shocked Florida legislators, a lobbyist for Planned Parenthood explained that “her organization believes the decision to kill an infant who survives a failed abortion should be left up to the woman seeking an abortion and her abortion doctor.” But what else should we expect from an organization that has made countless millions of dollars off the killing of unborn babies?

As reported March 29 by *The Weekly Standard*, these legislators were “considering a bill to require abortionists to provide medical care to an infant who survives an abortion,” similar to the Born Alive Protection Act that **Barack Obama** voted against four times before he was president.

Rep. Jim Boyd was so taken aback by the testimony of Alisa LaPolt Snow, the Planned Parenthood lobbyist, that he said to her, “So, um, it is just really hard for me to even ask you this question because I’m almost in disbelief. If a baby is born on a table as a result of a **botched abortion**, what would Planned Parenthood want to have happen to that child that is struggling for life?”

She replied, “We believe that any decision that’s made should be left up to the woman, her family and the physician.”

What? The baby survives an abortion in a **Planned Parenthood** clinic and is fighting for its life, and Planned Parenthood isn’t willing to say, “Yes, we want to see the baby’s life saved”? Of course not. If it was up to the mother and doctor to terminate the baby’s life inside the womb, why not continue the barbaric act outside the womb?

Rep. Jose Oliva, also incredulous, asked Snow, “You stated that a baby born alive on a table as a result of a

botched **abortion**, that that decision should be left to the doctor and the family. Is that what you're saying?"

Snow replied, "That decision should be between the patient and the health care provider," to which Oliva rightly countered, "I think that at that point, the patient would be the child struggling on the table. Wouldn't you agree?"

Snow was obviously caught off guard and could only reply, "That's a very good question. I really don't know how to answer that. I would be glad to have some more conversations with you about this."

In other words, *"Even I can't pretend to defend my own ridiculous position here."*

And what would Planned Parenthood say about the actions of Philadelphia abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell? He was charged "with murdering seven babies born alive and with the death of 41-year-old Karnamaya Mongar, who died during an abortion in November of 2009."

Specifically, these were "seven recently born babies whose necks were stabbed with scissors and whose spinal cords were slit" by Gosnell. But if we follow the rationale of Planned Parenthood, what did he do that was so terrible? After all, the mother wanted to terminate her baby's life and the doctor simply made sure it happened, inside or outside the womb. Why should he face criminal charges? (We're not discussing Gosnell's alleged involvement in the death of Mongar.)

Remarkably, last year, "a group of medical ethicists linked to Oxford University" published an article in the *Journal of Medical Ethics* arguing, "Parents should be allowed to have their newborn babies killed because they are 'morally irrelevant' and ending their lives is no different to abortion." (This is not a fabricated story.)

According to the article, "Newborn babies are not 'actual

persons' and do not have a 'moral right to life.' The academics also argue that parents should be able to have their baby killed if it turns out to be disabled when it is born."

This would include a baby born with Down syndrome whose condition had not been diagnosed by prenatal testing. By all means, the authors of the article, Alberto Giubilini and Francesca Minerva, argue, the parents should have the right to kill the baby. (I'm literally getting chills of disgust as I type these words.)

And these are "medical ethicists" linked to Oxford University, not Nazi doctors linked to the Third Reich (although they might as well have served Hitler with distinction with "ethics" like this).

Giubilini and Minerva concluded, "What we call '**after-birth abortion**' (killing a newborn) should be permissible in all the cases where abortion is, including cases where the newborn is not disabled." Yes, kill a healthy, unwanted baby too!

Not surprisingly, "The journal's editor, Prof. Julian Savulescu, director of the Oxford Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics [and a colleague of the two authors], said the article's authors had received death threats since publishing the article," which is completely understandable although not justifiable.

But rather than saying he had made a terrible error by publishing such dangerous—literally, murderous—drivel, Savulescu stated: "Those who made abusive and threatening posts about the study were 'fanatics opposed to the very values of a liberal society.' "

This is perverted academic arrogance at the highest (really lowest) imaginable level, but the professor simply stated directly what Planned Parenthood's Snow wasn't willing to say: *Only fanatics oppose our good work, and we are committed to taking the lives of unwanted babies. So if we can't finish*

the job in the womb, we're happy to do so outside the womb.

God help us.

Michael Brown is the author of *The Real Kosher Jesus* and the host of the nationally syndicated talk radio show *The Line of Fire* on the Salem Radio Network. He is also president of *FIRE School of Ministry* and director of the *Coalition of Conscience*. Follow him at *AskDrBrown* on Facebook or *@drmichaellbrown* on Twitter.