***Wayne County Chapter***

**Church Notes February 2022**

**February 5-6: *Right to Life - LIFESPAN Chief Justice Roberts on Viability***

Chief Justice John Roberts is reticent to change precedents and concerned with the prestige of the Court. Many analysts think Roberts may attempt to craft a narrow compromise in the *Dobbs* case allowing Mississippi’s 15-week ban on abortion to stand, while maintaining the core *Roe* precedent of the right to an abortion. Roberts made several statements pointing out that the viability rule was never directly at question in *Roe* and that *Casey* changed Roe’s focus on trimesters for abortion regulations to one focused on the viability of the baby. Roberts stated, “I’d like to focus on the 15-week ban because that’s not a dramatic departure from viability. It is the standard the vast majority of other countries have. When you get to the viability standard, we share that standard with the People’s Republic of China and North Korea.” We hope Roberts is not the tie-breaking vote in *Dobbs*, but his openness to question the viability standard is better than the status quo. Call 734-422-6230 or email [wcdr@rtl-lifespan.org](mailto:wcdr@rtl-lifespan.org) for more information.

**February 12-13: *Right to Life – LIFESPAN Justice Kavanaugh on Neutrality***

Justice Brett Kavanaugh’s views on *Roe* and *Casey* were untested and considered with anxiety by pro-lifers before the *Dobbs* case. To overturn *Roe* would require the support of either Chief Justice Roberts or Kavanaugh. Kavanaugh signaled openness, “…the most consequential cases in this Court’s history, there’s a string of them where the cases overruled precedent.” Even more positively, Kavanaugh stated, “As I understand it, you’re arguing that the Constitution is silent and therefore, neutral on the question of abortion? In other words, that the Constitution is neither pro-life nor pro-choice on the question of abortion but leaves the issue for the people or the States or perhaps Congress to resolve in the democratic process?” Kavanaugh mentioned constitutional neutrality on abortion 6 more time and neutrality would require overturning *Roe*. Visit [www.milifespan.org](http://www.milifespan.org) for more pro-life advocacy.

**February 19-20: *Right to Life – LIFESPAN Justice Barrett on the Burdens of Motherhood***

**The newest Supreme Court Justice, Amy Coney Barrett, reassuringly questioned the justification for legal abortion in *Roe*. Barrett questioned, “…both *Roe* and *Casey* emphasize the burdens of parenting…the ways in which forced parenthood, forced mothering, would hinder women’s access to the workplace and to equal opportunities…Why don’t safe-haven laws take care of that problem?” Also mentioning adoption, she narrowed the justification for abortion, “…are you saying that the right as you conceive of it is grounded primarily in the bearing of the child, in the carrying of a pregnancy, and not so much looking forward into the consequences on professional opportunities and work life and economic burdens?” Note that Barrett essentially cornered those arguing for abortion into agreeing that the right to abortion has nothing to do with the difficulties of parenting or job opportunities for women or a child being born into “bad circumstances”, but rather the simple inconvenience of carrying a pregnancy. Call 734-422-6230 or e-mail [wcdr@rtl-lifespan.org](mailto:wcdr@rtl-lifespan.org) for volunteer opportunities.

**February 26-27: *Right to Life - LIFESPAN Justice Alito: Roe & Casey = Plessy***

Justice Samuel Alito grilled attorneys Rikelman and Prelogar arguing on behalf of the abortionists in *Dobbs*. When Rikelman claimed that our common law tradition allowed abortion for centuries, Alito queried, “Did any state constitutional provision recognize that abortion was a right, liberty, or immunity in 1868 when the 14th Amendment was adopted? Does any judicial decision at that time…recognize that abortion was a right, liberty, or immunity?” When asked to cite a specific case to back up her historical reference, Rikelman was unable to name even one. Since the 14th Amendment is often pointed to as the hidden source of the right to abortion, Alito made it clear that intent did not exist at the time. Alito then used the example of *Plessy v. Ferguson* upholding racial segregation to maneuver U.S. Solicitor General Prelogar into implicitly agreeing to Alito’s phrasing, “So there are…circumstances in which a decision may be overruled, properly overruled, when it must be overruled simply because it was egregiously wrong at the moment it was decided?” Bravo Justice Alito! See [www.milifespan.org](http://www.milifespan.org) for more.