

The Defense of the Defenseless

Topical Study of the Abortion Issue

Written By
©Pastor Marty Baker
February 17, 2019



In January of 2019, New York Governor Andrew Cuomo signed a radical new abortion law titled the *Reproductive Health Act*. To commemorate the long-desired legislative victory he ordered that state landmarks be lit in pink. What was so celebrative about this particular abortion law? It allows abortion under any of three conditions: (1) if it is performed earlier than 24 weeks of pregnancy; (2) in an “absence of fetal viability”; or (3) if necessary to “protect the patient’s life or health. Simply put, an abortion can occur in the first or second trimesters, and beyond this the “fetal viability” of the baby is considered, along with the Practioner’s assessment of the physical and/or mental health of the mother in question. As one can logically conclude, item two opens the door for aborting babies who have physical issues, and item three will permit abortions for an ever-shifting array of mental issues with the mother. Both of these combined will, *ipso facto*, lead to late term abortions.

Further, prior to the legalization of this law, homicide included the death of person who was born and is alive or of an unborn baby if the mother had been pregnant for more than 24 weeks. Now, the first criteria for a viable homicide is left intact, while the second is removed, ostensibly meaning that babies in the womb are no longer classified in the state of New York as “human persons.” In addition, since a pre-born baby is not a person but a thing, protection of its life if he/she happened to live after a botched abortion is also removed by repealing section 4164 of the State’s public health law. Hence, with one quick movement of a pen, the Governor ratified a law designed to remove all protections of the unborn by removing every vestige of their prior “fetal personhood.”

Inspired by the victory in New York, Virginia Delegate Kathy Tran, introduced House Bill 2491. The summary of the now-tabled bill is listed on State of Virginia's legislative information site:

Abortion; eliminate certain requirements. Eliminates the requirement that an abortion in the second trimester of pregnancy and prior to the third trimester be performed in a hospital. The bill eliminates all the procedures and processes, including the performance of an ultrasound, required to effect a woman's informed written consent to the performance of an abortion; however, the bill does not change the requirement that a woman's informed written consent be first obtained. The bill eliminates the requirement that two other physicians certify that a third trimester abortion is necessary to prevent the woman's death or impairment of her mental or physical health, as well as the need to find that any such impairment to the woman's health would be substantial and irremediable. The bill also removes language classifying facilities that perform five or more first-trimester abortions per month as hospitals for the purpose of complying with regulations establishing minimum standards for hospitals.¹

Delegate Tran's questioning during the presentation of her bill by House Majority Leader Todd Gilbert revealed just how far this law would go if passed.

GILBERT: "Where it's obvious that a woman is about to give birth ... she has physical signs that she is about to give birth would that still be a point at which she could request an abortion if she was so certified? If she's dilating?"

TRAN: "Mr. Chairman, that would be a decision that the doctor, the physician, and the woman would make at that point."

GILBERT: "I understand that. I'm asking if your bill allows that."

TRAN: "My bill would allow that, yes."²

Public outcry concerning this barbaric and brutal law forced it to be tabled. But as we all know, evil never sleeps and I'm sure it will be just a matter of time before this type of pernicious proposal rears its ugly head again.

What is happening to our country when a baby can be aborted during birth for the mental issues of a mother? How can Americans of either political party support the legislative movement of states to classify the unborn as non-persons? Who decides what constitutes "fetal viability?" Does this mean we fail to see that babies born with physical issues can have meaningful lives?

Sadly, in many respects we are heading down the same problematic path of ancient Israel, a path which led to their national judgment by God. For one, Israel, as we learn from the prophets, listened all-too-readily to lying voices of false prophets. As Babylonian captivity loomed on the

¹HB 2491 Abortion; eliminate certain requirements, *Virginia General Assembly*, January 9, 2019 session, accessed February 14, 2019, <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?191+sum+HB2491>.

²Elizabeth Tyree, "House Tables Bill About Late-term abortions in Virginia After Video Goes Viral," *ABC 13 News*, January 30, 2019, <https://wset.com/news/at-the-capitol/house-tables-bill-about-late-term-abortions-in-virginia-after-video-goes-viral>,

horizon, the errant teachers soothed the conscience of the people by telling them peace, not judgment, was at hand

¹³For from the least of them even to the greatest of them, everyone is greedy for gain, and from the prophet even to the priest everyone deals falsely. ¹⁴ And they have healed the brokenness of My people superficially, Saying, 'Peace, peace,' But there is no peace. ¹⁵ Were they ashamed because of the abomination they have done? They were not even ashamed at all; they did not even know how to blush. Therefore, they shall fall among those who fall; at the time that I punish them, they shall be cast down," says the LORD (Jer. 6).

Likewise, in our decadent, dangerous day, false teachers cleverly redefine words so they can abort babies born in the image of God. Their greed for gain is, most certainly, a driving factor since studies show the abortion industry brings in over a billion dollars per year.³ No wonder they want the unborn redefined as not being human. And for their elimination of the defenseless unborn at the rate of over 1.21 million per year,⁴ it is absolutely shocking that there is no shame for their abominable stance and practices. Yes, unfortunately, we are like ancient Israel in this regard. We, too, listen to all the wrong voices and for all the wrong reasons. God's patience will eventually wear thin, as it did with His chosen people.

For another, Israel, during the lengthy period of the kings, scarified many of her first-born children to the false god of the Phoenicians named Moloch. A large metal image resembling a human with a bull's head was erected in the Valley of Hinnom just south of the entrance to the Temple of God. Here, politicians, like King Ahaz and Manasseh (2 Ki. 16:12ff; 21:6), along with countless people burned their babies alive all for the sake of the worship of a false god (Jer. 19:5; Ezek. 16:20-21). Prophets, like Ezekiel, made it clear that national judgment was intrinsically wedded to the senseless sacrifice of the innocent and defenseless babies (Ezek. 16:20; 20:26, 31; 23:29-37). I'm here today to inform you that the worship of Moloch is alive and well. It has just been changed and modified for modern, "enlightened" people, but it is still built on the unjustified death of the innocent. No matter what our educators, politicians from either party, and modern-day "prophets" proclaim about the positive aspects of abortion, we are as guilty as Israel regarding our failure to defend the defenseless.

What are we to do as Christ-followers? We are called to be salt to decaying meat and light to the ever-encroaching moral and spiritual darkness (Matt. 5:13-16). We, like John the Baptist, along with a long line of courageous prophets, should be bold in speaking moral truth to those in power (Matt. 14:4). Additionally,

Christ-followers Should Know Why We Should Defend The Defenseless

Before we consider three lines of informative evidence, I must first pause and address those among us who have, because of complex life factors, unfortunately had abortions. Never forget that there is no sin the grace and mercy of Christ cannot cover or cleanse. The same loving Lord who forgave those who murdered him, an innocent man, by means of crucifixion (Luke 23:34), has not changed.

³Mike S. Adams, *Letters to a Young Progressive* (Washington: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2013), 64.

⁴Ibid., 63.

He always stands ready to forgive us of our sins, be what they may, to restore us, and to give us a rich, meaningful life (John 10:10). The old hymn, *Grace Greater Than Our Sin*, puts His fathomless forgiveness in perspective:

Marvelous grace of our loving Lord,
 grace that exceeds our sin and our guilt!
 Yonder on Calvary's mount outpoured,
 there where the blood of the Lamb was spilt.
 Grace, grace, God's grace,
 grace that will pardon and cleanse within;
 grace, grace, God's grace,
 grace that is greater than all our sin!

If you struggle with a decision you made some time ago with a pregnancy and you have yet to kneel at Christ's cross, He waits for your arrival so He can pour His love and forgiveness all over you. This is, most certainly, the message which we must lovingly and patiently proclaim to the many women (and men) emotionally and spiritually wounded by this particular divisive cultural issue. And if you are contemplating ending the life of an unborn, realize there are many people who love and care for you. Additionally, realize you have many options to help you if you bare this child. Local crisis pregnancy centers, adoption agencies, along with this church and many other churches are here to provide wisdom, counsel, practical help for the road ahead for you and your baby.

With these all-important foundational concepts in mind, we now turn to study why we should defend the defenseless. For some, this will not be new information, but it never hurts to remind ourselves regarding why we are pro-life. For others, it will be new information, and that is good for it can serve to motivate you to speak up and out for those who cannot speak for themselves; namely, the unborn.

From my perspective, there are two lines of evidence as to why we, as believers, are to actively to our parts to protect the unborn.

The Biblical Evidence

According to Dr. Norman Geisler, there are three views of abortion:⁵

	VIEW 1	VIEW 2	VIEW 3
Status of unborn	Fully Human	Potentially Human	Subhuman
Abortion	Never	Sometimes	Anytime
Basis	Sanctity of life	Emergence of life	Quality of life
Mother's rights	Life over privacy	Combination of rights	Privacy over right to life

The Bible, which contains God's final and perfect revelation to mankind (1 Tim. 3:16), emphatically teaches that the unborn child is human in every respect. Ostensibly, this means view one is the most consistent with inspired biblical teaching. Consider the validation from the Old Testament.

⁵Norman Geisler, *Christian Ethics*, 2nd edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 131.

One, King David informs us, by way of divine inspiration, that God is responsible for creating the embryo which eventually becomes a baby. He even goes so far as to use personal pronouns to talk about his unborn self:

³ For I know my transgressions, and my sin is ever before me. ⁴ Against Thee, Thee only, I have sinned, and done what is evil in Thy sight, So that Thou art justified when Thou dost speak, and blameless when Thou dost judge. ⁵ Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me (Ps. 51).

David speaks here about his own personal sin, not his mother's. One cannot read these divinely ordained texts and not understand that David viewed his unborn self as a real person who was a sinner from the moment of actual conception. Michael Sandel, writing in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, asserts that embryo-killing for research is permissible in biomedical research because the human embryo and human beings are to different kinds of entities.

Robert P. George, the McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence at Princeton University, and Patrick Lee, a professor of philosophy at the Franciscan University of Steubenville, dismantle Sandel's argument in their article *Acorns and Embryos*:

So to say, as Sandel does, that embryos and human beings are different *kinds* of things is true only if one focuses exclusively on the accidental characteristics—size, degree of development, and so on. But the central question is, precisely, should we focus on the accidental characteristics by which embryonic human beings differ from mature human beings, or should we recognize their essential nature (that is, *what they are*)? [emphases in original]⁶

They, then, add this timely analysis:

Sandel's claim that human embryos are not human beings, or not "full human beings," or merely "potential human life," simply cannot be squared with the facts of human embryogenesis and developmental biology. Briefly, modern embryology shows the following: (1) The embryo is from the start distinct from any cell of the mother or the father, for it is growing in its own distinct direction and its growth is internally directed to its own survival and maturation. (2) The embryo is human, since it has the genetic constitution and epigenetic primordia characteristics of human beings. (3) Most importantly, the embryo is a complete or whole organism, though immature. From conception onward, the human embryo is fully programmed, and has the active disposition, to develop himself or herself to the next mature stage of a human being. And unless prevented by disease, violence, or a hostile environment, the embryo will actually do so, despite possibly significant variation in its circumstances (i.e., the mother's womb).

This analysis is in perfect agreement with what David said succinctly in Psalm 51. He was a sinner before and after he was born because he was a human being in each setting.

David repeats this motif that the unborn baby is a person in Psalm 139 when he states:

⁶Robert P. George and Patrick Lee, "Acorns and Embryos," *The New Atlantis* (Fall 2004-Winter 2005): 94-95, accessed February 14, 2019, <https://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/acorns-and-embryos>.

¹³ For Thou didst form my inward parts; Thou didst weave me in my mother's womb. ¹⁴ I will give thanks to Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; Wonderful are Thy works, And my soul knows it very well (Ps. 139).

Mark well how David employs the use of personal pronouns to describe his unborn self. He was not an “it” or a “thing,” but a human being. Further, as *he* grew in the womb he observes that God was responsible for who *he* became at the moment of birth. From the moment of conception God fashioned him into the person He desired to accomplish His purposes. This logically leads to a question: Who would dare destroy that which God creates? No wonder Jesus made this eye-brow raising statement many years later:

²¹It would be better for him if a millstone were hung around his neck and he were thrown into the sea, than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble. (Lk. 17).

Since the baby is a full-fledged human being inside and outside the womb, what is applicable after birth concerning them is transferrable to them pre-birth. Hence, to treat a child in a negative manner is to dare to tamper with a special creation of God. If leading them astray with false belief is met with divine judgment, why would the termination of their unborn life be met with any less divine displeasure and discipline?

Two, Mosaic capital punishment laws applied to human beings inside and outside of the womb. Concerning this truth, the Law could not have been clearer:

²² And if men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child so that she has a miscarriage, yet there is no *further* injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him; and he shall pay as the judges *decide*. ²³ But if there is *any further* injury, then you shall appoint *as a penalty* life for life, ²⁴ eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, ²⁵ burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise. ²⁶ And if a man strikes the eye of his male or female slave, and destroys it, he shall let him go free on account of his eye (Exod. 21).

The law anticipated a scenario where two men would be engaged in a fist fight. During the melee, a pregnant woman is a recipient of some of the violence. If this caused her to have a miscarriage, but neither she nor the baby died, then a hefty penalty was levied. If, however, either the mother or the unborn baby died, then the perpetrator was to be executed for his crime. Here both the mother and her unborn children are treated as full human beings, and rightly so. This is something the state of New York as conveniently forgotten with their twisted and unfounded logic. God, however, has not forgotten.

Let us take this Mosaic code one step further. The Law did, in fact, provide protection for a person who accidentally killed someone. If this occurred, the person in question could flee to a divinely ordained “city of refuge.” Regarding this unique type of city, the

Cities of Refuge. Six cities, three in Canaan and three in Transjordan (area east of the Jordan River), designated as places of safety for persons suspected of manslaughter. The 6 cities were among the 48 assigned to the Levites (Nm 35:6). The 3 Transjordan cities were “Bezer in the wilderness on the tableland for the Reubenites, and Ramoth in Gilead for the Gadites, and Golan in Bashan for the

Manassites” (Dt 4:43; Jos 20:8). The 3 cities west of the Jordan were “Kedesh in Galilee in the hill country of Naphatali, and Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and Kiriath-arba (that is, Hebron) in the hill country of Judah” (Jos 20:7). They were distributed so that east of the Jordan, Golan was located in the north, Ramoth in the center, and Bezer in the south. West of the Jordan, Kedesh, Shechem, and Hebron were located north, center, and south respectively. That made it possible for an accused manslayer to reach a city of refuge quickly.

In ancient Israel the nearest relative of a murder victim was required to take the life of the murderer (Nm 35:19–21). It was his duty to the widow, other family members, and to society. Murderers were not allowed to live, and there was no way to ransom them (Nm 35:31).

Accidental death, however, was another matter. Manslaughter without malice or premeditation had a special provision in the Law of Moses. A man who accidentally killed someone could flee to the nearest city of refuge, where the local authorities would grant him asylum (Dt 19:4–6). When the case came to court, if the man was found guilty of premeditated murder, he was handed over for execution (Dt 19:11, 12). If the death was deemed accidental, the person was acquitted. Nevertheless, he had to pay a penalty. The manslayer had to stay in the city of refuge as long as the current high priest was in office (Nm 35:22–28). That would be a considerable hardship in some cases. It meant either separation from one’s family or the expense and risk of moving from one’s ancestral land and trying to make a livelihood in a new city.⁷

This is most interesting and instructive.

Wayne Grudem does an excellent job with his analysis of this pivotal text in his *Politics According to the Bible: A Comprehensive Resource for Understanding Modern Political Issues in Light of Scripture*. Here is a summary of his keen observations: If a person *accidentally* killed someone, there was a place for them to seek refuge from being killed by a family member of the deceased. However, if an unborn baby *accidentally* died as a result of the tussle, then capital punishment applied. From this the legal and moral implication is clear: Since the perpetrator of the accidental death of an unborn child was to experience capital punishment, how much more culpable a person was/is who *intentionally* killed the unborn.⁸ The Torah, at this juncture, definitively demonstrates God placed a premium value on the life of the unborn baby. Why? Because that child was not only created in His image, but he/she was the epitome of pure innocence.

Three, from the prophet Jeremiah’s call in we learn that God viewed him as a person prior to his birth:

⁴ Now the word of the LORD came to me saying, ⁵Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I have appointed you a prophet to the nations (Jer. 1).

⁷ Walter A. Elwell and Barry J. Beitzel, “Cities of Refuge,” *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 466.

⁸ Wayne Grudem, *Politics According to the Bible: A Comprehensive Resource for Understanding Modern Political Issues in Light of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 160.

God emphasizes here that He knew of Jeremiah before he was even in the womb. In God's mind, Jeremiah was always a human being. Furthermore, God underscores, once again, that He is the one who controls the entire fertilization process from start to finish. Ostensibly, this leads to a question: Who would dare step in an attempt to abort the wonderful, spectacular work of the Almighty? Who would dare re-define the unborn baby so they could terminate it for their own personal, cultural, social, and/or monetary purposes? Finally, God's call upon Jeremiah, the human being's life, started before his actual birth. This demonstrates God wasn't calling a thing to be his prophet, but a man. This, of course, leads to another question: With over 1.2 million abortions a year in our land, have we not tampered with and arrogantly challenged the call of God upon these innocent lives? No doubt our culture has.

Four, Rebekah's twin boys, Jacob and Esau, are portrayed in Scripture as being two fighting foes inside her womb.

²¹ And Isaac prayed to the LORD on behalf of his wife, because she was barren; and the LORD answered him and Rebekah his wife conceived. ²² But the children struggled together within her; and she said, "If it is so, why then am I *this way*?" So she went to inquire of the LORD. ²³ And the LORD said to her, "Two nations are in your womb; And two peoples shall be separated from your body; And one people shall be stronger than the other; And the older shall serve the younger" (Gen. 25).

Nations are comprised of people, human beings, and this is just how the LORD identified the sibling rivalry between these two baby boys. And, please, note how Jacob and Esau are called "children" while in the womb. The word in Hebrew, *banim* (הַבָּנִים) is merely a plural form of the customary word for son, *ben* (בֶּן). Since this word denotes human beings post-birth, it is only logical and consistent to take it as referencing human beings pre-birth.

There are passages we could study in the Bible to validate the fact that God views the unborn as viable persons (viz., Luke 1:41-44), but for the sake of time, I think these will suffice. From the texts we have considered, God's mind about the unborn is clearly expressed:

- God does not say the fetus is not a human being and a viable person until it develops brain waves and consciousness.
- God knows the fetus, as Geisler notes, "possesses the ontological structure and capacity to have brain activity, but it is in a latent form. It is within the basic inherent capacity of the unborn fetus to develop cognitive activity."⁹
- God does not say the fetus becomes a person when is "viable or able to live outside the womb."¹⁰ Seen in this fashion the baby could be declared unviable after birth because of a variety of factors, and then terminated for not being human. From God's Word, God is quite clear that the unborn is a human being at all stages of pre-birth development.
- God does not intimate that the fetus is not a person until it (he/she) can feel pain. Making pain a prerequisite for validating humanness does not change the humanity already existent in the fetus. Based on this premise, a quadriplegic

⁹Geisler, *Christian Ethics*, 156.

¹⁰Ibid., 157.

from of mine from High School, Mike, could be readily classified as non-human because 95% of his body feels no pain because of spinal injury he suffered when we were young men. No, from the moment of conception, the fetus is, from God's perceptive fully human in every respect.

- Nowhere does God say a mother's right trumps the right of the innocent unborn baby. From God's perspective, the mother's choice is quite clear: to guard the life of the new person who is growing in her womb.
- God does not say the fetus is only a potential person, and can, therefore, be treated as a non-person. As Geisler correctly affirms:

Personality is a psychological concept; personhood is an ontological category. Personality is a property, but personhood is the substance of being human. Personalities are formed by their surroundings, but personhood is created by God. If personhood is identified with personality, then an improperly adjusted person is not properly human. Since personality involves consciousness, those who lack consciousness would cease to be human.¹¹

- God also never says a deformed baby should be done away with. Why? Because He is Lord even of the deformity as we learn from His response to Moses: "*Who has made man's mouth? Who makes him mute, or deaf, or seeing, or blind? Is it not I, the LORD?*" (Ex. 4:11). God has carefully crafted us just like we are to accomplish His lofty, noble spiritual purposes. To thwart this purpose by means of abortion is to affront the holy activity of the Almighty. It is also to fail to understand that God uses pain and suffering to accomplish much in our lives, as C. S. Lewis discusses in his book *The Problem of Pain*.

In summary, to God, personhood begins at the moment of conception, hence great care should be evidenced to protect this innocent, real, live person.

Even though much our Christless culture fails to accept the veracity and validity of the Bible, God promises that His world shall not return void.

So shall My word be which goes forth from My mouth; It shall not return to Me empty, without accomplishing what I desire, and without succeeding *in the matter* for which I sent it (Isa. 55).

So, do not be intimidated to employ it in defense of the defenseless for God will use it to bring down strongholds of erroneous, evil thinking in His own time and in His own fashion. And do not hesitate to utilize a second line of argumentation, even though it is not biblical. God is not restricted to just biblical apologetics. At times, it is most strategic to employ . . .

The Medical Evidence

Medical data unequivocally reveals that the new fetus has 46 chromosomes, 23 from the mother and 23 from the father, thereby demonstrating that this little one is every bit an individual person . . . even though he or she only weighs 15 ten-millionth of a gram. A new life has begun, for sure,

¹¹Geisler, *Christian Ethics*, 147.

and that life is not an extension of the mother, something akin to her kidneys or tonsils. No. In every respect this new life is a new person whose rights before God should be respected and guarded at all costs. In addition, as Geisler notes,

From the moment of conception, they have their own sex, and slightly more than half are male, while the mother is female. Beginning about forty days after conception, they have their own individual brain waves, which they keep until death. Within a few weeks of conception, they have their own blood type, which may differ from the mother's. Finally, the embryo is only "nesting" in the mother's womb.¹²

Robert George and Patrick Lee echo Geisler's analysis:

Briefly, modern embryology shows the following: (1) The embryo is from the start distinct from any cell of the mother or the father, for it is growing in its own distinct direction and its growth is internally directed to its own survival and maturation. (2) The embryo is human, since it has the genetic constitution of epigenetic primordia characteristic of human beings. (3) Most importantly, the embryo is a complete or whole organism, though immature. From conception onward, the human embryo is fully programmed, and has the active disposition, to develop himself or herself to the next mature stage of a human being.¹³

Essentially, these observations are a medical expression of Aristotle's concept of final causation, wherein he taught that things will fulfill their design or intended teleology. For example, an acorn will become a suckling and then an oak tree if planted in the soil while also receiving water and sunlight. At no stage in its design is the seed anything other than an oak. It may not look like an oak (its accidental characteristics), but its entire genetic structure has oak tree built into it. To nurture the seed is to nurture an oak. To attack the seed is to attack an oak. The same is true of life which is created at conception. It is a human from the beginning (as genetics demonstrates), and if permitted to grow and flourish he or she will be a magnificent adult in due time with hopes, dreams, and, of course, rights endowed on each of us from the loving Creator.

These are viable, logical reasons why we, as Christians, embrace pro-life. It is not our idea. It is God's. Both biblical and medical evidences demonstrate that human life begins at conception, therefore, that little precious life should be nurtured, cared for, and protected at all costs.

Our culture is, however, for a variety of vacuous, vain . . . and can we say, vicious reasons, conveniently forgetting or resisting these proofs, and the result is utterly tragic. Our responsibility, therefore, before the living God is to protect all human life both inside and outside of the womb.

- We defend the defenseless by utilizing sound, consistent, and logical arguments built on God's Word. Might the Spirit of God inspire you to lovingly speak up when given the opportunity.
- We defend the defenseless by financially supporting, individually and

¹²Geisler, *Christian Ethics*, 137.

¹³ Robert P. George and Patrick Lee, *The New Atlantis*, 94-95.

- corporately, the work of pro-life organizations in our area.
- We defend the defenseless by volunteering at pro-life facilities to help pregnant couples make good, life-honoring, and God-honoring decisions to protect the life of the unborn.
 - We defend the defenseless by doing what we can to persuade law-makers to pass just laws which protect all life. Please note, the argument that Christians should have no say in a matter like this because we just want to establish our version of morality is unfounded. All laws are grounded on someone's morality. I think I'll opt for God's version of morality which appropriately respects the rights of all people, the unborn and the born.

The question in light of all of this should not be missed: Are you a defender of the defenseless? Blessed are those who were this holy mantel.

Additional Data

For those who desire more information on how to respond to those who reject the pro-life view designed by God, I submit to you the fine work of Randy Alcorn: <https://www.epm.org/resources/2010/Apr/14/prolifeanswers-prochoice-arguments-table-contents/>.

ProLife Answers to ProChoice Arguments

By Randy Alcorn
Table of Contents

Part One: Arguments Concerning Life, Humanity, and Personhood

1. **“It is uncertain when human life begins; that’s a religious question that cannot be answered by science.”**
 - a. If there is uncertainty about when human life begins, the benefit of the doubt should go to preserving life.
 - b. Medical textbooks and scientific reference works consistently agree that human life begins at conception.
 - c. Some of the world’s most prominent scientists and physicians testified to a U.S. Senate committee that human life begins at conception.
 - d. Many other prominent scientists and physicians have likewise affirmed with certainty that human life begins at conception.
 - e. The possibility of human cloning does nothing to discredit the fact that all humans conceived in the conventional manner began their lives at conception.
2. **“The fetus is just a part of the pregnant woman’s body, like her tonsils or appendix. You can’t seriously believe a frozen embryo is an actual person.”**
 - a. A body part is defined by the common genetic code it shares with the rest of its body; the unborn’s genetic code differs from his mother’s.
 - b. The child may die and the mother live, or the mother may die and the child live, proving they are two separate individuals.
 - c. The unborn child takes an active role in his own development, controlling the course of the pregnancy and the time of birth.
 - d. Being inside something is not the same as being part of something.
 - e. Human beings should not be discriminated against because of their place of residence.
 - f. There is substantial scientific reason to believe that frozen embryos are persons and should be granted the same rights as older, larger, and less vulnerable persons.
3. **“The unborn is an embryo or a fetus—just a simple blob of tissue, a product of conception—not a baby. Abortion is terminating a pregnancy, not killing a child.”**

- a. Like *toddler* or *adolescent*, the terms *embryo* and *fetus* do not refer to nonhumans, but to humans at particular stages of development.
 - b. Semantics affect perceptions, but they do not change realities; a baby is a baby no matter what we call her.
 - c. From the moment of conception, the unborn is not simple, but very complex.
 - d. Prior to the earliest abortions, the unborn already has every body part she will ever have.
 - e. Every abortion stops a beating heart and terminates measurable brain waves.
 - f. Even in the earliest surgical abortions, the unborn child is clearly human in appearance.
 - g. Even before the unborn is obviously human in appearance, she is what she is—a human being.
 - h. No matter how much better it sounds, “terminating a pregnancy” is still terminating a life.
4. “The fetus may be alive, but so are eggs and sperm. The fetus is a potential human being, not an actual one; It’s like a blueprint, not a house; an acorn, not an oak tree.”
- a. The ovum and sperm are each a product of another’s body; unlike the conceptus, neither is an independent entity.
 - b. The physical remains after an abortion indicate the end not of a potential life, but of an actual life.
 - c. Something nonhuman does not become human by getting older and bigger; whatever is human must be human from the beginning.
 - d. Comparing preborns and adults to acorns and oaks is dehumanizing and misleading.
 - e. Even if the analogy were valid, scientifically speaking an acorn is simply a little oak tree, just as an embryo is a little person.
5. “The unborn isn’t a person, with meaningful life. It’s only inches in size and can’t even think; it’s less advanced than an animal and anyway, who says people have a greater right to live than animals?”
- a. Personhood is properly defined by membership in the human species, not by stage of development within that species.
 - b. Personhood is not a matter of size, skill, or degree of intelligence.
 - c. The unborn’s status should be determined on an objective basis, not on subjective or self-serving definitions of personhood.
 - d. It is a scientific fact that there are thought processes at work in unborn babies.
 - e. If the unborn’s value can be compared to that of an animal, there is no reason not to also compare the value of born people to animals.
 - f. Even if someone believes that people are no better than animals, why would they abhor the killing of young animals, while advocating the killing of young children?
 - g. It is dangerous when people in power are free to determine whether other, less powerful lives are meaningful.
 - h. Arguments against the personhood of the unborn are shrouded in rationalization and denial.
6. “A fetus isn’t a person until implantation...or until quickening or viability or when it first breathes.”
- a. Implantation is a gauge of personhood only if location, nutrition, and interfacing with others make us human.
 - b. Quickening is a gauge of personhood only if someone’s reality or value depends upon being noticed by another.
 - c. Viability is an arbitrary concept. Why not associate personhood with heartbeat, brain waves, or something else?
 - d. The point of viability changes because it depends on technology, not the unborn herself. Eventually babies may be viable from the point of conception.
 - e. In a broad sense, many born people are not viable because they are incapable of surviving without depending on others.
 - f. A child’s “breathing,” her intake of oxygen, begins long before birth.
 - g. Someone’s helplessness or dependency should motivate us to protect her, not to destroy her.
7. “Obviously life begins at birth. That’s why we celebrate birthdays, not conception days, and why we don’t have funerals following miscarriages.”
- a. Our recognition of birthdays is cultural, not scientific.
 - b. Some people *do* have funerals after a miscarriage.
 - c. Funerals are an expression of our subjective attachment to those who have died, not a measurement of their true worth.

- d. There is nothing about birth that makes a baby essentially different than he was before birth.
8. **“No one can really know that human life beings before birth.”**
- Children know that human life begins before birth.
 - Pregnant women know that human life begins before birth.
 - Doctors know that human life begins before birth.
 - Abortionists know that human life begins before birth.
 - Prochoice feminists know that human life begins before birth.
 - Society knows that human life begins before birth.
 - The media know that human life begins before birth.
 - Prochoice advocates know that human life begins before birth.
 - If we can't know that human life begins before birth, how can we know whether it begins at birth or later?

Part Two: Arguments Concerning Rights and Fairness

9. **“Even if the unborn are human beings, they have fewer rights than the woman. No one should be expected to donate her body as a life-support system for someone else.”**
- Once we grant that the unborn are human beings, it should settle the question of their right to live.
 - The right to live doesn't increase with age and size; otherwise toddlers and adolescents have less right to live than adults.
 - The comparison between a baby's rights and a mother's rights is unequal. What is at stake in abortion is the mother's lifestyle, as opposed to the baby's life.
 - It is reasonable for society to expect an adult to live temporarily with an inconvenience if the only alternative is killing a child.
10. **“Every person has the right to choose. It would be unfair to restrict a woman's choice by prohibiting abortion.”**
- Any civilized society restricts the individual's freedom to choose whenever that choice would harm an innocent person.
 - “Freedom to choose” is too vague for meaningful discussion; we must always ask, “Freedom to choose *what?*”
 - People who are prochoice about abortion are often not prochoice about other issues with less at stake.
 - The one-time choice of abortion robs someone else of a lifetime of choices and prevents him from ever exercising his rights.
 - Everyone is prochoice with it comes to the choices prior to pregnancy and after birth.
 - Nearly all violations of human rights have been defended on the grounds of the right to choose.
11. **“Every woman should have control over her own body. Reproductive freedom is a basic right.”**
- Abortion assures that 650,000 females each year do *not* have control over their bodies.
 - Not all things done with a person's body are right, nor should they all be legally protected.
 - Prolifers consistently affirm true reproductive rights.
 - Even prochoicers must acknowledge that the “right to control one's body” argument has no validity if the unborn is a human being.
 - Too often “the right to control my life” becomes the right to hurt and oppress others for my own advantage.
 - Control over the body can be exercised to prevent pregnancy in the first place.
 - It is demeaning to a woman's body and self-esteem to regard pregnancy as an unnatural, negative, and “out of control” condition.
12. **“Abortion is a decision between a woman and her doctor. It's no one else's business. Everyone has a constitutional right to privacy.”**
- The constitution does not contain a right to privacy.
 - Privacy is never an absolute right, but is always governed by other rights.
 - The encouragement or assistance of a doctor does not change the nature, consequences, or morality of abortion.
 - The father of the child is also responsible for the child and should have a part in this decision.
 - The father will often face serious grief and guilt as a result of abortion. Since his life will be significantly affected, shouldn't he have something to say about it?

13. “It’s unfair for an unmarried woman to have to face the embarrassment of pregnancy or the pain of giving up a child for adoption.”
- Pregnancy is not a sin. Society should not condemn or pressure an unmarried mother into abortion, but should help and support her.
 - The poor choice of premarital sex is never compensated for by the far worse choice of killing an innocent human being.
 - One person’s unfair or embarrassing circumstances do not justify violating the rights of another person.
 - Adoption is a fine alternative that avoids the burden of child-raising, while saving a life and making a family happy; it is tragic that adoption is so infrequently chosen as an alternative to abortion.
 - The reason that adoption may be painful is the same reason that abortion is wrong—a human life is involved.
14. “Abortion rights are fundamental for the advancement of women. They are essential to having equal rights with men.”
- Early feminists were prolife, not prochoice.
 - Some active feminists still vigorously oppose abortion.
 - Women’s rights are not inherently linked to the right to abortion.
 - The basic premises of the abortion-rights movement are demeaning to women.
 - Many of the assumptions that connect women’s welfare with abortion, the pill, and free sex have proven faulty.
 - Some of the abortion-rights strategies assume female incompetence and subject women to ignorance and exploitation.
 - Abortion has become the most effective means of sexism ever devised, ridding the world of multitudes of unwanted females.
15. “The circumstances of many women leave them no choice but an abortion.”
- Saying they have no choice is not being prochoice, but proabortion.
 - Those who are truly prochoice must present a woman with a number of possible choices instead of just selling the choice of abortion.
 - “Abortion or misery” is a false portrayal of the options; it keeps women from pursuing—and society from providing—possible alternatives.
16. “I’m personally against abortion, but I’m still prochoice. It’s a legal alternative and we don’t have the right to keep it from anyone. Everyone’s free to believe what they want, but we shouldn’t try to impose it on others.”
- To be prochoice about abortion is to be proabortion.
 - The only good reason for being personally against abortion is a reason that demands we be against other people choosing to have abortions.
 - What is legal is not always right.
 - How can we tell people that they are perfectly free to believe abortion is the killing of children but that they are not free to act as if what they believe is really true?

Part Three: Arguments Concerning Social Issues

17. “‘Every child a wanted child.’ It’s unfair to children to bring them into a world where they’re not wanted.”
- Every child is wanted by someone; there is no such thing as an unwanted child.
 - There is a difference between an unwanted pregnancy and an unwanted child.
 - “Unwanted” describes not a condition of the child, but an attitude of adults.
 - The problem of unwantedness is a good argument for wanting children, but a poor argument for eliminating them.
 - What is most unfair to unwanted children is to kill them.
18. “Having more unwanted children results in more child abuse.”
- Most abused children were wanted by their parents.
 - Child abuse has not decreased since abortion was legalized, but has dramatically increased.
 - If children are viewed as expendable before birth, they will be viewed as expendable after birth.
 - It is illogical to argue that a child is protected from abuse through abortion since abortion is child abuse.

19. “Restricting abortion would be unfair to the poor and minorities, who need it most.”
- It is not unfair for some people to have less opportunity than others to kill the innocent.
 - The rich and white, not the poor and minorities, are most committed to unrestricted abortion.
 - Prochoice advocates want the poor and minorities to have abortions, but oppose requirements that abortion risks and alternatives be explained to them.
 - Planned Parenthood’s abortion advocacy was rooted in the eugenics movement and its bias against the mentally and physically handicapped and minorities.
20. “Abortion helps solve the problem of overpopulation and raises the quality of life.”
- The current birthrate in America is less than what is needed to maintain our population level.
 - The dramatic decline in our birthrate will have a disturbing economic effect on America.
 - Overpopulation is frequently blamed for problems with other causes.
 - If there is a population problem that threatens our standard of living, the solution is not to kill off part of the population.
 - Sterilization and abortion as cures to overpopulation could eventually lead to mandatory sterilization and abortion.
 - The “quality of life” concept is breeding a sense of human expendability that has far-reaching social implications.
21. “Even if abortion were made illegal, there would still be many abortions.”
- That harmful acts against the innocent will take place regardless of the law is a poor argument for having no law.
 - The law can guide and educate people to choose better alternatives.
 - Laws concerning abortion have significantly influenced whether women choose to have abortions.
22. “The antiabortion beliefs of the minority shouldn’t be imposed on the majority.”
- Major polls clearly indicate that the majority, not the minority, believes that there should be greater restrictions on abortion.
 - Many people’s apparent agreement with abortion law stems from their ignorance of what the law really is.
 - Beliefs that abortion should be restricted are embraced by a majority in each major political party.
 - In 1973 the Supreme Court imposed a minority morality on the nation, ignoring the votes of citizens and the decisions of state legislatures.
23. “The antiabortion position is a religious belief that threatens the vital separation of church and state.”
- Many nonreligious people believe that abortion kills children and that it is wrong.
 - Morality must not be rejected just because it is supported by religion.
 - America was founded on a moral base dependent upon principles of the Bible and the Christian religion.
 - Laws related to church and state were intended to assure freedom *for* religion, not freedom *from* religion.
 - Religion’s waning influence on our society directly accounts for the moral deterioration threatening our future.

Part Four: Arguments Concerning Health and Safety

24. “If abortion is made illegal, tens of thousands of women will again die from back-alley and clothes-hanger abortions.”
- For decades prior to its legalization, 90 percent of abortions were done by physicians in their offices, not in back alleys.
 - It is not true that tens of thousands of women were dying from illegal abortions before abortion was legalized.
 - The history of abortion in Poland invalidates claims that making abortion illegal would bring harm to women.
 - Women still die from *legal* abortions in America.
 - If abortion became illegal, abortions would be done with medical equipment, not clothes hangers.
 - We must not legalize procedures that kill the innocent just to make the killing process less hazardous.
 - The central horror of illegal abortion remains the central horror of legal abortion.
25. “Abortion is a safe medical procedure—safer than full-term pregnancy and childbirth.”
- Abortion is not safer than full-term pregnancy and childbirth.

- b. Though the chances of a woman's safe abortion are now greater, the number of suffering women is also greater because of the huge increase in abortions.
 - c. Even if abortion were safer for the mother than childbirth, it would still remain fatal for the innocent child.
 - d. Abortion can produce many serious medical problems.
 - e. Abortion significantly raises the rate of breast cancer.
 - f. The statistics on abortion complications and risks are often understated due to the inadequate means of gathering data.
 - g. The true risks of abortion are rarely explained to women by those who perform abortions.
26. "Abortion is an easy and painless procedure."
- a. The various abortion procedures are often both difficult and painful for women.
 - b. Abortion is often difficult and painful for fathers, grandparents, and siblings of the aborted child.
 - c. Abortion is often difficult and painful for clinic workers.
 - d. Abortion is difficult and painful for the unborn child.
 - e. Even if abortion were made easy or painless for everyone, it wouldn't change the bottom-line problem that abortion kills children.
27. "Abortion relieves women of stress and responsibility, and thereby enhances their psychological well-being."
- a. Research demonstrates abortion's adverse psychological effects on women
 - b. The many postabortion therapy and support groups testify to the reality of abortion's potentially harmful psychological effects.
 - c. The suicide rate is significantly higher among women who have had abortions than among those who haven't.
 - d. Postabortion syndrome is a diagnosable psychological affliction.
 - e. Many professional studies document the reality of abortion's adverse psychological consequences on a large number of women.
 - f. Abortion can produce both short- and longer-term psychological damage, especially a sense of personal guilt.
 - g. Most women have not been warned about and are completely unprepared for the psychological consequences of abortion.
28. "Abortion providers are respected medical professionals working in the woman's best interests."
- a. Abortion clinics do not have to maintain the high standards of health, safety, and professionalism required of hospitals.
 - b. Many clinics are in the abortion industry because of the vast amounts of money involved.
 - c. Clinic workers commonly prey on fear, pain, and confusion to manipulate women into getting abortions.
 - d. Clinic workers regularly mislead or deceive women about the nature and development of their babies.
 - e. Abortionists engage in acts so offensive to the public that most media outlets refuse to describe them even in the abortionist's own words.
 - f. Abortionists, feminists, a past president of the United States, many congressmen, and the Supreme Court have defended partial-birth abortion, one of the most chilling medical atrocities in human history.
 - g. Abortion clinics often exploit the feminist connection, making it appear that their motive is to stand up for women.
 - h. Doctors doing abortions violate the fundamental oaths of the medical profession.

Part Five: Arguments Concerning the Hard Cases

29. "What about a woman whose life is threatened by pregnancy or childbirth?"
- a. It is an extremely rare case when abortion is required to save the mother's life.
 - b. When two lives are threatened and only one can be saved, doctors must always save that life.
 - c. Abortion for the mother's life and abortion for the mother's health are usually not the same issue.
 - d. Abortion to save the mother's life was legal before convenience abortion was legalized and would continue to be if abortion were made illegal again.
30. "What about a woman whose unborn baby is diagnosed as deformed or handicapped?"
- a. The doctor's diagnosis is sometimes wrong.

- b. The child's deformity is often minor.
 - c. Medical tests for deformity may cause as many problems as they detect.
 - d. Handicapped children are often happy, always precious, and usually delighted to be alive.
 - e. Handicapped children are not social liabilities, and bright and "normal" people are not always social assets.
 - f. Using dehumanizing language may change our thinking, but not the child's nature or value.
 - g. Our society is hypocritical in its attitude toward handicapped children.
 - h. The adverse psychological effects of abortion are significantly more traumatic for those who abort because of deformity.
 - i. The arguments for killing a handicapped unborn child are valid only if they also apply to killing born people who are handicapped.
 - j. Abortions due to probably handicaps rob the world of unique human beings who would significantly contribute to society.
 - k. Abortions due to imperfections have no logical stopping place; they will lead to designer babies, commercial products to be bred and marketed, leaving other people to be regarded as inferior and disposable.
31. "What about a woman who is pregnant due to rape or incest?"
- a. Pregnancy due to rape is extremely rare, and with proper treatment can be prevented.
 - b. Rape is never the fault of the child; the guilty party, not an innocent party, should be punished.
 - c. The violence of abortion parallels the violence of rape.
 - d. Abortion does not bring healing to a rape victim.
 - e. A child is a child regardless of the circumstances of his conception.
 - f. What about already-born people who are "products of rape"?
 - g. All that is true of children conceived in rape is true of those conceived in incest.

Final Thoughts on the Hard Cases:

- 1. No adverse circumstance for one human being changes the nature and worth of another human being.
- 2. Laws must not be built on exceptional cases.

Part Six: Arguments against the Character of Prolifers

32. "Antiabortionists are so cruel that they insist on showing hideous pictures of dead babies."
- a. What is hideous is not the pictures themselves, but the reality they depict.
 - b. Pictures challenge our denial of the horrors of abortion. If something is too horrible to look at, perhaps it is too horrible to condone.
 - c. Nothing could be more relevant to the discussion of something than that which shows what it really is.
 - d. It is the prochoice position, not the prolife position, that is cruel.
33. "Prolifers don't care about women and they don't care about babies once they're born. They have no right to speak against abortion unless they are willing to care for these children."
- a. Prolifers are actively involved in caring for women in crisis pregnancies and difficult child-raising situations.
 - b. Prolifers are actively involved in caring for unwanted children and the other "disposable people" in society.
 - c. It is abortion providers who do not provide support for women choosing anything other than abortion.
34. "The antiabortionists are a bunch of men telling women what to do."
- a. There is no substantial difference between men and women's views of abortion.
 - b. Some polls suggest that more women than men oppose abortion.
 - c. The great majority of prolife workers are women.
 - d. If men are disqualified from the abortion issue, they should be disqualified on both sides.
 - e. Men are entitled to take a position on abortion.
 - f. There are many more women in prolife organizations than there are in proabortion organizations.
 - g. Of women who have had abortions, far more are prolife activists than prochoice activists.
35. "Antiabortionists talk about the sanctity of human life, yet they favor capital punishment."
- a. Not all Prolifers favor capital punishment.

- b. Capital punishment is rooted in a respect for innocent human life.
 - c. There is a vast difference between punishing a convicted murderer and killing an innocent child.
36. **“Antiabortion fanatics break the law, are violent, and bomb abortion clinics.”**
- a. Media coverage of prolife civil disobedience often bears little resemblance to what actually happens.
 - b. Prolife civil disobedience should not be condemned without understanding the reasons behind it.
 - c. Peaceful civil disobedience is consistent with the belief that the unborn are human beings.
 - d. Prolife protests have been remarkably nonviolent, and even when there has been violence, it has often been committed by clinic employees and escorts.
 - e. Abortion clinic bombing and violence are rare, and are neither done nor endorsed by prolife organizations.
37. **“The antiabortionists distort the facts and resort to emotionalism to deceive the public.”**
- a. The facts themselves make abortion an emotional issue.
 - b. It is not the prolife position, but the prochoice position that relies on emotionalism more than truth and logic.
 - c. The prolife position is based on documented facts and empirical evidence, which many prochoice advocates ignore or distort.
 - d. The prochoice movement consistently caricatures and misrepresents Prolifers and their agenda.
 - e. The prochoice movement, from its beginnings, has lied to and exploited women, including the “roe of *Roe v. Wade* and the “Doe” of *Doe v. Bolton*.
38. **“Antiabortion groups hide behind a profamily façade, while groups such as Planned Parenthood are truly profamily because they assist in family planning.”**
- a. The prochoice movement’s imposition of “family planning” on teenagers has substantially contributed to the actual cause of teen pregnancy.
 - b. Through its opposition to parental notification and consent, Planned Parenthood consistently undermines the value and authority of the family.
 - c. Planned Parenthood makes huge financial profits from persuading people to get abortions.
 - d. Planned Parenthood has been directly involved in the scandals of trafficking baby body parts.
 - e. As demonstrated in the case of Becky Bell, the prochoice movement is willing to distort and exploit family tragedies to promote its agenda.
 - f. Planned Parenthood, the prochoice movement, and the media ignore family tragedies that do not support the prochoice agenda.

Summary Argument

39. **“The last three decades of abortion rights have helped make our society a better place to live.”**
- a. Abortion has left terrible holes in our society.
 - b. Abortion has made us a nation of schizophrenics concerning our children.
 - c. Abortion is a modern holocaust which is breeding unparalleled violence and to which we are accomplices.
 - d. Abortion is taking us in a direction from which we might never return.
 - e. Abortion has ushered in the brave new world of human pesticides.
 - f. Abortion has led us into complete moral subjectivism in which we are prone to justify as ethical whatever it is we want to do.