

First, Do No Harm...

While a State Senator in Illinois, Barack Obama voted against the “Born Alive Infant Protection Act.” That law would have outlawed the “alternate abortion” practice of inducing labor and then leaving the baby to die, unattended. Obama’s defense was that the legislation lacked a “neutrality clause,” a statement that the legislation was not meant to override *Roe v. Wade*. In fact, an amendment to add that clause to the Illinois bill was approved by the Senate committee on a 10 to 1 vote. Obama voted against the bill anyway, in a 6 to 4 party line vote in the Health and Human Services Committee, and it never made it to the Illinois Senate floor for a vote. The clause which Barack “open and transparent” Obama said was not there was indeed there.

The media has yet to confront Obama with the fact that his excuse for voting against the bill was groundless. He knows it was a lie, because he voted “no” on three separate occasions. (Then again, his other defense of bad votes has been that he “hit the wrong button.”) But you know he’s being cagey, as the good Senator cannot even bring himself to utter the words, “Born Alive Infant Protection Act.” Instead, he refers to it as “*restrictive choice legislation*.” Ah, a veritable wordsmith is he.

But even if Obama hasn’t a good excuse, other liberals can always be counted on to come up with creative arguments in defense of their do-no-wrong candidate. Now that Obama’s cover has been blown (that is, his excuse for voting against the bill has been proven to be false), one of his ardent, adoring fans has managed to post on the internet this gem of a defense:

"Okay, I have a question. What kind of shape are these babies in that survive an abortion attempt? Think about that. These babies are gouged, punctured, suctioned to pieces, etc. Is it just slightly possible that by allowing them to live after they have "survived" such a procedure, you might not be doing them any damn favors whatsoever?"

That sounds an awful lot like the "Your honor, you can't send my client to jail for murdering his parents... after all, he's an orphan!" argument. I'm tempted to say, "I rest my case" (against lunatic liberals), but I feel obligated to comment further.

Exactly how did Johnny Cochran miss that brilliant line of defense in the O.J. trial? "Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, even if you accept the premise that my client partially slit the throat of his ex-wife, you cannot accuse him of murder. After all, what kind of life would she have been able to lead, had the knife blade stopped at only the half-way point? At the very least she would have had an unattractive scar, and at the worst she may have had significant medical problems requiring a permanent breathing tube, irreparable brain damage, and a lifetime of expensive medical care to be shouldered by the taxpayers. It's obvious that my client was doing his ex-wife in particular, and society as a whole, a tremendous favor... ending her suffering by extending the knife almost to the point of full decapitation, ensuring there would be an immediate end to her agony. Three cheers for the compassionate O. J. Simpson!"

I don't know about anyone else but, from my perspective, allowing a baby to die in a cold, stainless steel pan to put it out of its misery should not be considered a humanitarian gesture by the people who caused the misery in the first place. I must confess that I never went to medical school, but somehow I was under the impression that students there are taught, *Primum non nocere* ("First, do no harm"). Apparently that has since been changed (perhaps some Clinton legislation I missed?) to simply, "Do nothing."

Oh, and by the way, those Illinois babies which survive abortions, only to be left to die without medical attention, are issued both birth certificates and death certificates. Senator Obama, why does mere "fetal tissue," which is what liberals call a discarded baby, need a birth and death certificate?

Some Democrats at least pretend to care, when they repeat ad infinitum that abortions should be "safe, legal, and rare." I wonder, though, why they say abortions should be rare if they believe they are not immoral? And if they believe abortions are immoral, then shouldn't they be illegal, rather than just rare? (Sorry, I sometimes have an overwhelming urge to use common sense.)

It may be that the fuss I'm making here is a moot point, even in those states which have managed to pass legislation outlawing this disgusting practice. After all, the compassionate Senator Obama has already promised Planned Parenthood that the very *first* piece of legislation he will sign if elected will be the strangely-named "Freedom of Choice Act," which will overturn all state pro-life laws. Taxpayers in all states will then have to fund abortions, parents will never have to be informed if their daughter has an abortion, and partial birth abortions will be legal in all 50 states. Perhaps Obama has also promised an increase in jobs in the cold stainless steel pan industry...

Don Fredrick
August 15, 2008

Copyright 2008 Don Fredrick