

Even justices make some mistakes

Decisions made by our United States Supreme Court justices are not always correct ones.

Supreme Court justices are only human, and are consequently fallible. History has shown that to be the case, and it was certainly the case when the court recently defied basic human rights for unborn children in their decision allowing "partial-birth" abortions to continue.

The U.S. Supreme Court recently heard a Nebraska case where that state Legislature banned partial-birth abortion

with only one dissenting voice. Twenty-nine other state Legislatures have enacted similar bans on partial-birth abortions.



B.J. Nikkel
Community

The majority of the Supreme Court justices stuck with what many

still see as erroneous logic invoked by the previous court in *Roe v. Wade*. That mistaken logic involved describing a fetus merely as "potential life." In doing so, it completely disregarded basic embryology — a branch of biology dealing with the features and phenomena exhibited in the formation and development of an embryo.

Roe v. Wade is the precedent that allowed our current Supreme Court to legalize killing nearly full-term babies who are practically born before they are cruelly killed. This recent Supreme Court ruling overturning the Nebraska ban on partial-birth abortions allows the inhumane and grisly procedure to continue. Testimony in Congress by various medical professionals and associations (some that are pro-choice on the other forms of abortion) indicated that the babies do indeed feel the pain inflicted.

The procedure allows the abortionist to pull the baby out of the birth canal far enough for the act to nearly be considered a live birth. The legalistic means by which it's not considered murder is that only the baby's head is left inside the birth canal — thus the term "partial-birth." A sharp tool is then inserted into the baby's head, which sucks the brains out and collapses the skull. The baby is then fully delivered. If a baby were fully delivered and the procedure then done, it would be considered murder.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, who, by the way, are pro-choice and oppose restrictions on abortion, says that there are no circumstances under which this type of procedure could be identified as the only option available to save the life or preserve the health of a woman.

In addition, the American Medical Association testified that it couldn't identify any situation where partial-birth abortion could be considered an "appropriate procedure."

The United States Supreme Court has used bad constitutional reasoning and showed blatant disregard for basic morality before. In dissent over the partial-birth abortion decision (the court was divided over the decision 5-4), Justice Anthony Scalia said that his colleagues would make "live-birth abortion" rank in infamy with other bad Supreme Court decisions. Scalia cited the 1857 *Dred Scott* case proclaiming that blacks couldn't be citizens and the 1944 *Korematsu* case allowing for the internment of our own United States citizens — people of Japanese ancestry.

Another bad decision made by a U.S. Supreme Court that I have talked about in previous columns is the 1896 case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. That famous ruling legalized state-endorsed racial discrimination and mandated segregation. It took 60 years for a more reasonable and morally conscious Supreme Court to reverse the *Plessy* ruling and proclaim the great injustice done to African-Americans.

I look forward to seeing a day when our United States Supreme Court will be guided by a sense of basic morality and won't be hampered by political and social pressures.

This presidential election will indeed be important in terms of balancing the country's culture and possibly providing for a more balanced court filled with Supreme Court justices who will respect the rights of all citizens — even the unborn ones.