

Facts on Partial-Birth Abortion

The pictures you see here are not fiction. The partial-birth abortion has been performed here in the United States for years. It is neither a "rare" procedure, nor is it done only for babies who are severely deformed or dying. It is, essentially, a variant of the even more common and equally gruesome Dilation and Evacuation (D&E) procedure.

In 1992, Dr. Martin Haskell presented his paper on this procedure at a Risk Management Seminar of the National Abortion Federation. He personally claims to have done over 700 himself (Interview with Dr. Martin Haskell, AMA News, 1993), and points out that some 80% are "purely elective." In a personal conversation with Fr. Frank Pavone, of Priests for Life, Dr. Haskell explained that "elective" does not mean that the woman chooses the procedure because of a medical necessity, but rather chooses it because she wants an abortion. He admitted to Fr. Frank that there does not seem to be any medical reason for this procedure. There are in fact absolutely no obstetrical situations encountered in this country which require a partially delivered human fetus to be destroyed to preserve the life or health of the mother (Dr. Pamela Smith, Senate Hearing Record, p.82: Partial Birth Abortion Ban Medical Testimony).

In April of 2000, the Supreme Court heard



The baby's leg is pulled out into the birth canal.



The abortionist delivers the baby's entire Body except for the head.



The abortionist jams scissors into the baby's skull and then opens them to enlarge the hole.



The scissors are removed and a suction catheter is inserted. The child's brains are sucked out, causing the skull to collapse. The dead baby is then removed.

Acknowledgements:
Father Frank Pavone, Priests for Life
National Right to Life

Pope John Paul II Society of Evangelists
P.O. Box 5584, Bakersfield, California 93388
E-mail: info@pjpiisoe.org Phone: 661 393-3239

www.pjpiisoe.org
Pamphlet 044W

oral arguments in the *Stenberg vs. Carhart* decision, which was handed down in June 2000. The court struck down a Nebraska statute which had banned partial birth abortion. Nebraska, as well as over two dozen other states, had banned this procedure, but the court said the procedure should remain legal. One of the reasons given was that any proposed ban must allow the procedure "for the health of the mother." Fr. Pavone was present at the Supreme Court both for the oral arguments and on the day the decision was issued. At a press conference on the court steps, Father asked the lead attorney from the pro-abortion side whether any evidence presented to the court had identified even a single medical circumstance in which this procedure was the only way to preserve the mother's health. Of course, none could be cited, and the reason is that none exist.

The court argued, furthermore, that a "health reason" for the partial-birth abortion procedure was present if, in the judgment of the physician, it was safer than alternative procedures. One of the problems with this line of argument is that one can identify many circumstances in which it is safer for the mother to deliver the child normally than to have a partial-birth abortion. Normal delivery excludes the dangers that arise from inverting the position of the child, and from inserting surgical instruments into the birth canal. Why not argue, therefore, that "live-birth abortion" should be legal as a safer alternative to partial-birth abortion. People like Jill Stanek have exposed this practice, in which children marked for abortion are born

alive and then killed. This is exactly where the logic of partial-birth abortion leads.

On November 5, 2003, President George W. Bush signed into law the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. Pro-abortion forces, not having the support of the American public, challenged the law in court. On March 29, 2004, trials began in New York, San Francisco, and Nebraska, in which the US Department of Justice is defending the new law.

Comments of President George W. Bush while signing the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003:

"The facts about partial-birth abortion are troubling and tragic, and no lawyer's brief can make them seem otherwise. (Applause.) By acting to prevent this practice, the elected branches of our government have affirmed a basic standard of humanity, the duty of the strong to protect the weak. The wide agreement amongst men and women on this issue, regardless of political party, shows that bitterness in political debate can be overcome by compassion and the power of conscience. And the executive branch will vigorously defend this law against any who would try to overturn it in the courts.

"America stands for liberty, for the pursuit of happiness and for the unalienable right of life. And the most basic duty of government is to defend the life of the innocent. Every person, however frail or vulnerable, has a place and a purpose in this

world. Every person has a special dignity. This right to life cannot be granted or denied by government, because it does not come from government, it comes from the Creator."

Some Americans may succeed in desensitizing themselves to what is going on, as many did with slavery, but most recognize that partial birth abortions are simply the slaughter of the innocent.

These illustrations of a partial-birth abortion were prepared on the basis of an instructional paper by an Ohio abortionist, explaining step by step how he performs the procedure. These drawings accurately depict a partial-birth abortion being performed on a baby at 24 weeks gestational age. Most partial-birth abortions are performed in the 20-26 week range (the fifth and sixth months), and some are performed even later.



Guided by Ultrasound, the abortionist grabs the baby's leg with forceps.