Commentary:

Media spiked Gosnell's crimes

Michael Costello/Lewiston Tribune

Newspeak is here. And it works. And thanks to Newspeak, one of the most horrific trials in American history is proceeding with little press attention.

You probably don't know who Kermit Gosnell is. What should be the trial of the century has been mostly blacked out by the mainstream media. There are a number of reasons for their negligence. One reason is that the vocabulary adopted by the elites makes the precise description of Gosnell's alleged crimes impossible.

It's similar to the Associated Press' deletion of the accurate term "illegal alien" from their stylebook.

I still remember how to speak English.

Gosnell is accused of performing seven illegal, late-term, partial-birth abortions. In the course of these abortions, he delivered living, breathing, crying babies whom he then executed by severing their spinal cords.

He decorated his office with jars containing the preserved feet of his tiny victims. They were his trophies.

It's quite likely that he performed hundreds of these partial-birth abortions, but because he destroyed most of his records, the state could only prosecute him for seven. He may be the most prolific mass murderer in U.S. history.

Until shamed into sending a reporter, The New York Times covered only the first day of the trial and made its contribution to the cover-up by dehumanizing the babies as "viable fetuses." In doing so, the Times played its part in the left's campaign of obscuring what abortion really is.

In doing so, the Times embraced Gosnell's own contributions to Orwellian speech. Gosnell would instruct his staff that the babies were not "born." Instead "the fetus precipitated." He "snipped" the spinal cords, not to kill them, but "to ensure fetal demise."

His and the Times choice of words were pure squid's ink intended to blur the fact that he was committing infanticide.

And before you think that Gosnell occupies some sort of extreme outlier position on infanticide, consider this: Just a few weeks ago, Alisa LaPolt Snow, a lobbyist for Planned Parenthood, argued that the fate of a baby who was born alive as a result of a botched abortion deserves no protection under the law.

"We believe that any decision that's made should be left up to the woman, her family, and the physician," she said.

Last year, the ironically misnamed Journal of Medical Ethics published a paper that argued that any baby could be killed after birth, even if it was born healthy. The authors termed the "procedure," "after birth abortion."

Peter Singer, the Ira W. DeCamp Professor of Bioethics at Princeton University, once argued that, "killing a newborn baby is never equivalent to killing a person, that is, a being who wants to go on living." Singer argues that until a baby lives long enough to acquire a unique set of experiences, its life is undeserving of the protection we afford real humans.

And this column would be negligent if it did not remind its readers that our current president argued and voted against protecting the babies from the Gosnells of the world.

If you have a strong stomach, you can listen to a recording of Barack Obama explaining why monsters of Gosnell's ilk should be legally protected from prosecution for doing just what Gosnell stands accused of.

His speech can be heard here: http://youtu.be/YUkbuhXzbvI.

One of the primary goals of the pro-abortion cultural left has been to obscure what really goes on during an abortion. Recently, abortion advocates objected to a bill just signed into law in Kansas because it declares that life begins "at fertilization."

The left's objection to this phrase is somewhat ironic because it is liberals who claim that their belief system is scientifically based. Anyone with even a rudimentary grasp of biology knows that human life begins at conception. But the left intends to corrupt biology by corrupting the language of biology. Planned Parenthood trains its employees to tell wavering teenagers that abortion doesn't kill babies. Instead it "terminates the product of conception."

The pro-abortion left cannot even admit that they are pro-abortion. They call themselves pro-choice. If they're pro-choice, then will they stand up for my choice to own a firearm or to buy a 17-ounce soft drink in New York City? No. There's only one choice they're in favor of.

Would abortion be so culturally acceptable if what the abortionist did was described in plain English? Probably not. Certainly monsters like Gosnell would be impossible.

Costello is a research technician at Washington State University. His email address is kozmocostello@hotmail.com.