



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 19, 2019

## Roswell: First Known for Aliens, Now a Sanctuary for Unborn Babies

It's famous for space aliens and has featured prominently on shows such as the *X-Files*, but now Roswell is making news for being very human — and humane. The New Mexico city recently passed a resolution declaring itself, as pro-life activists are putting it, “a sanctuary for the unborn.”

As LifeNews [reports](#), state lawmakers were considering



[a bill to keep abortions legal for basically any reason up until birth](#), even if *Roe v. Wade* is overturned.

...[T]he Roswell City Council responded with a resolution declaring their city a sanctuary for unborn babies; it passed in a 7-1 vote Thursday.

The resolution states that “innocent human life” deserves to be protected, and “life” is the “first declared right” in the Declaration of Independence. It supports “adoption as an alternative to abortion,” as well as resources to “ease the burden of adoption.”

The council members also supported conscience protections for medical workers by recognizing the “rights of healthcare providers to object on moral grounds to performing abortions” in the resolution.

As to the latter, the bill cited above, which was being considered by the New Mexico Senate, “would have forced doctors to commit abortions,” [reports](#) LifeSite. “It also would have repealed old, unenforced sections of the law criminalizing abortion — preparation for a possible overturning of *Roe v. Wade*. New Mexico is home to an [infamous late-term abortion facility](#), [Southwestern Women's Options](#), and has some of the loosest abortion laws in the country. Southwestern Women's Options commits abortions [throughout the third trimester of pregnancy](#).”

Yet there was still more good news Thursday for the unborn. In [a surprising pro-life victory](#), “the New Mexico Senate rejected the bill 24 to 18. Eight Democrats joined 16 Republicans in voting against it,” *LifeSite* also informs.

It's possible the Roswell declaration wouldn't have been issued had the above result come sooner, but it's good it was issued because it's powerful. It not only quotes the Declaration, but also “cites a paper from the American College of Pediatricians stating,” *LifeSite* relates,

The predominance of human biological research confirms that human life begins at conception-fertilization. At fertilization, the human being emerges as a whole, genetically distinct, individuated zygotic living human organism, a member of the species *Homo sapiens*, needing only the proper environment to grow and develop. The difference between the individual in its adult state and in its zygotic state is one of form, not nature.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 19, 2019

In other words, the difference is merely one of developmental level. Thus, is claiming it's okay to kill a baby one-day old in the womb, but not a baby one-day removed from it really different from saying it's licit to kill a baby one-day removed from it, but not a baby one-day removed from diapers?

Critics may laugh or scoff, but it's not just that Virginia governor Ralph Northam [recently helped highlight](#) the support for killing newborns; it's that certain Americans and others [have already claimed](#) killing toddlers is okay if they're not "sentient" (video below). Two "philosophers" even [wrote](#) in 2011 that they proposed calling "this practice 'after-birth abortion', rather than 'infanticide,' to emphasize that the moral status of the individual killed is comparable with that of a fetus."

Where does this come from? Well, upon saying that "development" determines kill-worthiness, where do you draw the line? Either human life will be viewed as sacred or it won't. It makes no sense saying that one second the intrauterine entity is a thing, but the next moment it's human.

Once a precedent has been set stating it's alright to kill a child one second, however, why not the next second? Why not the one after that, the next, the next, and the next? Follow it out, and soon you'll be murdering newborns (as proposed), then toddlers (as proposed), and then, what? Remember, killing a 30-year-old could be an "after-birth abortion," too. [Logan's Run](#), here we come.

Yet, "Men do not differ much about what things they will call evils; they differ enormously about what evils they will call excusable," as philosopher G. K. Chesterton put it. The reality is that because of what has already been outlined — and with pregnant women feeling babies kick and ultrasound technology showing them in the womb sucking their thumbs — most people already have at least a strong sense that prenatal infanticide kills a human.

Thus does the language relating to it amount to typical "political speech and writing," which "are largely the defence of the indefensible," to quote 1984 author George Orwell. They must consist, he [wrote](#), "largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness."

There's no compulsion to euphemize regarding the destruction of harmful bacteria because we know such action is right and necessary. But just as we may call innocent war casualties "collateral damage," the psychological need to distance oneself from prenatal-infanticide's reality stops people from calling it what it is. Instead it's termed "reproductive choice" or, if you're a physician — who generally knows better and therefore does worse — "dilation and extraction."

But the truth will out, and this brings to mind a relevant story related years ago by a pro-life activist. While talking to a woman and after listening to her justifications for prenatal infanticide (the mother's hardship, etc.), she replied that she was sure all that was true — but it doesn't change the fact that "you know in your heart abortion is murder" (I'm paraphrasing).

The woman broke down crying and walked away.

Presumably, she'd submitted to prenatal infanticide herself in the past.

Below is a video, titled "Abortion Clinic Employees — 'Babies born alive daily,'" that's far more moving than even the above story.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J5q3wUXtJOY>

Perhaps politicians such as Irish Bob ("Beto") O'Rourke — who [just announced](#) his support for third-trimester prenatal infanticide — should be asked to watch it. If such things don't move them, they're truly more alien than anything ever purported to have crashed in Roswell.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 19, 2019

---

*Image: PEDRE via iStock / Getty Images Plus*



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,  
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



**Subscribe**

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.