

"Writing the truth  
as I see it;  
trying not to  
offend  
those who will  
disagree."

# The truth as I see it™

Idaho Common Sense™



Craig L. Bosley, MD

## How dare 'Juno' make a choice?

March 31, 2008

My wife and I recently saw a movie that was both delightful and comforting, with a surprisingly politically incorrect choice. Juno, a high school girl, gets pregnant and immediately wants a "quickie abortion." Approaching the abortion clinic, she interacts with a girl picketing the clinic. She then goes into the clinic but changes her mind and leaves, determined to have the baby and put him/her up for adoption; "It has fingernails?" She continues to reject abortion even after her stepmother advocates that she "take care of the pregnancy" so she can have a "real" baby when the time is right. Juno remains adamant, unwavering. What is a "real" baby? When does a fetus become "real?" The suggestion is a "real" baby is the one you decide not to abort; the aborted baby is not "real." Interesting perspective?

How did this movie get by the Hollywood censors? Instead of a "quickie abortion" to solve an irresponsible, unwanted pregnancy, this teenager accepts responsibility for her choices and deals with the consequences of those choices. Might this suggest we have some personal responsibility for our choices rather than our society's no-fault, throwaway values?

One critic said the movie failed to show the very negative reality of adoption, the significant emotional consequences of adoption. This critic also felt the movie failed to appreciate the tremendously valuable right of abortion on demand. Several critics were offended because Juno did not portray abortion favorably enough. Women selecting adoption will have their faces "etched with grief and regret." Adoption leaves the woman "broken and changed forever." Do the rest of us simply fail to comprehend the ease of abortion; the reality that abortion has no negative consequences because the baby is not "real?" Can we

imagine the disgrace of allowing an unwanted baby to be born, the shame of admitting pregnancy without intent, the humiliation of accepting responsibility for our choices?

Doesn't pro-choice mean the right to choose? Weren't we told that was what abortion on demand was all about? Isn't that exactly what Juno did, make a choice? Are we being told making a choice other than abortion sends a "negative message?" Do these negative critical reactions to Juno suggest those favoring abortion on demand are not pro-choice, but more accurately pro-abortion?

The former president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Gloria Feldt, said, "Women don't have abortions because they fail to value children, but because they value children so highly, they want to give birth when they can care for them well." She asserts it is not the abortion that is traumatic, only the unwanted pregnancy. Am I misunderstanding? Are we discussing the value of a baby being comparable to the purchase of a car or home? Is the timing right, is it convenient, does it fit with my plans? Do we realize the tissue we abort will never exist again; we cannot have that same baby later, only a brother or sister to that baby? Are we to believe babies are interchangeable? Are babies only "real" when we want them to be?

The Juno critics also complain the government interferes with abortion on demand with informed consent expectations that are too restrictive. If this is just tissue and not a "real" human, as we are so forcefully told, then why are the pro-abortion advocates so opposed to what appears to be legitimate informed consent? Reading samples of the information given to patients seeking an abortion, I suspect a patient has a better understanding of virtually any other medical procedure than they do of an abortion. Is it

informed consent to say it is just tissue, it is not human, it does not even look human, we don't have pictures of what it looks like, it can be replaced with another one later, and the like? Pro-abortion advocates oppose a recommendation that the patient meet with the physician 24 hours prior to the procedure and be informed of exactly what will be done and the probable age of the fetus. Why is this so offensive? What are we trying to keep from the patient, what must they not know? Why do we fear allowing patients information? If you needed elective surgery at a hospital would you agree to first meet your physician in the operating room at the time of surgery? The abortion proponents are especially resistant to allowing patients any information which could provide an accurate representation of what the fetus looks like. When did we regress to the era of "its best if the patient does not know?" If it's just tissue, why can't they know?

Why the fuss? It's not human. We demand choice. We demand! Adoption is "grief and regret." Adoption is "broken and changed forever." We demand! Minimal information. Maximal speed. No time to think. We demand! "It has fingernails?" Juno. Choices. Responsibility.

To see what this non-human tissue looks like, visit:

<http://www.pregnancy.org/pregnancy/fetaldevelopment1.php>