

The pros and cons of Judge Neil M. Gorsuch

Our young are so full of innocence and capabilities that are not yet known. Why would anyone want to destroy that through abortion? One of the most absurd pro-choice claims is that those who are pro-life do not like or care for the baby after he or she is born. In fact, pro-lifers find equal importance of life inside and outside of the womb. The gravity in a baby's eyes, showing such extreme happiness for life, is one of the most beautiful things in the world. –G. K. Chesterton

I am overjoyed that Donald J. Trump is our 45th President, and I'm thrilled with 95% of his nominees. Nevertheless, unlike the sycophants who supported Obama and Hillary, when I am in doubt, I'm going to let my readers know about it.

God Said, CHOOSE LIFE

The Lord said in [Deuteronomy](#) to Choose Life! When those of us who hate Roe v. Wade think of the suffering of millions of little babies in their mothers' wombs when abortion is chosen, we cry out for it to come to a screeching halt. We know too what happens to those little murdered bodies. It is why our 45th President has promised to put pro-life justices on the Supreme Court. We can thank God Hillary Clinton is not nominating a justice.

My first choice would have been Judge Charles Canady from Florida. While he was in Congress, Canady was credited for coining the term "partial-birth abortion" while developing the [Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995](#). He has proven to be stellar on pro-life issues.




Neil Gorsuch and Antonin Scalia

When introducing Neil Gorsuch, our President said, "I took the task of this nomination very seriously. I have selected an individual whose qualities define, really, and I mean closely, define what we're looking for. Judge Gorsuch has outstanding legal skills, a brilliant mind, tremendous discipline and has earned bipartisan support." He added that Gorsuch's resume was as good as he's ever seen.

As he searched for a nominee to ultimately take Scalia's empty seat, Trump said he spoke "regularly" with Scalia's wife, Maureen McCarthy Scalia, according to Kellyanne Conway. Mrs. Scalia has been a rock throughout this entire process," Conway said. "She has been somebody who the President has talked to regularly throughout this process and he has very much enjoyed his time with her in person and over the phone."

Gorsuch is better than half of those on the list who really don't see much that can be done in stopping abortion. He does have sterling credentials, and in theory believes in the Constitution. However, no one can truly say whether or not he'd vote to overturn Roe v. Wade, which is ultimately the definition of pro-life.



Gorsuch and Scalia were

friends, and obviously had enjoyed time together in Colorado as the signed photo suggests.

The insignia reads, "To Neil Gorsuch, Fond memories of a day on the Colorado. With warm regards, Antonin Scalia.

After President Trump's announcement of Neil Gorsuch as his nominee, Gorsuch met Mrs. Scalia and chatted amiably with her and her son, Fr. Paul Scalia.

Gorsuch and Hobby Lobby

Many believe Gorsuch is pro-life because he ruled for the Christian Hobby Lobby stores against Obamacare's demand (via [Secretary Sebelius](#)) that this Christian for-profit organization provide all contraceptive funding in their insurance. The left would have you think that Hobby Lobby was against all contraception for women, which is untrue. The reality is that the FDA approved 18 forms of female [contraception](#), and Hobby Lobby took offense to only the ones that killed an already fertilized egg, Plan B "morning-after pill," Ella "morning-after pill," and two hormonal and copper intrauterine devices (IUDs). They didn't object to most birth control pills, sponges, condoms and even sterilization.



The key issue on appeal in the 10th was whether or not a “for-profit corporation” may be considered a “person exercising religion” under the [Religious Freedom Restoration Act](#), which came into play in the [decision for Hobby Lobby from the lower court](#). The case was about religious freedom, not about abortion per se. Gorsuch sided with the Little Sisters of the Poor in a similar religious freedom case involving Obamacare.

In the Supreme Court decision, Justice Alito wrote that, “The owners of the businesses have religious objections to abortion, and according to their religious beliefs the contraceptive methods at issue are abortifacients.”

[According to ABC News](#), Gorsuch “is a defender of the ‘Free Exercise Clause,’ which says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” As such, he has also championed the rights of religious groups to display their religion in public places. And that’s a big Amen.

Gorsuch and Assisted Suicide



Gorsuch disagreed with Judge Richard Posner of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Posner has written in favor of permitting physician-assisted suicide, arguing that the government should not interfere with a person's decision to take his or her own life, especially in cases where the patient is terminally ill.

Gorsuch rejected that view, writing it would "tend toward, if not require, the legalization not only of assisted suicide and euthanasia, but of any act of consensual homicide." Posner's position, he writes, would allow "somasochist killings" and "mass suicide pacts," as well as duels, illicit drug use, organ sales and the "sale of one's own life."

Gorsuch concludes his book by suggesting that the law could allow for terminally ill patients to refuse treatments that would extend their lives, while stopping short of permitting intentional killing.

In his book, *The Future of Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia* (2006), Gorsuch praised the pro-abortion ruling that upheld *Roe v. Wade* as follows: "The plurality in Casey expressly sought to provide a firmer basis for the abortion right and to shore up the reasoning behind Roe's result." (p. 79) This is extremely troubling, as no one who is pro-life would ever assert that there is a "firmer basis" and better "reasoning" that can support the horrifically unjust result of abortion-on-demand.

Citing the Judge's book as proof that he is pro-life is not valid inasmuch as pro-abortion supreme court judges have ruled

against physician assisted suicide in the past.

Gorsuch and Stare Decisis

Gorsuch also clings to bad precedent, and is an extreme supporter of [stare decisis](#), both of which are excuses for upholding *Roe v. Wade* rather than overturning it. “Our duty to follow precedent sometimes requires us to make mistakes,” Gorsuch declared in ruling against the Second Amendment rights of a man before his court. [United States v. Games-Perez, 667 F.3d 1136, 1142 \(10th Cir. 2012\)](#) (Gorsuch, J. concurring).



What is stare decisis? It is Latin for “to stand by things decided,” and is the doctrine of precedent. Courts cite to stare decisis when an issue has been previously brought to the court and a ruling already issued. Generally, courts will adhere to the previous ruling, though this is not universally true. See, e.g. [Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey, 505 US 833](#). The doctrine operates both horizontally and vertically. Horizontal stare decisis refers to a court adhering to its own precedent. A court engages in vertical stare decisis when it applies precedent from a higher court. Consequently, stare decisis discourages litigating established precedents.

Although courts seldom overrule precedent, Justice Rehnquist explained that *stare decisis* is not an “[inexorable command](#).” On occasion, the Court will decide not to apply the doctrine if a prior decision is deemed [unworkable](#). In addition, significant societal changes may also prompt the Court to [overrule precedent](#); however, any [decision](#) to overrule precedent is exercised cautiously. ([Cornell University Law School](#))

Gorsuch Nominated by George W. Bush

“Not a single Democrat opposed [#NeilGorsuch’s](#) confirmation in 2006,” [tweeted](#) Mitch McConnell on February 1st. [Both Bush](#)

[families](#) stated they were pro-choice after they were out of office. It is likely the Democrat Senators knew the families were really pro-choice and thus confirmed their nominee. [Here's the list of the leftists who confirmed him.](#)


Gorsuch and the CFR

Neil Gorsuch was a term member of the Council on Foreign Relations, listed in the 2008 CFR Annual Report Membership Roster. He is not listed in the 2017 Annual Report, but is listed as a member in his 2006 nomination by President George W. Bush. ([See part 8](#))

Aside from his stint at Harvard Law, can we conjecture that his term membership in the CFR might have influenced him with the **One-World-Socialist-Police-State-under-the-United-Nations** goals of the CFR? Here is a [short tutorial on the CFR](#). You can also [purchase a booklet about the CFR](#).

Because of his membership, will he will be a shoe-in for the post, as he was in 2006? Other CFR Members of the Court are Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer.

The only way you can find out about CFR Membership rosters is to obtain the CFR Annual Reports through purchase from Amazon for a nominal fee. (Hat tip to Sue.)



Gorsuch's Pro-Abortion Church

Neil Gorsuch and his wife attend the apostate [St. John's Episcopal Church in Boulder](#), Colorado, that has a woman rector, Rev. Susan Springer, who considers homosexuality as

acceptable, and who believes that women have the right to kill their unborn babies. Springer also promotes climate control and gun control. [[Link](#)]

Homosexuals have had union blessing ceremonies in the church. [Here](#) is an article written by Rev. Susan Springer in 2010 supporting homosexuals and their behavior.

In 1994, as the anti-abortion movement mobilized to restrict reproductive freedom of American women, the Episcopal Church added this resolve:

“The Episcopal Church expresses its unequivocal opposition to any legislative, executive or judicial action on the part of local, state or national governments that abridges the right of a woman to reach an informed decision about the termination of pregnancy or that would limit the access of a woman to safe means of acting on her decision.”

From this [article in Huffington Post](#), it appears Gorsuch is also pro-gay marriage, and unlikely to ever change Roe v. Wade.

Gorsuch’s [membership in an Episcopal church](#) in Boulder, Colorado, whose female senior pastor attended the Women’s March in Colorado, and has been associated with other liberal causes, gives great pause to most pro-life conservatives.

Lobbyist Influence

The influence, primarily by the pro-abortion [Federalist Society](#) and Heritage Foundation lobbyists, over the Supreme Court decision by our President was unprecedented. Why did Trump lock himself into only 21 names given by these organizations?



According to media accounts Trump considered only candidates whom the Federalist Society recommended, and no others.

Florida Supreme Court Justice Charles Canady is pro-life and more qualified than Gorsuch, but apparently, Trump never even interviewed Canady. Other prominent pro-life candidates, both on and off the list, who Trump cited during his campaign, were also not seriously considered.

If this were merely the first time that a Supreme Court nominee was supposedly pro-life, but was actually pro-choice, then perhaps a “wait and see” approach might be reasonable. However, unborn children have been sacrificed time and time again by this deception. President Ronald Reagan appointed Sandra Day O’Connor, who was supposed to be pro-life but wasn’t, and then likewise for Anthony Kennedy. The first President Bush appointed David Souter, who was also supposed to be pro-life, but became stridently pro-abortion instead.

As well, the [pro-choice, pro-gay-marriage billionaire Koch brothers](#) have thrown their weight behind Judge Gorsuch. [[Link](#)] They launched a digital campaign urging senators to confirm Gorsuch, and they plan to mobilize the network’s 3.2 million activists to put pressure on lawmakers.

Gorsuch on Other Issues

In [an analysis](#) by Larry Pratt of Gun Owners of America, he pointed out that Gorsuch joined an opinion that adhered to the anti-gun view that “concealed weapons create an immediate and severe danger to the public.” [United States v. Rodriguez, 739 F.3d 481, 490 \(10th Cir. 2013\)](#).

On the transgender issue, Gorsuch joined an opinion holding that “it is unlawful to discriminate against a transgender (or any other) person because he or she does not behave in accordance with an employer’s expectations for men or women.” [Kastl v. Maricopa Cty. Cmty. Coll. Dist., 325 F. App’x 492, 493 \(9th Cir. 2009\)](#).



Where will Gorsuch come down on in the issue of whether men, who claim to be women, may enter women's public bathrooms, showers and locker rooms. His opinion would affect children in public school facilities. Will he even be questioned on this issue by senators during his hearing proceedings?

Conclusion

Unfortunately for us, Gorsuch's views on abortion are not well defined. In his book, he wrote, "In Roe, the Court explained that, had it found the fetus to be a "person" for purposes of the Fourteenth Amendment, it could not have created a right to abortion because no constitutional basis exists for preferring the mother's liberty interests over the child's life."

For the sake of the unborn babies in America, I pray that Gorsuch truly is pro-life.

Like Joe Friday of Dragnet, I'm just giving you the facts, the decision is yours.