Thirty Years of *Roe v. Wade*

Wanda Franz, Ph.D.

THIRTY YEARS AGO the United States Supreme Court, for all practical purposes, legalized abortion through all nine months of pregnancy. The twin decisions of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* struck down not only the abortion statutes of Texas and Georgia but also invalidated all other state laws prohibiting abortion.

Dissenting Justice Byron White characterized the majority's ruling in *Roe v. Wade* as "an exercise of raw judicial power." He observed that

> I find nothing in the language or history of the Constitution to support the Court's judgment. The Court simply fashions and announces a new constitutional right for pregnant mothers and, with scarcely any reason or authority for its action, invests that right with sufficient substance to override most existing state abortion statutes. The upshot is that the people and the legislatures of the 50 States are constitutionally disentitled.

It is telling that the pro-abortion majority on the Court had to resort to brute judicial force and disregard for the constitution in order to unleash the abortion holocaust on the nation. It is unthinkable that the normal legislative process would have produced a right to abortion-on-demand in all 50 states. In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court ruled that the Texas abortion statute (prohibiting most abortions) violated a woman's "right to privacy" as protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In another dissent (*Thornburgh v. ACOG*, 1986), Justice Byron White, one of the two dissenters in *Roe*, revisited the question of the right to privacy, a right supposedly protected as a "fundamental liberty" under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. According to legal precedent, to be a "fundamental liberty," the specific right must either (1) be "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty," without which "neither liberty nor justice would exist," or (2) be "deeply rooted in this Nation's history and tradition." Justice White concluded that under

either definition *Roe v. Wade* is illegitimate.

The pro-abortion majority on the Court is, of course, aware of this fundamental flaw in *Roe v. Wade*. In *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Robert Casey* (1992), the Court's majority opinion–authored by Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy, and David Souter–made a desperate attempt at salvaging the "liberty" problem. The result is the notorious "mystery passage" about the meaning of the personal "liberty" protected under the Fourteenth Amendment:

> These matters, involving the most intimate and personal choices a person may make in a lifetime, choices central to personal dignity and autonomy, are central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. At the heart of the liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.

This is, at best, "new age" drivel and not legal reasoning. As Justice Antonin Scalia observed in his dissent, under this standard, bigamy, for example, would be a constitutional right.

In the majority opinion of *Roe v. Wade*, Justice Harry Blackmun conceded that the "privacy right involved...cannot be said to be absolute," but concluded that "the right to personal privacy includes the abortion decision, but...this right is not unqualified, and must be considered against important state interests in regulation." This is probably a sly attempt to make *Roe v. Wade* appear as a compromise. Justice Blackmun was more honest in the companion decision of *Doe v. Bolton.* There he dropped the pretense of a limit on the privacy right and swept away any state interests once "health" is invoked to justify the abortion. Under *Doe v. Bolton*, practically *any* abortion is free from limitation by the state because of its broad definition of "health":

> [T]he medical judgment may be exercised in the light of all factors–physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the woman's age–relevant to the wellbeing of the patient. All these factors may relate to health. This allows the attending physician the room he needs to make his best medical judgment.

And how much "room" does the abortionist get? Enough room for near-infanticide, up to the point just before complete birth. This we

know because on June 28, 2000, the Supreme Court ruled in *Stenberg v. Carhart* that Nebraska's law outlawing partial-birth abortions is unconstitutional. According to that ruling, a woman may opt for a partial-birth abortion and have the child delivered, except for the head, and then have the child killed by having his brains sucked out. This is the full meaning of "the right to privacy" and "the right to choose" under *Roe v. Wade*.

After *Roe v. Wade* was issued, it was promptly criticized over its faulty legal reasoning and for the Court's acting as an extra-constitutional super-legislature. Beyond the narrow legal issues, *Roe v. Wade* is pretty appalling in other aspects, too. Its pretentious attempt at scholarship through a highly selective excursion into the practices of ancient pagan societies is matched by its willful disregard of the biological facts supplied by modern science.

All in all, *Roe* is a dishonest and shoddy piece of lawmaking. And sometime in the future, it will be considered one of the worst Supreme Court decisions ever, on par with *Dred Scott v. Sanford* of 1857. But, but...right now, thirty years after it was issued, it still is a brilliant piece of revolution-making. And a thoroughly evil piece it is.

In spite of its severe flaws, *Roe* succeeded with the progressive elite because it promised sex without consequences under the guise of a newly-discovered constitutional right. According to *Roe*, the right to choose an abortion derives from an alleged right to privacy and therefore somehow derives from the Fourteenth Amendment. Moreover, abortion is a matter between a woman and her physician. The latter idea is probably the direct contribution of Justice Blackmun, who previously had been legal counsel to the Mayo Clinic. The slogan "between a woman and her physician" subtly suggests that abortions would be done only if a woman's health were jeopardized.

The rephrasing of the abortion issue as a constitutionally protected right to choose and a private matter between a woman and her doctor is completely dishonest but also extremely effective. Americans are loath to take away rights supposedly guaranteed by the constitution. And who would want to endanger a woman's health. If her doctor says she must have an abortion, who can object? Of course, most of the time, the

"doctor" turns out to be the abortionist himself.

It is in the nature of really big lies that their very enormity makes it difficult to erase them from public consciousness. Fortunately, we have made progress exposing these lies. Yet, after thirty years, large parts of the public are still unaware of the brutal sweep of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*.

The pro-abortion media have done a good job obfuscating the issue. This is not necessarily the result of a media conspiracy. For the most part it reflects the generally liberal predisposition of journalists, intellectual laziness, and their reluctance to give coverage to what they consider socially extreme positions. In their view, the "pro-choice" position is mainstream for the simple reason that they themselves hold it. And pro-lifers are definitely extreme because "these people" want to take away what the Supreme Court declared a constitutional right.

Given the intellectual laziness and herd instincts residing in the average journalist, papers such as the *New York Times* have a magnified influence. Whatever "the newspaper of record" writes tends to be reflected in the rest of the press.

A high school student wishing to inform herself on the legal status of abortion might reach for the *2003 New York Times Almanac*. In the "U.S. Health and Medicine–Abortion" section (p.371) she would find this: "The deliberate termination of a pregnancy before the fetus is capable of living outside the womb has generally been legal in the United States since 1973, when the Supreme Court ruled (in *Roe v. Wade*) that abortions cannot be prohibited during the first three months of pregnancy." This high school student would not find in the almanac a reference to a 1982 report from a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee concluding that "no significant legal barriers of any kind whatsoever exist today in the United States for a woman to obtain an abortion for any reason during any stage of her pregnancy."

In fairness to the *New York Times*, I should point out that its editorial *news* policy on the description of *Roe* has changed. In a letter to the National Right to Life Committee's legislative director, Douglas Johnson, an assistant to the editor announced on July 26, 1982–*nine* years after *Roe v. Wade*–the *New York Times'* new policy:

After examining the substance of your point, our National News editor is promulgating a memorandum for our national desk and our Washington Bureau instructing our editors and reporters that brief references to the Supreme Court's 1973 decision on abortion should say simply that the Court legalized abortion. As you indicate, the phrase "in the first three months of pregnancy" might be incorrectly interpreted to mean that abortions in the last six months of pregnancy remain illegal.

And for the most part, the *Times* has stuck to this policy in its newspaper reporting. That the editors of the *New York Times Almanac*, which is a widely sold *reference* book, have not yet caught up with the policy established in 1982 raises some questions. If the almanac's editors actually believe that their version of *Roe v. Wade* is correct, then they are seriously misinformed–a sign of incompetence. (After all, the list of contributors includes four researchers and fact checkers.) If they agree that it is misleading but publish it anyway, then they are deliberately *misinforming*–a journalistic crime.

The *New York Times Almanac's* misrepresentation of *Roe* is equivalent to a description of the First Amendment as "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press," *without* mentioning the parts establishing religious freedom and the rights to freedom of speech and association and the right to petition the government. While the truncated rendition of the amendment is "correct," it is also totally misleading.

Ironically, the journalistic impulse to report facts breaks through in the *Almanac*. The second paragraph in the "Abortion" section of the 2001 version states that 88% of abortions are performed during the first trimester, thereby implying that the preceding description of *Roe v. Wade* is inaccurate because 12% must have been legally done *after* the first trimester. Also, a curious reader of the almanac might find the following description of *Roe v. Wade* under "Important Supreme Court Decisions":

In a controversial ruling, the Court held that state laws restricting abortion were an unconstitutional invasion of a woman's right to privacy. Only in the last trimester of pregnancy, when the fetus achieved viability outside the womb, might states regulate abortion–except when the life or health of the mother was at stake. (p.125)

This is better, but still not an adequate description of the abortion right granted under *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* (which isn't mentioned at all).

In a recent article in the *Times* is remarkably honest about what actually goes on in an abortion. Published on April 22, 2003, under the title "Likely Ban on Abortion Technique Leaves Doctors Uneasy," the article by Mary Duenwald describes the fear of abortionists that the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act would ban other abortion techniques, too. The article uses language usually employed by pro-lifers and previously not considered "fit to print" by the *New York Times*. It's worth quoting at some length:

> The procedure at issue–what doctors now call intact dilatation and extraction, or intact D&X–involves pulling the fetus's legs and torso out of the uterus and then crushing its skull before removing it entirely....
>
> In 2000, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, a research organization that supports abortion rights, surveyed abortion providers nationwide and estimated that 2,200 such [partial-birth abortion] procedures were done that year, by 31 physicians....
>
> One aspect of the debate has changed. When it began, some opponents of the ban [of partial-birth abortions] said the targeted form of abortion was used only when a fetus had extreme abnormalities or a mother's health was endangered by pregnancy. [In other words, the pro-abortionists had been lying.] Now, both sides acknowledge that abortions done late in the second trimester, no matter how they are conducted, are most often performed to end healthy pregnancies because the woman arrived relatively late at her decision to abort. [One side, the pro-lifers, has nothing to "acknowledge now," for we told the truth from the very beginning; a correct statement would be: "Now, some opponents of the partial-birth abortion ban admit that..."]....
>
> A Guttmacher study from 1987 [!] indicates that only 2 percent of abortions done after 16 weeks of pregnancy are done because of fetal abnormalities. [In other words, the truth about that was out years *before* our campaign to ban partial-birth abortions.]
>
> A vast majority of second-trimester abortions are done using a technique called dilatation and evacuation, or D&E, in which the cervix is dilated, the fetal sac is punctured and drained, and the fetus's head is crushed. Then the body is dismembered and removed....
>
> Dr. [Warren] Hern [of Boulder, CO] kills the fetus with an injection of the heart drug digoxin a few days ahead of [inducing labor resulting in expulsion of

the dead child].... Dr. George R. Tiller of Wichita, Kan., who uses a labor-and-delivery technique, injects the fetus with digoxin one to four days ahead of time....

The [intact D&X] technique was designed for abortions done 18 to 20 weeks, when the fetus's head has grown too large to fit through the cervix easily. By 20 weeks, a fetus is typically about eight inches long.

The physician reaches into the uterus to turn the fetus into a feet-first position. The fetus is pulled through the cervix up to the neck. The doctor then pierces the fetal skull with an instrument and drains some of its content. This causes the skull to collapse and fit through the opening.…

"The goal of any abortion procedure is the destruction of the fetus," said Dr. Felicia H. Stewart of the University of California at San Francisco. "Given that that is the reality, it doesn't seem to me we ought to have a legislative mandate that likely increases the risks to the woman."

The article from which the above quotes are taken doesn't tell pro-lifers anything that they do not already know. But imagine how this looks to the ordinary reader of the *New York Times*, America's "newspaper of record" that supposedly prints "all the news that's fit to print." For years, the *New York Times* misrepresented *Roe v. Wade* as legalizing abortion "during the first trimester of pregnancy." For years, the paper gave full coverage to the propaganda of the pro-abortionists, while giving short shrift to facts presented by the "anti-abortion" side.

Now, there is something new at work. The *New York Times* alludes to the pro-abortionists' propensity to lie: "one aspect of the debate has changed," as it is delicately presented in the above excerpt. The *Times'*s subscribers read of fetal heads being "crushed" and "pierced" and made to "collapse," of the bodies in the womb being "dismembered and removed," of fetuses being "killed." The partial-birth abortion procedure is described not once–but *twice*, though under the sanitized term "intact D&X." And in the last paragraph it is plainly stated that "the goal of any abortion procedure is the destruction of the fetus."

Let's not overestimate what has happened here. The *New York Times* hasn't suddenly become pro-life. There is no reference to the right to life, nor is the term "pro-life" used. The article for the most part gives abortionists an opportunity to attack the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, although the correct name of the proposed law is avoided. And the *New York Times* persists in clumsy attempts to appear evenhanded: "now,

both sides acknowledge...," implying that *both* sides had lied about the reasons and frequency of partial-birth abortions. It wasn't "news that's fit to print" that we had spoken the truth all along and the pro-abortionists had lied persistently–"through [their] teeth," as Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, once admitted on national TV. Maybe the editors of the *New York Times* simply thought it too unseemly to keep repeating those lies. Maybe the impending passage and signing of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act into law "clarified their mind." Or maybe there is a defiant resolve to admit that abortion kills–and so what, it's a woman's "choice," period. It could be just an angry growl from the inhabitants of the culture of death.

The tendency to mischaracterize *Roe v. Wade* and make it appear less radical is not limited to the *New York Times* or the mainstream media in general. Polling firms, often working in association with mainstream papers and TV networks, have shown similar tendencies. The polling with regard to *Roe v. Wade* demonstrates that the wording of the poll question has a great influence on the result–and that the public is still quite uninformed about *Roe v. Wade* and abortion in general.

A study by Professor Raymond Adamek of Kent State University (presented 6/23/1999 at the annual meeting of the Association for Interdisciplinary Research in Values and Social Change, Milwaukee, WI) found that, for the period 1973 to 1998, eight major pollsters described *Roe v. Wade* as permitting abortion "during the first three months of pregnancy" in 85 different polls. In only 20 polls did they address abortion beyond the first trimester, and then mostly to pose it as a hypothetical case, that is, "should it be permitted?" In only four instances did they reveal that abortion after the first trimester is actually legal. The worst serial offender was pollster Louis Harris, who kept referring to *Roe v. Wade* as legalizing abortion "up to three months of pregnancy."

Lydia Saad of the Gallup Organization published a review of abortion polls in January 2002 (1/22/2002 at gallup.com/polls/special reports). She lists first-trimester-only polls that produced numbers in favor of *Roe v. Wade* as high as 62% and 63%, with 29% opposed. In contrast, a *Los Angeles Times* poll (June 8-13, 2000), describing *Roe v.*

Wade as permitting "a woman to have an abortion from a doctor at any time," produced support of *Roe* at 43% and opposition at 42%, with 15% having no opinion or not knowing enough. I suspect that the phrase "from a doctor" implies for many respondents that *Roe v. Wade* requires a serious medical reason for the abortion, but of course it doesn't. Yet, as polls on *Roe v. Wade* go, this is one of the least biased. If pollsters were serious about gauging the public's support for the actual legal meaning of *Roe v. Wade*, they would ask a question like this:

> Under the U. S. Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision, it is legal for an abortion doctor to deliver a healthy child feet first, except for the head, and then stab a pair of scissors into the base of the child's skull–which is still in the womb–to make a hole so he can suck the baby's brains out and kill it. Do you favor *Roe v. Wade* or do you oppose it?

I leave it to you to guess what the response would be. While the polls show that the public is ambivalent about *Roe v. Wade,* at the same time, a clear majority, currently around 60%, thinks that abortion should be either illegal in all cases or be legal in only a few circumstances. This tells us two things: first, that abortion-on-demand is not accepted by the public; second, that most of our fellow citizens are still uninformed about the truly radical nature of *Roe v. Wade.*

So, where do we stand 30 years after *Roe v. Wade*? Let me give you some statistics and polling data and allow me to comment on them.

According to compilations available on the web site of the Alan Guttmacher Institute, the number of abortions peaked in 1990 at 1.61 million per year. It has declined steadily since then to about 1.31 million in 2002, the most recent year for which data were collected. The rate of abortions per 1000 women of child-bearing age peaked in 1980/81 at 29.3. It has since then declined to 21.3 in 2000. The number of women with more than one abortion rose from around 15% in 1974 to around 48% in the late 1990s.

As reported in *The Buffalo News* on November 27, 2002, a Zogby poll found that "about 22 percent said they were less in favor of abortion today than they were a decade ago. About half that number said they were more in favor of it.... Nationwide, one-third of people ages 18 to 29

said abortion should never be legal. That contrasts with about 23 percent for those ages 30 to 64, and about 20 percent for those over age 65.... [O]nly about 4 percent nationwide...said they always vote for pro-choice candidates. About 13 percent nationally...said they always vote for anti-abortion candidates."

The conventional explanations for the decline in the *number* and *rate* of abortions do *not* explain the change in *attitude*. Why should, to quote from a recent report of the federal Centers for Disease Control (or CDC), "reduced access to abortion services" or "changes in contraceptive practices" make people three times as likely to vote for pro-life candidates than for pro-abortions ones (13% vs. 4%, according to Zogby International)?

Or how would, to quote again, "a shift in age distribution of women toward the older less fertile stages" explain why, according to Zogby International, the young (18 to 29 years) are 50% more likely than those thirty and older to think that abortion should never be legal? Women of age 18-29 have well over half the abortions, according to the CDC. Hence, conventional wisdom would postulate that a greater "need" for abortion would make the young more pro-abortion than the older age group.

Note also that the decline in the number of abortions would have been greater were it not for the high percentage of repeat abortions. Clearly, the significant changes of attitude in the pro-life direction rest on more than changes in access to abortion or perceived "need" to have an abortion. While the routine use of ultrasound imaging has made the humanity of the unborn child more "visible" and thus strengthened natural pro-life attitudes, a large part of the positive change is the result of the hard work of pro-lifers.

In her review of public opinion polls referenced above, Lydia Saad of the Gallup Organization writes this: "It is worth highlighting that in July 1996, coincident with the emergence of a new national debate over partial-birth abortion, Gallup recorded a significant drop in the number of Americans saying that abortion should be legal in all cases. Since then, the percentage favoring unrestricted abortions has averaged just 25%, down from about 33% in the previous five years."

In other words, when we at the National Right to Life Committee conceived and executed the campaign to ban partial-birth abortions we knew what we were doing. During the past decade, NRLC and its chapters undertook three huge educational campaigns. These campaigns were of national scope, required the coordinated effort of thousands of grassroots pro-lifers from the local chapter level to the national office, reached millions of people through leaflets and advertising, and drained our resources enormously–but they produced results.

The first two were defensive. One was to prevent the so-called "Freedom of Choice Act" from becoming law and the other helped defeat Hillary Clinton's health plan. The "Freedom of Choice Act" would have made unlimited abortion on demand a federally protected right. Hillary Clinton's health plan would have made abortion-on-demand a part of routine medical care ("no questions asked," as one columnist put it) and would have federally mandated it as a health benefit. The plan would also have rationed medical care for the elderly and disabled and thus threatened them with involuntary euthanasia.

The third campaign, the effort to ban partial-birth abortions, put us on offense. It has been the most successful so far because it has had a far-reaching effect on attitudes.

Some misguided pro-lifers criticized NRLC over the partial-birth abortion campaign. It was "incremental" and therefore not "pro-life," they said. By focusing on partial-birth abortions, it would make people more tolerant of all other abortions, they said. Well, they were wrong. They should look at the Gallup report quoted above.

When *Roe v. Wade* was announced, pro-lifers warned that, ultimately, infanticide and euthanasia in various forms were the logical consequences of the ruling. In fact, in 1996, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a lower court's ruling that struck down the State of Washington's statute banning assisted suicide. Judge Stephen Reinhardt stated in the majority opinion that "in deciding right-to-die cases, we are guided by the [Supreme] Court's approach to the abortion cases." Fortunately, the Supreme Court reversed the Ninth Circuit Court's decision. As an aside it should be noted that Judge Reinhardt, a Carter appointee, has the distinction of being the most reversed federal appeals

judge.

Yet, in spite of this setback to the euthanasia cause in Washington State, physician-assisted suicide is now legal in another state in the Pacific Northwest, namely, Oregon. The National Right to Life Committee, its Oregon affiliate, and the Catholic Church put a lot of effort into defeating the referendum legalizing physician-assisted suicide; but we failed. We could have used help from other groups that call themselves "pro-life."

With regard to Oregon, former Attorney General Janet Reno refused to enforce the federal Controlled Substances Act that bans the use of controlled drugs for non-medical use. Killing people or helping people kill themselves with controlled substances is clearly not a "medical" use of these drugs. With the willful incompetence that characterized so much of Reno's tenure, she refused to enjoin Oregon on the grounds that the federal prohibitions do not apply because Oregon law provides otherwise. This is an entirely novel application of the principle that federal law trumps state law.

The current attorney general, John Ashcroft, reverted to precedent and ruled that Oregon may not violate federal law and must not condone the use of controlled substances for physician-assisted suicide. Mr. Ashcroft's ruling was struck down by a lower court and is now on appeal before a panel of the same Ninth Circuit Court that struck down Washington's ban on assisted suicide.

The "bottom of the slippery slope" that we warned about after *Roe v. Wade* turned out to be more of moral swamp than we originally expected. Now, beyond the issue of abortion and demands for legalized physician-assisted suicide, we are in a fight to stop human cloning and the establishment of cloned-embryo farms where tiny human beings would be destroyed for the sake of harvesting fetal stem cells.

And who would have thought that we would have to expend enormous amounts of money and political and legal energy to preserve our First Amendment right to participate in political process? Yet the new law on campaign finance reform threatens to keep us from being an effective voice in Congress. I find it astounding that so few other pro-life and public policy interest groups understand the threat to their First

Amendment rights.

The seven men on the Supreme Court, who on January 22, 1973 imposed abortion on demand on the country, clearly intended to settle the matter once and for all in favor of the pro-abortion side. Those opposed to abortion were supposed to fall into line, because abortion was now an unassailable "constitutional" right. Of course nothing was settled. Instead, the Court's arrogance roused the pro-life movement into action. In fact, one of the good things that we can celebrate after 30 years of *Roe v. Wade* is the growing strength of the right-to-life movement. Moreover, the numbers and rates of abortions have been steadily declining in recent years, and public opinion has swung in the pro-life direction.

The growth of the right-to-life movement clearly has annoyed the pro-abortion majority on the Court. Obviously bothered by the increasing strength and success of pro-life activism, the majority in the *Casey* decision of 1992 wants such activism to end and demands obedience with breathtaking conceit. Using stilted language because they didn't dare say it in plain English, they assert

> Where in the performance of its judicial duties, the Court decides a case in such a way as to resolve the sort of intensely divisive controversy reflected in Roe …, its decision has a dimension that the resolution of the normal case does not carry. It is the dimension present whenever the Court's interpretation of the Constitution calls the contending sides of a national controversy to end their national division by accepting a common mandate rooted in the Constitution.

In plain English, "shut up, they explained" to pro-lifers. Pro-lifers are used to gratuitous insults, but this one we remember. This one motivates us.

Well, the Court has it backwards: pro-lifers didn't start the controversy, the Court did–with *Roe v. Wade*. The Court "resolved" nothing in *Roe v. Wade*. Rather, the Court created a constitutional crisis and an enormous social problem through *Roe v. Wade* in the first place. Asking us to be quiet in the face of the horrendous consequences of their illegitimate lawmaking from the bench is the height of judicial arrogance–and we won't shut up.

Justice Antonin Scalia makes the point by quoting from Justice

Benjamin Curtis's dissent in the *Dred Scott* case of 1857 which said:

> When a strict interpretation of the Constitution, according to fixed rules which govern the interpretation of laws, is abandoned, and the theoretical opinions of individuals are allowed to control its meaning, we have no longer a Constitution; we are under a government of individual men.

And in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having, to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

Indeed, "that eminent tribunal" will just have to stand by and watch us getting stronger. And even if it takes another thirty years, the day will come when *Roe v. Wade* will be considered a grave judicial error–as grave an error as the *Dred Scott* decision of 1857. It will become evident to all that *Roe v. Wade* seriously injured this nation, and the right to life will be constitutionally protected.

When the pro-abortion majority on the Supreme Court is reduced to both arrogant bombast and desperate whining it's time to show the pro-life banner proudly. Indeed, 30 years after *Roe v. Wade*, active pro-lifers are more numerous and more organized than ever. And the National Right to Life Committee has grown into the largest and most effective grassroots pro-life organization in this country. As Congressman Henry Hyde put it, NRLC is the "flagship" of the pro-life movement. Naturally, I couldn't agree more.