

SONOMA COUNTY PROLIFE NEWSLETTER
JANUARY 2017

Contents:

Coming Events

SCPL Rally

Walk for Life West Coast

40 Days for Life Spring Campaign

How Do Things Stack up for 2017, by Lawrence Lehr

The Sled Test, a Simple Argument Against Abortion, by Dean Davis

SANTA ROSA SCPL RALLY
JANUARY 22

Sonoma County ProLife will be sponsoring our rally this year on the actual anniversary of the Roe v. Wade ruling, Sunday, January 22nd.

Please note that because our usual location, Old Courthouse Square, in Santa Rosa is being reconstructed and is unavailable, we will be holding the event at Santa Rosa Christian Church, 1315 Pacific Avenue, instead. Plenty of on-site parking is available.

The event will run from 3:00 P.M. to 4:30 P.M. and as always will feature interesting speakers, music, prayer, and, as a special celebration this year, light refreshments. Come and hear the opportunities and challenges that 2017 will bring to the prolife movement.

This is a family-friendly event, and we welcome all ages. See you on the 22nd.

Lawrence Lehr

WALK FOR LIFE WEST COAST
SATURDAY, JANUARY 21

The annual West Coast Walk for Life will begin at CIVIC CENTER PLAZA, SAN FRANCISCO at 1:30 P.M., and continue down Market Street to Justin Herman Plaza.

Saturday events will begin with an Info Faire at Civic Center Plaza from 11:00 A.M. to 12:30 P.M.

Silent No More Awareness will hold a rally from 11:45A.M. to 12:15:P.M., followed by the Main Rally from 12:30 1:30 P.M.

Rally Speakers include:

Pam Tebow, Mother of Heisman Trophy Winner Tim Tebow

Reggie Littlejohn, founder and president of Women's Rights without Borders

Melissa Ohden, Abortion Survivor

Rev. Childres, founder of Black Genocide.org

For more information, including satellite events, see www.walkforlifewc.com

Note: A bus has been chartered by the Knights of Columbus, St. Eugene's in Santa Rosa. While the deadline for registration was Dec. 27, you can contact Mike Flanagan, at 579-8982 and see if there is any room available.

40 DAYS FOR LIFE IS BACK!

This spring, the 40 Days for Life national campaign begins on March 1, and runs until April 9 (Ash Wednesday to Palm Sunday). This is a Prayer Vigil at abortion clinics throughout the United States and in many other nations. If you are not familiar with it, please check their website at www.40-daysforlife.com.

In the 10 years since this event began, 40 Days for Life reports that, world-wide, 12,663 babies have been saved from abortion (that they know of), 141 abortion workers have left their jobs, and 75 abortion facilities have closed their doors.

Santa Rosa will participate again, at Planned Parenthood's Clinic at 1140 Sonoma Avenue, from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, hopefully. We are on the national website, www.40daysforlife/santarosa.

Planning for the opening event is just beginning, but we will have flyers available. For information or flyers for your group, call Judy at (707) 579-2941. Para information en Espanol, llama a Kay at (707) 584-7810.

Mary Heeney

HOW DO THINGS STACK UP FOR 2017

With the surprise election of Donald Trump in November, and continued control of Congress by Republicans, Prolifers have lots to cheer about. The Obama administration was hostile to many of our concerns and a Clinton administration would likely have been even more so. President-elect Trump however has constantly stated that he is pro-life and so far his choices for counselors and cabinet positions have been uniformly so. Most critically, Mr. Trump has stated emphatically that he will fill the current Supreme Court opening and any others that should arise with a justice in the mode of Antonin Scalia (strongly pro-life) and with a friendly congress confirmation should be assumed.

Even though many in the pro-life community were less than enamored with the Trump candidacy, the dread of a continued hostility to Sanctity of Life issues at the federal level convinced many undecideds to vote for him. In fact, the percentage of Catholics, Evangelicals and even Hispanics who voted for Trump/Pence was higher than in any election since Ronald Reagan. This clearly indicates that "social issues" --especially on life -- are very important to a strong plurality of voters nationwide.

The election results will likely mean that in the next two years we should see more protection for the unborn enacted at the federal level, and some of the more onerous executive decisions of the last 8 years rolled back. It is very possible that federal funds will pay for far fewer abortions also, as funding for Planned Parenthood and other programs inconsistent with the Hyde Amendment (which outlawed federal funding for abortion) will potentially be significantly cut.

Another potential positive from the election is that with the Democratic Party reeling from the defeat, those Democrats who are anti-abortion may have an opportunity to crack the strangle-hold pro-abortion activists have had over the party platform and leadership. Pro-life Dems, of whom there are many, have a significant opportunity to move the party to a more inclusive practice, which would be good for the party and for the nation as a whole.

This would be especially significant in California, where Democrats now have a "super majority" in the legislature and hold all elective state offices. It is a fact that although Hispanics, who are becoming the most powerful electoral group in the state, are largely pro-life, they have been effectively muzzled by the Dem. party structure on this issue. Hopefully this will change, along with the fact that blacks have a much higher abortion rate over all than others and it is clear they have been targeted demographically. Perhaps this election will be a wake-up call that will actually unify us as a state and a nation, rather than further dividing us. We should all pray that this will be so.

Lawrence Lehr

THE SLED TEST, A SIMPLE ARGUMENT AGAINST ABORTION

The SLED test, developed by Stephen Schwarz (*The Moral Question of Abortion*) is a powerful, memorable and (seemingly) non-religious argument for the civil rights of all human beings from the moment of conception to natural death. It is based on the fact that most Americans readily acknowledge the full personhood and constitutional rights of *born* human beings. Tapping into this bias, the SLED test demonstrates that we are denying both of these blessings to the unborn -- discriminating against them -- based solely upon four minor and temporary characteristics.

1. Size: True, a pre-born baby human is smaller than a born human. But by what logic does her size disqualify her from being a person with civil rights? A four-year old is smaller than a fourteen year old. Does that mean the four-year old is less a person, or less worthy of protection in law? How, then, can we justly discriminate against millions of slightly smaller persons, simply because they are smaller and hidden from our sight?

2. Level of Development: A four-year old girl cannot bear children because her reproductive system is less developed than that of a fourteen-year old girl. Does this make the four-year old less valuable, less human, or less a person than the fourteen-year old? Also, we now know that, genetically speaking, the fully developed human being (person) is already present in the fertilized ovum, simply awaiting food, water and love, to grow into all that she was meant to be. In abortion we are not killing a potential person, but a person with great potential.

3. Environment: Does where we are determine who we are or what we are worth? An astronaut floating around in space is in a different environment from someone on earth; would anybody deny him his personhood simply because he's temporarily in a different location? How, then, can we deny personhood and protection to a little aquanaut, floating around in his mother's amniotic sac? And how could a 7 inch journey through the birth canal magically transform a non-person into a person, or a value-less human being into a valuable one?

4. Degree of Dependency: Every day in hospitals across the land sick and injured people depend on medical personnel for their very lives. Who among us would dare to declare them non-persons or kill them outright? Surely, then, it is not reasonable to depersonalize and devalue the pre-born just because they briefly depend on nutrients drawn from their mother's womb.

We see, then, that the SLED test exposes the pro-abortion argument for what it really is: Unreasonable and unjust discrimination against the pre-born. Abortion-choice advocates are actually discriminating against a huge class of true human beings, denying them personhood and life based on their size, level of development, environment and degree of dependency. Meanwhile, pro-lifers assert that every human being -- regardless of size, skin color, level of dependency, gender, ethnicity or place of residence -- should be reckoned a true person, accorded the full spectrum of his/her human rights, and welcomed as a valued member of the family of man.

As I said earlier, the SLED test seems to be a non-religious argument for the right to life. If, however, we pause to consider why it works so well, we will see that the whole edifice is built on our innate sense of justice. But where does THAT come from? Our founding fathers knew the answer, and so declared "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; and that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

Let us pray that as we use the SLED test, others will see this as well.

Dean Davis

(This article is based on an essay written by Alan Shlemon, of Stand to Reason.)